Advantages of ICT tools and technologies have influenced working styles of libraries. Libraries have been adopting these tools and technologies for discharging efficient services to fulfill the requirements of users. Web 2.0 is one of the latest technology of ICT which has become buzz word in the present society. The usage of Web 2.0 in day to day life has raised a question i.e. Can Web 2.0 play important role in the information dissemination in the academic institutions. There is a need to know the potentiality, usefulness of Web 2.0 in the academic institutions.

In the present study an effort has been made to know the usage, implementation, usefulness, preference, barriers and required skills to use these technologies in IIM libraries among PGDM- PGP students. The study finds that usage and implementation of Web 2.0 technologies in the libraries of IIM is at nascent stage. Major findings of the study are as follows:

**MAJOR FINDINGS**

**Demographic Information**

**Age wise Distribution of Respondents**

- Overall 428 responses were received.
- In the age group 20-25, total 298 (69.60%) responses were received from respondents.
- In the age group 26-30, total 115 (26.9%) responses were received from respondents.
- In the age group > 30, total 15 (3.5%) responses were received.
- Highest number of respondents 78 (76.50%) in the age group 20-25 were from IIMA, 30 (51.70%) from IIMB in age group 26-30 and 7 (7.40%) from IIMI in the age group more than 30.

**Gender wise Distribution of the Respondents**

- 114 (26.6%) responses received from female.
- 314 (73.4%) responses were received from male respondents.
• Highest number of respondent 24 (41.40%) were female at IIMB and 84 (82.40%) were male responded at IIMA.

**Availability of Library Portal/Website/Webpage**

• Out of 428 respondents, 22 respondents responded that library portal is not available in their institute whereas 406 responded in the favour of availability.

• Highest number of respondent 8 (8.50%) from IIMI responded that their library does not have portal / page and 57 (98.30%) from IIM B responded that their library has library portal / page.

**Frequency of Web Portal Use (Usage Pattern)**

• 108 (25.2%) respondents use library portal on daily basis.

• 157 (36.7%) respondents use library portal on weekly basis.

• 88 (20.6%) respondents use library on fortnightly basis.

• 41 (9.6%) respondents use library on monthly basis.

• 34 (7.9%) use library rarely.

• Highest number of the respondents 36 (35.30%) from IIMA use library portal / page on weekly basis, 26 (44.80%) from IIMB on monthly basis, 33 (35.10%) form IIMI on weekly basis, 31 (34.40%) from IIMR on daily basis and 38 (45.20%) from IIMU on weekly basis which was highest.

**Purpose for using Library portal**

• Respondents 47 (81.03%) use library portal for keeping updates about library activities at IIMB.

• Majority of respondents 323 (75.47%) use library portal for keeping about updates about library activities.

**Relevant information at Library Portal**

• Highest number of respondents 26 (28.90%) at IIMR responded that information available at library portal / page is not relevant and 72 (85.70%) at IIMU responded that information available at library portal / page is relevant.
Total 325 (75.90%) respondents responded that web portal of their institute’s library has relevant information.

**Library Portal User Friendly**

- Highest number of respondents 33 (36.70%) at IIMR responded that library portal/page is not user friendly and 68 (81.00%) at IIMU responded that library portal/page is user friendly.
- Total 299 (69.90%) respondents responded that library web portal/page of their institute’s library is user friendly.

**Time Spent Online**

- 119 (27.8%) respondents spent 1-2 hour(s) online in a day.
- 141 (32.9%) respondents spent 2-3 hours online in a day.
- 168 (39.3%) respondents spent more than 3 hours online in a day which is highest.
- Highest number of respondents 30 (51.70%) at IIMB spent 2-3 hours in online.

**Awareness of usage of Web 2.0 technologies**

- Most of respondents 82 (80.39%) are aware about usage of SNS in their library at IIM A.
- Majority of respondents 188 (42.93%) are aware about the usage of SNSs in their libraries.

**Reasons for not using web 2.0**

- 45 (25.7%) respondents responded that their library do not use web 2.0 due to time constraint.
- 34 (19.40%) respondents responded that their library do not use web 2.0 due to time Training
- 62 (35.40%) respondents responded that their library do not use web 2.0 due to time Privacy
- 21 (12.00%) respondents responded that their library do not use web 2.0 due to Institutional policy
7 (4.00%) respondents responded that their library do not use web 2.0 due to Technology
6 (3.40%) respondents agreed that their library do not use web 2.0 due to other reasons
Highest number of respondents 62 (35.4%) responded that privacy could be possible reasons for not using web 2.0 by their libraries.

Place of Use of web 2.0

Most respondents 318 (74.30%) uses Web 2.0 from hostel and minimum respondents 63 (14.72%) from library.

Usefulness of Information services

40 (9.40%) respondents opined information services as I don’t know, 45 (10.50%) Not Useful, 93 (21.80%). Somewhat Useful, 150 (35.10%) Useful and 99 (23.20%) Very Useful
Highest number of the responded 26 (44.80%) at IIM B opined information services useful which are provided by their library using web 2.0.
7 (1.70%) respondents opined communication services as I don’t’ know, 30 (7.20%) Not Useful, 115 (27.40%) Somewhat Useful, 179 (42.70%) Useful, 88 (21.00%) Very Useful.
Highest number of the responded 28 (48.30%) at IIM B opined communication services useful.
31 (7.40%) respondents opined promotion services as I don’t know, 46 (11.00%) not useful, 138 (32.90%) somewhat useful, 134 (31.90%) useful, 71 (16.90%) very useful.
Highest number of the responded 31 (38.30%) at IIMU opined promotion services somewhat useful.
45 (10.60%) respondents opined referral services as I don’t know, 41 (9.70%) not useful, 135 (31.90%) somewhat useful, 139 (32.90%) useful, 63 (14.90%) very useful.
Highest number of the respondents 22 (37.90%) at IIMB opined referral services useful.
• 58 (13.90%) respondents opined advisory services as I don’t know, 58 (13.90%) not useful, 132 (31.60%) somewhat useful, 124 (29.70%) useful, 46 (11.00%) very useful.

• Highest number of the respondents 30 (34.90%) at IIMB opined advisory services useful.

• 75 (17.60%) respondents opined reference services as I don’t know, 47 (11.00%) not useful, 127 (29.80%) somewhat useful, 129 (30.30%) useful and 48 (11.30%) very useful.

• Highest number of the respondents 33 (35.10%) at IIMI opined reference services useful.

• 116 (28.10%) respondents opined academic liaison services as I don’t know, 61 (14.80%) not useful, 102 (24.70%) somewhat useful, 100 (24.20%) useful and 34 (8.20%) very useful.

• Highest number of the respondents 35 (42.70%) at IIMU opined academic liaison services useful.

• 70 (16.90%) respondents opined searching services as I don’t know, 53 (12.80%) not useful, 132 (31.90%) somewhat useful, 113 (27.30%) useful and 46 (11.10%) very useful.

• Highest number of the respondents 20 (36.40%) at IIMB opined searching services useful.

• 76 (18.20%) respondents opined user education services as I don’t know, 64 (15.30%) not useful, 149 (35.70%) somewhat useful, 93 (22.30%) useful and 35 (8.40%) very useful.

• Highest number of the respondents 25 (45.50%) at IIMB opined user education services average.

Potentiality of Web 2.0 / social media

• 23 (5.50%) respondents opined promoting library holdings as I don’t know, 36 (8.70%) poor, 109 (26.20%) average, 174 (41.80%) good and 74 (17.80%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 29 (50.90%) at IIMB opined promoting library holding as I don’t know.
• 26 (6.40%) respondents opined flow of Information as I don't know, 33 (8.10%) poor, 105 (25.70%) average, 188 (46.10%) good and 56 (13.70%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 52 (53.60%) at IIMA opined flow of information good.
• 26 (6.30%) respondents opined quick information as I don’t know, 37 (9.00%) poor, 106 (25.70%) average, 189 (45.80%) good and 55 (13.30%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 54 (54.50%) at IIMA opined quick information good.
• 27 (6.50%) respondents opined keep abreast of contemporary news as I don’t know, 71 (17.10%) poor, 117 (28.30%) average, 134 (32.40%) good and 65 (15.70%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 23 (41.10%) at IIMB opined quick information good.
• 50 (11.90%) respondents opined connect with other professionals as I don’t know, 72 (17.10%) poor, 117 (27.80%) average, 124 (29.50%) good and 58 (13.80%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 21 (36.80%) at IIMB opined Average.
• 66 (15.80%) respondents opined support in peer-to-peer learning as I don’t know, 56 (13.40%) poor, 138 (33.10%) average, 104 (24.90%) good and 53 (12.70%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 22 (39.30%) at IIMB opined Average.
• 79 (19.00%) respondents opined support in innovative teaching as I don’t know, 71 (17.10%) poor, 108 (26.00%) average, 123 (29.60%) good and, 35 (8.40%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 37 (37.40%) at IIMA opined good.
• 67 (15.70%) respondents opined collaborate and share scholarly work as I don’t know, 67 (15.70%) poor, 115 (26.90%) average, 117 (27.40%) good and 61 (14.30%) very good.
• Highest number of the respondents 38 (40.40%) at IIMI opined good.

Preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 Technologies
Most of the respondents 24 (37.50%) opined not useful about the preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 technology (Blog) in their library at IIMA.

Most of the respondents 10 (55.60%) at IIMU opined not useful about the preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 technology (IM) in their library.

Most of the respondents 8 (29.60%) at IIMU opined not useful about the preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 technology (Wiki) in their library.

Most of the respondents 23 (41.80%) at IIMI opined useful about the preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 technology (RSS) in their library.

Most of the respondents 15 (40.50%) opined not useful at IIMB about the preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 technology (Podcast) in the library.

Most of the respondents 21 (39.60%) at IIMA opined very useful about the preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 technology (Vodcast) in the library.

Most of the respondents 17 (33.30%) I don’t know about the preferences for implementation of Web 2.0 technology (SNS) in the library at IIMR.

Skill/Training

Most of the respondents 287 (67.06%) are learn Web 2.0 by practice.

Most of the respondents 262 (61.20%) opined computer literacy required to use Web 2.0.

Majority of respondents 32 (32.00%) opined that their institute had organized workshop at IIMA.

Majority of respondents 26 (26.53%) opined that orientation helped them to use Web 2.0 technologies at IIMA.

Majority of respondents 8 (72.72%) opined that content was not useful at IIM I.

Contribution

Majority of respondents 27 (31.03%) publish content while using Web 2.0 technologies at IIM I.

Cyber policy

Overall 257 (61.20 %) respondents responded that their institute has cyber policy.

Highest number of respondents 43 (75.40%) from IIMB responded that their library have cyber policy.
Provision to Secure your Privacy

- Overall 311 (74%) respondents agreed that their institute have provision to secure user privacy, post, comments, pictures and videos.
- Highest number of respondents 50 (87.70%) from IIMB responded that their library have provision to secure user privacy, post, comments, pictures and videos.

Further Plans:
1. Use of Web 2.0 tools by faculty members for academic purpose
2. Competency mapping of Web 2.0 tools as information source in the academic institution
3. Assessment of users’ behavior towards the use of Web 2.0 tools.
4. Framework and policy for the use of Web 2.0 tools in academic libraries.
5. Evaluation of the Service Quality of Web 2.0 Services in Academic Libraries

Suggestions:
1. IIMs should integrate Web 2.0 tools with their library portal / page.
2. Library professionals should be trained in the use of Web 2.0 tools.
3. Orientation workshop should be conducted to create awareness among users.
4. Librarian should also take initiative to use Web 2.0 in libraries.
5. Leadership of IIMs should encourage librarians to use Web 2.0 tools in library services
6. Advantages of using Web 2.0 tools in the libraries should be brought into the notice of leadership and users by librarian.
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