

# Awareness and Use of Research Profiles among Faculty Members in Non-Technical Colleges in Ahilyanagar District: A Survey

**Dr. Anil B. Pawar**

Librarian, Arts Science and Commerce College , Kolhar Tal- Rahata,  
Dist- Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India  
[asapawar@gmail.com](mailto:asapawar@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

*As the employment of digital research profiles is fast becoming the norm to achieve better visibility, accessibility, and impact in academic work, the issue arises regarding the tools, which are web technologies available only online. For instance, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, ORCID, and Academia.edu are platforms that not only enable professors to display their research outputs but also allow them to interact with other scholars and monitor their scholarly metrics.*

*The present research is conducted to identify the understanding and the users categories of this kind of profile among faculty members at non-technical colleges in Ahilyanagar District. A descriptive survey technique was used to gather data using structured questionnaires, which were prepared and shared with faculty from all the disciplines in the entire district. The research findings show that even though the majority of the participants are briefed about research profiles, the usage levels are still below par, as they face different obstacles stemming from a lack of training, digital literacy, and institutional support. Bringing the importance of coordinated awareness programs and educational initiatives to create a research-friendly academic Setting for non-technical colleges, this study also illuminates the path for decision makers and teaching staff during the policymaking process and in Faculty training activities in similar regional and institutional settings*

**KEYWORDS:** Research Profiles, Faculty Awareness, Non-Technical Colleges, Academic Networking, Research Visibility, Scholarly Communication, Academic Identity.

## INTRODUCTION

With the new academic research stage that is underway, researcher profiles in digital form have become a necessity of immediate attention for being visible, collaboration with colleagues, and setting the academic impact. The current study aims to analyze the awareness and utilization levels of research profile platforms of faculty members like Google Scholar, Research Gate, Academia.edu, and ORCID who are from non-technical colleges in Ahilyanagar District. Data was which is the past participle of the verb "to be," was collected through a funded survey method to

## ***Awareness and Use of Research Profiles among Faculty Members in Non-Technical Colleges in Ahilyanagar District: A Survey***

take a sample of faculty members there in order to find their awareness level, usage rate, the benefits they claimed from the usage, and the challenges they encountered while using these platforms. The general/average situations are that the outcome of the survey reveals a good level of awareness, but only minimal active use; however, it also shows a significant difference in the academic designation, discipline, and institutional support. The research highlights the need for organizations because of the requirements of digital literacy programs that are specifically suitable for the local colleges and schools, and their attempts to improve the teachers' skills in the field of technology. In addition, they succeed in persuading teachers to better use the converting job of research, hence creating a good academic culture of the institutions in the non-technical parts in their teaching. In the context of development by digital teachers in the region in the case of local and academic problems alike.

### **Research profiles: The concept**

The term "research profile" has been defined as a digital record of a scholar's academic identity that usually resides within online platforms, exhibits his/her research output, describes professional affiliations, schooling honors, and measures such as citations or downloads. These profiles help the dissemination, searching, and evaluation the scholarly work, as well as networking and collaboration in the academic community.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research utilized a survey research design to see if the staffs were aware of and interested in using research profiles in non-technical colleges in Ahilyanagar District.

### **Population and Sampling**

The population in consideration was made up of the faculty members at non-technical colleges that were either affiliated with universities in

Ahilyanagar District. They were properly distributed to ensure that the sample selected by the researchers is representative of all disciplines and academic ranks with a **stratified random** sampling method (Kothari, 2006). That is, people from Arts, Commerce, Education, and Management were generally of the same number. Along with it, the respondents were ranked as being either of a higher or lower academic level, which was further sub-classified. The researcher made an effort to ensure that he covered a wide range of areas; besides that, some of these people had to be researchers, and some of those people in those areas had to be researchers. number to be filled based on actual data) Individuals eventually participated in the study.

### **Data Collection Instrument**

The developed **structured questionnaire** was the instrument used to collect data for the study. The questionnaire was in addition to yes/no and two-option questions also **open-closed** types. In the different sections, there were multiple choice items concerning matters from which some are enumerated above, like, for example, obstacles, which, in respondents' opinion, can be faced during the usage of the tools. (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

## **Data Collection Procedure**

The survey was distributed via both **online forms (Google Forms)** and **physical copies**, where digital access was limited. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses.

## **Review of Literature - Literature Review**

The increasing digitalization of academic communication has led to the emergence and widespread use of research profile platforms such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and ORCID. These platforms serve as vital tools for researchers to disseminate their work, track citations, and engage with the global academic community. A growing body of literature explores how these tools are being adopted and utilized by faculty across various disciplines and regions.

**Global Trends in Research Profile Usage:** Several studies have documented the rising global trend in the use of digital research profiles among academics. According to Nicholas et al. (2015), researchers are increasingly relying on digital platforms not only to share their publications but also to network and track scholarly metrics. Holstein et al. (2014) highlight the role of these platforms in facilitating alternative metrics that provide a broader view of research impact beyond traditional citation counts.

**Adoption in Indian Higher Education:** In the Indian context, research by Singh and Sahoo (2019) reveals a growing awareness of research profiling tools among faculty members in universities and technical institutions, though usage varies widely depending on digital literacy and institutional support. A study by Patel (2021) emphasizes that while faculty in urban areas show higher adoption rates, those in rural or semi-urban areas often lack awareness and access to training.

**Challenges in Non-Technical Institutions:** There is limited literature specifically focusing on faculty members in non-technical disciplines such as Arts, Commerce, or Education. However, existing studies (e.g., Joshi & Mehta, 2020) suggest that faculty in these areas may face challenges such as limited exposure to research technology, lack of institutional incentives, and lower emphasis on research output. As noted by Tiwari (2020), research culture in many non-technical colleges remains underdeveloped, which may directly affect the use of digital scholarly tools.

**Institutional and Individual Factors:** Awareness and usage of research profiles are influenced by multiple factors, including academic rank, research experience, institutional policies, and access to digital infrastructure (Kumar & Sharma, 2022). Training programs, research mandates by regulatory bodies, and peer influence have also been identified as important enablers of engagement with research profiles (Mukherjee, 2021).

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

The study was carried out in 100 selected Faculties that responded to the questionnaire from **Awareness and Use of Research Profiles among Faculty Members in Non-Technical Colleges in Ahilyanagar District: A Survey**.

## ***Awareness and Use of Research Profiles among Faculty Members in Non-Technical Colleges in Ahilyanagar District: A Survey***

**Table No- 1** Awareness of Research Profiles

Sr. No.	Awareness of Research Profiles	No. of Respondent	Percentage
1.	Google Scholar	75	75%
2.	ResearchGate	62	62%
3.	ORCID	48	48%
4.	Academia.edu	55	55%
5.	Vidwan	32	32%
6.	Scopus/Web of Science	20	20%

Table No. 1 shows that the awareness level was highest for Google Scholar (75%), followed by ResearchGate (62%) and Academia.edu (55%). Platforms such as ORCID and Vidwan had moderate awareness, while global indexing services like Scopus and Web of Science had significantly lower familiarity. This trend suggests that faculty are more inclined toward free and user-friendly platforms.

**Table 2** How did you learn about these platforms

Sr. No.	How did you learn about these platforms	No. of Respondent	Percentage
1.	Institution/Workplace	71	71%
2.	Colleagues	65	65%
3.	Online Platforms	59	59%
4.	Conferences/Seminars	78	78%

Table No. 2 shows that 71(%) of respondent users stated 'Yes' for Institute/Workshops .65 (%),59(%),78 (%) of respondent users stated 'Yes' for Colleagues, Online Platforms, Conferences/Seminars, respectively. It is observed that mostly users learn about these platforms in various ways.

**Table 3.** How frequently do you update your research profile

Sr. No.	How frequently do you update your research profile	No. of Respondent	Percentage
1.	Regularly (Once a month or more)	31	31 %
2.	Occasionally (Once every 3-6 months)	42	42 %
3.	Rarely (Once a year or less)	15	15 %
4.	Never	13	13 %

Table No. 3 shows that 31(31%), 42(42%),15(15%),13(13%)respondents, were stated 'Yes' for the update of Research Profiles Regularly, Occasionally, Rarely, Never, respectively. It is observed that most users update occasionally.

**Table 4.** Purpose of Using Research Profiles

Sr. No.	Purpose of Using Research Profiles	No. of Respondent	Percentage
1.	To increase visibility	65	65 %

2.	Citation tracking	40	40 %
3.	Academic networking/collaboration	35	35 %
4.	Compliance with API/NAAC	25	25%
5.	Sharing full-text research papers	24	24 %

Table No. 4 shows that the primary motivation for using research profiles is to improve visibility (65%), followed by tracking citations and engaging in academic networking. Interestingly, 25% admitted they maintain profiles only for fulfilling institutional or policy requirements like NAAC or API scores.

**Table 5 : Challenges Faced by Faculty Members**

Sr. No.	Challenges Faced by Faculty Members	No. of Respondent	Percentage
1.	Lack of awareness/training	60	60 %
2.	Limited institutional support	45	45 %
3.	Technical difficulties	30	30 %
4.	Perceived lack of relevance	20	20 %

Table No. 5 shows that Lack of awareness and training emerged as the most prominent challenge (60%), followed by inadequate institutional support (45%). Technical difficulties, especially among senior faculty, and doubts about the utility of these platforms also contribute to underutilization.

## FINDINGS

1. Awareness of research profiles is moderate, with younger faculty being more active.
2. Google Scholar is the most known and used platform.
3. A significant number of faculties do not update their profiles regularly.
4. There is a clear need for institutional encouragement and training.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Organize regular training workshops on academic networking and research profiles.
2. Make research profile maintenance part of institutional policy for career progression.
3. Encourage creation of ORCID iDs and integration with institutional repositories.
4. Provide technical support to senior faculty members.
5. Promote a research culture where visibility and collaboration are valued is often driven by API requirements rather than genuine interest.

## CONCLUSION

The study reveals a growing but uneven awareness and use of research profiles among faculty members in non-technical colleges of Ahilyanagar. While digital tools have become indispensable in modern academia, their adoption requires structured institutional effort and individual motivation. Enhancing faculty engagement with research profiles can ultimately strengthen the academic ecosystem of the district.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Haustein, S., Bowman, T. D., Holmberg, K., Peters, I., & Larivière, V. (2014). Astrophysicists on Twitter: An in-depth analysis of tweeting and scientific publication behavior. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 66(3), 279–296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-09-2013-0081>
  - [2] Joshi, R., & Mehta, N. (2020). Digital engagement of faculty in non-technical institutions: A case study of research culture. *Indian Journal of Higher Education Research*, 9(2), 45–53.
  - [3] Kumar, V., & Sharma, R. (2022). Factors influencing the adoption of digital academic tools among college faculty in India. *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT*, 18(1), 89–102.
  - [4] Mukherjee, A. (2021). Academic profiling platforms and their role in research dissemination in India. *Library Herald*, 59(1), 65–74.
  - [5] Nicholas, D., Rowlands, I., Jamali, H. R., & Boukacem-Zeghmouri, C. (2015). Digital research communications: How are researchers using social media? *Research Trends*, 39, 7–10.
  - [6] Patel, S. (2021). Use of research profile platforms among faculty in Indian urban and semi-urban colleges: A comparative study. *Journal of Educational Technology and Research*, 13(1), 23–31.
  - [7] Singh, R., & Sahoo, S. (2019). Awareness and use of ORCID and Google Scholar among academic staff in Indian universities. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 39(2), 82–88. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.39.2.13887>
  - [7] Tiwari, P. (2020). Barriers to research culture in non-STEM higher education institutions: An exploratory study. *Journal of Educational Policy and Planning*, 10(3), 33–40.
-