

## USE OF E-RESOURCES BY THE FACULTY MEMBERS OF AAEMF'S DELIGHT COLLEGE OF PHARMACY, PUNE.

Yasmeen H. Tamboli \*      Dr. Siddiqui Eraj Aziza \*\*

**\*PhD Scholar,**

DLIS,

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar  
Marathwada University  
Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India

**\*\* Librarian & Professor**

Dr. Rafiq Zakaria College for  
Women,  
Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India

QR Code



**Abstract:** - *The present research seeks to provide insight into the use of various online sources, awareness of e-resources, experience level with using e-resources, time spent using e-resources, as well as purpose of utilizing e-resources. The preferred location for associate professors and assistant professors of Pharmacy College, Pune to access electronic resources.*

**Keywords:** E-Resources, Pharmacy College, User Study

### INTRODUCTION:-

Sources of information accessible offline or online with both digital and analogue formats through the use of the intranet or the internet via computers, e-readers, tablets, smartphones, etc.

E-resources are sources providing data that's preserved electronically and accessible utilizing electronic networks and systems. OPACs, CDROMs, Online database systems, e-journals, e-books, Internet resources, print-on-demand (POD), e-mail publishing, wireless publishing, electronic links, web publishing, and physical carriers in all formats are just a few examples of

the many publishing models that tumble under the overarching concept "e-resources" (electronic resources). According to IFLA ISDB, the term in this context applies to "any electronic product that provides collection of data, whether it in text, numerical, graphical or time-based, as an available commercially resource" (ER).

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE:-

Varadharajan (2007)<sup>1</sup> stated in his study "Digital Libraries and Library Professional in the Changing Environment," Scenario," a series of workout sessions on digital libraries can provide

an outstanding balance of topics covering technological, technical, management, and social challenges. Rajput et al (2007)<sup>2</sup> that analyzed Internet Resources and Services in Institute of Engineering & Science, IPS Academy Indore: and finding in the paper “Internet Resources and Services in Institute of Engineering & Science, IPS Academy Indore: An Exploratory Study”. Many users expressed dissatisfaction with the IES infrastructure facilities, particularly the hardware facilities. Dhanavandan (2012%) explores the most recent state-of-the-art information using the digital library resources and shows how engineering professionals use them in the engineering institutions in the Cuddalore District. 33.7% of users believe that difficulty accessing resources from digital libraries is caused by a lack of knowledge. The results of this study will help internet users become better browsers. Haneefa K (2007)<sup>3</sup> Presented the results of an investigation in the study “Use of ICT Based Resources and Services in Special Libraries in Kerala, India. The majority of users have made use of the email service. 60% of library patrons were using the WWW. Several users expressed dissatisfaction with the usage of ICT in the libraries and cited "inadequate ICT infrastructure" as the cause of their discontent. A few formal orientation and training programmes for ICT-based resources and services were suggested by users.

## OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study are:

1. To analyze the use of e-resources.
3. To find out the time spent on usage of e-resources
4. To identify the purpose of using e-resources
5. To study the use of various online sources
6. To find out the most preferred place for accessing e-resources
7. To determine the usefulness of e-resources

## METHODOLOGY:-

In this study covers both primary and secondary data. A questionnaire and secondary data were used to acquire the primary data in a survey has been collected from a variety of sources, including books, periodicals, and so on. Associate professors and Assistant professors at the AAEMF's Delight College of Pharmacy in Koregaon Bhīma provided the information for the study's purposes. 45 faculty members out of a number of 50 received and answered the questionnaires. As a result, 70% of the study's participants responded to it. The data have been collected using a stratified random sampling procedure.

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:-****Table 1: Status wise Distribution of Respondents**

Status	Total No. of Respondents	%
Associate Professor	13	28.88
Assistant Professor	32	71.11
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 1 shows the status wise distribution of respondents. The result reveals that out of a total of 45 respondents, the Associate professor population is 13 in number and comes to 28.88 percent whereas the population of Assistant professor is 32 and the percentage share comes to 71.11 percent.

**Table 2: Status wise Distribution of Respondents use of E-Resources**

Status	No of Respondent				Total	%
	Yes	%	No	%		
Associate professor	11	84.62	02	15.38	13	28.89
Assistant Professor	28	87.5	04	12.5	32	71.11
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>86.66</b>	<b>06</b>	<b>13.33</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 2 shows the status wise distribution of respondents awareness of e-resources. Out of 45 total respondents, 39 (86.66) respondents are aware of e-resources and 06 (13.33%) respondents are not aware of e-resources. The above table also shows that out of 13 Associate Professors, 11(84.62%) respondents are aware of e-resources and 2 (15.38%) respondents are not aware of e-resources. Out of 32 Assistant Professors, 28 (87.5%) respondents are aware of e-resources and 4(12.5%) respondents are not use of e-resources.

**Table 3: Status wise Distribution of Respondents Time spent on usage of E-Resources**

Time Spent	No of Respondent				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Less than 1 hour	04	30.77	07	21.88	12	26.67
1 to 2 hour	05	38.46	11	34.37	14	31.11
2 to 3 hour	02	15.38	08	25.00	10	22.22
Less than 3 hour	03	23.07	06	18.75	09	20.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 3 indicates the status wise distribution of respondents time spent on usage of e-resources. It could be noted that out of the total 45 respondents, 12 (26.67%) respondents spend less than an hour in a day, 14 (31.11%) respondents spend 1-2 hours per day, 10 (22.22%) respondents spend 2-3 hours in a day and 09 (20.00%) respondents spend above three hours in a day for accessing e-resources. With regard to 13 Associate professors, 05 (38.46%) respondents spend 1-2 hours in a day, and 02 (15.38%) respondents spend more than 3 hours in a day for accessing e-resources. Out of 32 Assistant professors, 07 (21.88%) respondents use e-resources less than an hour in a day and 06 (18.75%) respondents' access e-resources for more than three hours in a day.

**Table 4: Status wise Distribution of Respondents Purpose of using E-Resources**

Purpose	No of Respondent				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
To Update new Knowledge	04	30.77	07	21.87	11	24.44
For research purpose	04	30.77	08	25.00	12	26.67
Professional Development	03	23.08	07	21.88	10	22.22
To improving subject knowledge	02	15.38	10	31.25	12	26.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Data presented in table 4 indicates status wise distribution of respondents purpose of using eresources. It is clearly observed from the table that, 11 (24.44%) respondents using e-resources for there to update new knowledge followed by 12 (26.67%) respondents use e-resources for research purpose, 10 (22.22%) respondents use for professional development and 12 (26.67%) respondents use e-resources for improving subject knowledge. As far as the status wise break up of faculty members is concerned with the purpose of use e-resources. The above table depicts that 04 (30.77%) Associate professors use e-resources for keeping up-to-date knowledge as well as research purpose and 10 (31.25%) Assistant professors use e-resources for the improving subject knowledge.

**Table 5: Status wise Distribution of Respondents Purpose of using E-Resources**

Purpose	No of Respondent				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
E-Journals	02	15.38	05	15.62	07	15.56
E-Books	03	23.07	09	28.13	12	26.67
E-Databases	01	7.69	04	12.5	05	11.11
Online lecture notes	04	30.77	09	28.13	13	28.89
E-Thesis and Dissertations	02	15.38	03	9.37	05	11.11
E-Reference Sources	01	7.69	02	6.25	03	6.66
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5 shows the status wise distribution of respondents use e-resources. It can be seen from the table that 07 (15.62%) respondents use e-journals followed by 12 (26.67%) respondents use e-books, 05 (11.11%) respondents use e-databases, 13 (28.89%) respondents use online lecture notes, 05 (6.66%) respondents use e-thesis and dissertations, 03 (6.66%) respondents use e-reference sources. It is also observed from the above table that 09 (28.13%) Associate professors use e-books and 04 (30.77%) Assistant professors use e-thesis and dissertations.

**Table 6: Status wise Distribution of visited search Engine by the respondents**

Search Engines	No of Respondent				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Google	04	30.77	06	18.75	10	22.22
YouTube	05	38.46	10	31.25	15	33.33
FreeBookSearch.net	01	7.69	09	28.12	10	22.22
Other E-Resources (DELNET, NDLI etc...)	03	23.08	07	21.88	10	22.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 6 indicates the status wise distribution of visited search engine by the faculty members while using e-resources. Out of 45, 10 (22.22%) respondents gave the preference to the Google search engines, most respondent gave preference to the YouTube with 15 (33.33%) and the FreeBookSearch.net and other E-

resources replied 10 (22.22%). It is revealed that the 15 (33.33%) Associate Professor and 05 (38.46%) Assistant Professor gave respondents to the YouTube search engine.

**Table 7: Status wise Distribution of Respondents regarding the Usefulness of Electronic resources**

Usefulness	No of Respondent				Total	%
	Associate Professor	%	Assistant Professor	%		
Very Useful	06	46.15	17	53.13	23	51.11
Useful	04	30.77	10	31.26	14	31.11
average	02	15.39	03	9.36	05	11.11
Not useful	01	7.69	02	6.25	03	6.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Table 7 shows the status wise distribution of respondents regarding the usefulness of e-resources. Out of 45 total respondents, 23 (51.11%) respondents opinion that very useful, 14(31.11%) respondents opine that useful , 05 (11.11%) respondents opine that average and 03 (6.67%) respondents opine that not useful. The table also depicts that status wise break up of faculty members is concerned with the usefulness of e-resources. About 06 (46.15%) Associate professors opine that very useful and 10 (31.26%) Assistant professors opine that useful.

#### **Conclusion-:**

The findings of this study showed that the majority of participants were conscious of the electronic resources accessible in their college library. For the purpose of their research and investigation, they have used electronic resources. E-resources, in the belief of a majority of the respondents, are useful.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Vadharajan, N., (2007) "Digital libraries and Library Professionals in the changing scenario" PEARL: A Journal of Library and Information Science, 1(4) p 42- 45.
2. Haneefa, K., (2007) "Use of ICT based resources and services in special libraries in Kerala" Annals of Library and Information Studies 54(1) p23-31.
3. Rajput, et al., (2007) "Internet Resources and Services in Institute of Engineering and Science, IPS Academy Indore: An Exploratory Study" Library Progress (International) 27(2)
4. [What is E-Resources | IGI Global \(igi-global.com\)](http://www.igi-global.com)