REVIEW OF RESEARCH
IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631(UIF) UGC APPROVED JOURNAL NO. 48514 ISSN: 2249-894X
VOLUME - 8 | ISSUE - 3 | DECEMBER - 2018

ELECTRONIC RSOURCES UNDER NATIONAL CONSORTIA: ACCESS AND CHALLENGES

Raghavendra Bonal
Assistant Librarian ,
Central University of Karnataka ,
Kadaganchi, Aland Road, Kalaburagi.

ABSTRACT

The modern communication technologies have become essential for libraries and information centers for resource sharing in recent time. It is all due to libraries, which are transforming themselves to information centers as well as to knowledge centre. National Consortia are very effective tools for e-information to provide authentic and specific information to the users in all the disciplines. This study highlights the significance of national consortiums in India and provides results of e-resources under national consortiums mainly E-Shodhsindhu and CeRA consortiums by the users in the universities of Hyderabad Karnataka region.

KEYWORDS: *Electronic Resources, National Consortia, E-Shodhsindhu.*

LIBRARY CONSORTIA

No library is able to satisfy all the needs of its users due to various constraints. In the present technological age, libraries and information centers have started acquiring and maintaining new forms of information resources such as e-journals, e-books, online database, e-documents etc. The spurt in prices of electronic journals and publications has necessitated the formation of library consortium by the library community. The concept of library consortium gravitates different member libraries to meet the goal of working as a team.

"Consortia "is a plural form of "consortium "but is often used in a singular form. Consortium is derived from the Latin word "consort" which means partnership. A library consortium is a group of libraries which come together to realize a combined objective that usefully requires co-operation and the sharing of resources. The library consortium mainly deals with resource sharing in digital or electronic format. The aim of the consortia is to achieve what the members of the group cannot achieve individually (Anju Saini, 2017).

Library consortia provide a connection of common goals of libraries for the help of its client needs. In consortium, group libraries can easily exchange their resources to other group's libraries and use other library resource to help its institutions client requirements. In library consortium, library's members share different types of resources i.e. e-content (e-books, e-journals, and other e-media), catalogue, OPAC (Online Public Access Catalogue), and other library services.

NATIONAL CONSORTIA FOR ACADEMIC UNIVERSITIES

E-ShodhSindhu merges three consortia initiatives, namely UGC-INFONET Digital Library Consortium, NLIST and INDEST-AICTE. The e-ShodhSindhu will continue to provide current as well as archival access to more than 15,000 core and peer-reviewed journals, bibliographic, citation and factual databases in different disciplines from a large number of publishers and aggregators to its member institutions. Also to centrally-

funded technical institutions, universities and colleges that are covered under 12(B) and 2(f) Sections of the UGC Act.(Source: https://ess.inflibnet.ac.in/about.php). The main objective of the e-ShodhSindu: Consortia for Higher Education E-Resources is to provide access to qualitative electronic resources including full-text, bibliographic and factual databases to academic institutions at a lower rates of subscription.

The Consortium for e-Resources in Agriculture (CeRA) came to existence in November 2007 for facilitating accessibility of scientific journals to all researchers / teachers in the National Agricultural Research System by providing access to information specially access to journals online which is crucial for having excellence in research and teaching. Currently 147 institutions in NARS have 24x7 online access to important journals in CeRA platform through IP authentication. Thomson Web of Science for Science Citation Index (SCI) has been made available to the Lead Institute (IARI), but the facility is available to all members of CeRA (Source: http://cera.iari.res.in/)

RESULTS OF RESEARCH ON USE OF E-RESOURCES

Using the self-administrative questionnaire, data was been collected to understand the use of e-shodhsindhu and Cera consortia covering four universities in Hyderabad Karnataka region with a total population of 838 samples. It is seen from the table 1 that out of 838 respondents, a majority proportion of the respondents, more than two-fifth (376, 44.9%), is from pure science discipline. A significant proportion of the respondents, more than one-fourth, (240, 28.6%), is from social science. A small proportions of the respondents, less than one-tenth, (78, 9.3%), (72, 8.6%) and (72, 8.6%) is from humanities, management and engineering and allied disciplines respectively.

Table No.1: Discipline of the respondents

Discipline	Frequency	Percentage
Social Science	240	28.6
Humanities	78	09.3
Pure Sciences	376	44.9
Management	72	08.6
Engineering & allied	72	08.6
Total	838	100.0

Table No.2: Use of electronic resources and services in last five years

Extent of use	Frequency	Percentage
Greatly increased	450	53.7
Increased	334	39.9
Reduced	54	6.40
Total	838	100.0

A majority proportion of the respondents, more than two-fourth (450, 53.7%) have opined that their use of electronic resources and services have greatly increased in last five years. A significant proportion of the respondents, less than two-fifth (334, 39.9%) said that their use has increased. A small proportion of them less than one-tenth (54, 6.4%) said their use of electronic resources and services have reduced. Therefore, it is clear from the above table that the majority of the respondent's use of electronic resources and services in last five years has greatly increased.

Table No. 3: Comparison in access of e-resources (E-shodhsindhu and CerA)

Level of acquaintance with		Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std error mean
1	American chemical society	Teaching Faculty	316	1.89	.310	.017
		Research Scholars	522	1.75	.432	.019
2	American institute of physics	Teaching Faculty	316	1.91	.294	.017
		Research Scholars	522	1.82	.388	.017
3	American physical society	Teaching Faculty	316	1.92	.265	.015
		Research Scholars	522	1.74	.439	.019
4	Annual reviews	Teaching Faculty	316	1.76	.428	.024
		Research Scholars	522	1.52	.500	.022
5	Blackwell publishing	Teaching Faculty	316	1.72	.449	.025
		Research Scholars	522	1.73	.444	.019
6	Cambridge university press	Teaching Faculty	316	1.46	.499	.028
		Research Scholars	522	1.50	.500	.022
7	Elsevier	Teaching Faculty	316	1.42	.494	.028
		Research Scholars	522	1.45	.498	.022
8	Emerald (LIS collection)	Teaching Faculty	316	1.70	.458	.026
		Research Scholars	522	1.43	.495	.022
9	Encyclopaedia Britannica	Teaching Faculty	316	1.58	.494	.028
		Research Scholars	522	1.54	.499	.022
10	Institute of physics publishing	Teaching Faculty	316	1.91	.285	.016
		Research Scholars	522	1.76	.429	.019
11	Institute of studies in industrial Level.	Teaching Faculty	316	1.87	.333	.019
		Research Scholars	522	1.78	.412	.018
12	JCCC	Teaching Faculty	316	1.92	.265	.015
		Research Scholars	522	1.84	.364	.016
13	JSTOR	Teaching Faculty	316	1.51	.501	.028
		Research Scholars	522	1.55	.498	.022
14	Nature	Teaching Faculty	316	1.80	.403	.023
		Research Scholars	522	1.61	.488	.021
15	Oxford university press	Teaching Faculty	316	1.61	.489	.028
		Research Scholars	522	1.47	.499	.022
16	Portland press	Teaching Faculty	316	1.91	.294	.017
		Research Scholars	522	1.80	.397	.017
17	Project muse	Teaching Faculty	316	1.79	.407	.023
		Research Scholars	522	1.84	.368	.016
18	Royal society of chemistry	Teaching Faculty	316	1.89	.318	.018
		Research Scholars	522	1.61	.487	.021
19	Science direct	Teaching Faculty	316	1.51	.501	.028
		Research Scholars	522	1.33	.472	.021
20	Springer link	Teaching Faculty	316	1.36	.481	.027
		Research Scholars	522	1.26	.439	.019
21	Taylor & Francis	Teaching Faculty	316	1.40	.490	.028
		Research Scholars	522	1.29	.456	.020

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t.	df.	Sig (2-tailed	Mean difference	Std. Error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
									Lower	Upper
1	EVA	122.583	.000	5.014	836	.000	.140	.028	.085	.000
	EVnA			5.423	811.777	.000	.140	.026	.089	.000
2	EVA	55.155	.000	3.514	836	.000	.089	.025	.039	.000
	EVnA			3.757	795.339	.000	.089	.024	.042	.000
3	EVA	253.052	.000	6.759	836	.000	.185	.027	.131	.000
	EVnA			7.583	835.998	.000	.185	.024	.137	.000
4	EVA	185.682	.000	6.998	836	.000	.237	.034	.170	.000
	EVnA			7.269	743.493	.000	.237	.033	.173	.000
5	EVA	.274	.601	-.263	836	.793	-.008	.032	-.071	.793
	EVnA			-.262	659.312	.793	-.008	.032	-.071	.793
6	EVA	4.010	.046	-1.351	836	.177	-.048	.036	-.118	.177
	EVnA			-1.352	666.279	.177	-.048	.036	-.118	.177
7	EVA	2.797	.095	-.810	836	.418	-.029	.035	-.098	.418
	EVnA			-.811	668.375	.418	-.029	.035	-.098	.418
8	EVA	62.013	.000	8.024	836	.000	.275	.034	.208	.000
	EVnA			8.179	705.193	.000	.275	.034	.209	.000
9	EVA	7.047	.008	1.295	836	.196	.046	.035	-.024	.196
	EVnA			1.298	670.006	.195	.046	.035	-.024	.115
10	EVA	165.001	.000	5.690	836	.000	.155	.027	.101	.208
	EVnA			6.264	829.266	.000	.155	.025	.106	.203
11	EVA	47.868	.000	3.282	836	.001	.090	.027	.036	.144
	EVnA			3.456	769.891	.001	.090	.026	.039	.141
12	EVA	52.600	.000	3.445	836	.001	.081	.024	.035	.127
	EVnA			3.715	807.921	.000	.081	.022	.038	.124
13	EVA	3.029	.082	-1.222	836	.222	-.043	.036	-.113	.026
	EVnA			-1.221	661.692	.223	-.043	.036	-.113	.026
14	EVA	154.687	.000	5.658	836	.000	.184	.033	.120	.248
	EVnA			5.928	760.342	.000	.184	.031	.123	.246
15	EVA	17.295	.000	4.023	836	.000	.142	.035	.073	.211
	EVnA			4.044	675.347	.000	.142	.035	.073	.211
16	EVA	69.306	.000	3.900	836	.000	.100	.026	.050	.151
	EVnA			4.191	803.168	.000	.100	.024	.053	.148
17	EVA	11.989	.001	-1.756	836	.080	-.048	.027	-.102	.006
	EVnA			-1.712	612.719	.087	-.048	.028	-.103	.007
18	EVA	475.391	.000	8.820	836	.000	.271	.031	.211	.331
	EVnA			9.740	831.224	.000	.271	.028	.216	.326
19	EVA	38.800	.000	5.210	836	.000	.179	.034	.112	.247
	EVnA			5.135	634.033	.000	.179	.035	.111	.248
20	EVA	33.018	.000	3.087	836	.002	.100	.032	.037	.164

	EVnA			3.019	618.216	.003	.100	.033	.035	.165
21	EVA	32.250	.000	3.160	836	.002	.106	.033	.040	.171
	EVnA			3.103	626.732	.002	.106	.034	.039	.172

Independent sample t-test is conducted to find the difference mentioned in above hypothesis (Table No. 3). The test shows that there is a significant difference among the designation of the respondents and respondents access to the e-resources by American Chemical Society (t-value: 5.012, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), American institute of physics (t-value: 3.514, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), American physical society (t-value: 6.759, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Annual reviews (t-value: 6.998, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Blackwell publishing (t-value: -0.263, df: 836, p= 0.793 > 0.05), Cambridge university press (t-value: -1.351, df: 836, p= 0.177 > 0.05), Elsevier (t-value: -0.810, df: 836, p= 0.418 > 0.05), Emerald (LIS collection) (t-value: 8.024, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Encyclopaedia Britannica (t-value: 1.295, df: 836, p= 0.196 > 0.05), Institute of physics publishing (t-value: 5.690, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Institute of studies in industrial development (t-value: 3.282, df: 836, p= 0.001 < 0.05), JCCC (t-value: 3.445, df: 836, p= 0.001 < 0.05), JSTOR (t-value: -1.222, df: 836, p= 0.222 > 0.05), Nature (t-value: 5.658, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Oxford university press (t-value: 4.023, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Portland press (t-value: 3.900, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Project muse (t-value: -1.756, df: 836, p= 0.080 > 0.05), Royal society of chemistry (t-value: 8.820, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Science direct (t-value: 5.210, df: 836, p= 0.000 < 0.05), Springer link (t-value: 3.087, df: 836, p= 0.002 < 0.05), and Taylor & Francis (t-value: 3.160, df: 836, p= 0.002 < 0.05) respectively. Therefore, the study hypothesis is rejected and an alternative hypothesis is formed that there is a significant difference in respondent's access to e-resources in their respective libraries and their designation. The difference is not found in the access with respect to Blackwell publishing, Cambridge university press, Elsevier, Encyclopaedia Britannica, JSTOR and Project muse.

CONCLUSION

Libraries have to realize that working together can accomplish far more than what they can do individually. Libraries in India should work cooperatively in order to establish library consortia with a view to offering and sharing electronic resources. With a view to improve the research productivity of faculty and research community and thereby ensure quality in research and also gain better accreditation, the national agencies like UGC and ICAR have provided ample of useful e-resources to the universities in the country and it is up to them to make best of these e-resources for their academic and research. Librarians have a greater role to play in promoting better use of e-resources and the results of survey warrants still more usage among academic community.

REFERENCES

1. Anju Saini (2017). LIBRARY CONSORTIA: AN OVERVIEW, International Journal of Digital Library Services, Vol. 7, October - December, 2017, Issue – 4
2. E.Shodhsindhu Consortia. https://ess.inflibnet.ac.in/about.php).
3. Gillies, S. (2014). Negotiating Author Fees for Hybrid OA Journals: Library Consortial Leadership. *Collection Management*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2014.935903
4. ICAR Cera Consortia. http://cera.iari.res.in/
5. Kalita, Hira (2015). Medical library consortium and its importance in present time: a study. Knowledge librarian an international peer reviewed bilingual e-journal of library & information sc.vol 2(4).116-128p.
6. Kaye, J., & Hawkins, N. (2014). Data sharing policy design for consortia: Challenges for sustainability. *Genome Medicine*. https://doi.org/10.1186/gm523
7. Kupryte, R., Segbert-Elbert, M., & Bernal, I. (2005). The eifl.net initiative: Access and management of electronic resources by library consortia in developing and transition countries. *Serials Review*. https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2005.10764999

8. Malhana, I. V., & Rao, S. (2012). Refocusing attention on institutional and collective responsibility for an effective consortia model. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*.
9. Meert, D. L., & Given, L. M. (2009). Measuring Quality in Chat Reference Consortia: A Comparative Analysis of Responses to Users' Queries. *College & Research Libraries*. https://doi.org/10.5860/0700071
10. Muthu, M (2013). Resource sharing in libraries: A vital role of consortia.· International research journal of library & information science.vol 3 (1).
11. Turner, C. N. (2014). E-resource acquisitions in academic library consortia. *Library Resources and Technical Services*. https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.58n1.33