

Marketing 4.0 – Are Indian Academic Libraries Ready for Future Transition?

Dr. Vanishree Pabalkar- Symbiosis Institute of Management Studies (SIMS),
Dr. Komal Chopra - Symbiosis Institute of Management Studies (SIMS),
Ms. Dipali More – Symbiosis Institute of Management Studies (SIMS)

Article Info

Volume 83

Page Number: 18015 - 18026

Publication Issue:

March - April 2020

Abstract:

According to Kotler –“Marketing 4.0 is a marketing approach that blends online and offline platforms. In today’s digital world it is important to have the presence online; at the same time it is extremely important to have a human interface to understand the customers’ perspective. Marketing 4.0 is a combination of style with substance”. The paper studies the transition of library from a traditional setup to a digital setup. The research aims at understanding the antecedents of marketing 4.0 with reference to Indian academic libraries. Further the paper examines the challenges in the process of transition and empowerment of librarian in facilitating the transition. Mix research method which is combination of qualitative and quantitative research was adopted for the study where structured questionnaire was used and interviews of the respondents were taken. The respondents include students and librarians of Indian academic libraries. The result shows that the respondents have varied expectations inspite of the challenges from Indian academic libraries and are positively inclined towards transition. The study has several implications for libraries which are facing constraints in the process of future transition.

Article History

Article Received: 24 July 2019

Revised: 12 September 2019

Accepted: 15 February 2020

Publication: 30 April 2020

Keywords: Marketing 4.0, future, transition, library, digital world.

Introduction:

The World is transforming at ever-increasing rate. The sole reason being the diffusion of Information, Communication and Technology. The consumer today is more demanding and this is the outcome of Technology. ICTs provides a platform to companies to communicate about their Products and brands at a global level, (Parasuraman and Zinkhan, 2002; Yadav and Varadarajan, 2005).The relationships that exists between the customer and the market encompass various dimensions. Emphasis on strengthening the relationships with the customer was the focus in marketing 3.0 era. In this scenario, the customer would specifically pick and choose the Products and Brands of his choice to ensure that those meet his needs and provide him with utmost satisfaction.

In the field of Marketing, the advancements are bound to happen. The series of transition in Marketing, there has been a major shift from product driven marketing (1.0) to customer-centric marketing (2.0), and ultimately to human-centric

marketing (3.0). In Marketing 4.0 the transition to the digital world is witnessed. Marketing 4.0 is the natural extension of Marketing 3.0. With Technology to its best, and with the presence of Data analytics and Artificial Intelligence, the Products and Brands that are offered to customers are becoming more and more personalised. Devices that are voice-controlled and used in homes today, like Amazon’s Echo with its Alexa technology are providing extremely innovative and vibrant platforms to connect with customers. Customers can give personalized tasks through such devices.

The convergence will ultimately lead to the convergence between digital marketing and traditional marketing. In a high-tech world, people long for high touch. The more social we are, the more we want things that are made just for us. Backed by big-data analytics, products become more personalized and services become more personal. In the digital economy, the key is to leverage these paradoxes. In this transitional era, a new marketing approach is required. Thus, Marketing 4.0 is the

natural outgrowth of Marketing 3.0. The role of marketers is to show the right path to the customers from awareness and ultimately to advocacy.

In essence, Marketing 4.0 describes a deepening and a broadening of human-centric marketing to cover every aspect of the customer's journey. Customer today is exploring options that provide and connect him with the high-tech world. The interaction and communication mix that happens through this high definition touch points is the strategy for differentiation in this era. For instance, Birch box, is one of the first online cosmetic product retailer. It had its offline stores along with the presence online. The retailer provides customers with iPads, to enhance the personalization. The customers are free to provide their recommendations, through this platform. The dash buttons by Amazon is another example. This product enabled customers to replenish the products with one button. This was the move that Amazon adopted with Internet of Things.

The transition will certainly lead to a path of convergence between digital marketing and conventional marketing. In search for the high-tech world, customers are keen for the high touch. Though the impact of connectivity with customers through online platforms is more convenient and cost effective, the question is, of these tools will completely replace the conventional marketing tools. Instead an option of using hybrid tools is yet available for the marketers. Since it is a challenge to completely get the new wave of Online to replace the offline legacy marketing. The co-existence of both would provide and enhance customer satisfaction.

Objectives

- 1) Understand the antecedents of marketing 4.0 with reference to Indian academic libraries.
- 2) Understand the transition of libraries from traditional to digital
- 3) Understand if there are differences in the usage pattern among users
- 4) Understand effect of transition on user experience.

Literature Review

Evolution of Marketing

The research papers published on Marketing 4.0 preferably reviewed the concept of all three stages of evolution of marketing activity namely Marketing 1.0, Marketing 2.0 and Marketing 3.0 with Marketing 4.0 and also the influence of technology on each stage of marketing activity (Basayazicioglu and Karmastufa, 2018; Jimenez-Zarco et.al., 2017; Jara et.al., 2012).

Product-Centric Marketing

According to Kotler, Kartajaya and Setiawan (2010) Marketing 1.0 is product centric marketing where products are sold generically to masses without differentiating them with gender, social-economic background etc. Marketing of food and beverages industry and pharma industry is the prominent example of Marketing 1.0. Marketing 1.0 came out in time of industry revolution where the main objective of companies is to sell as many products as possible. The products were designed to serve physical needs of masses. Therefore industry aims towards controlling and reducing the cost of production which lowers the cost of product and help in reaching out more customers (Kotler, Kartajaya and Setiawan, 2010). The companies employing one to many marketing strategies where product information is conveyed through flyers, posters, brochures, commercials on TV and Radio, advertisements in newspapers and magazines, billboards, telemarketing, sponsorships, face-to-face etc (Todor, 2016; Geraghty and Conway, 2016; Henekom and Scriven, 2002). Customized marketing or target marketing for group or segment of community is possible; targeting individual is beyond reach in such product centric marketing (Todor, 2016).

Customer-Centric Marketing

Product centric industries have decreased in number and replaced by customer centric industries over the years (Golding, 2014). Seth (2000) defines the customer centric marketing as "an emphasis on understanding and satisfying the needs, wants and resources of individual consumers and customers

rather than those of mass markets or market segments". Tseng and Pillar (2011) signify that customer centric approach means achieving goal of high quality management and implementing customer requirement without increasing production and distribution cost". Wright et. al (2002) says that the objective of customer centric marketing is to expertise in customer's attitude, motivation, habit and values that create customer opinion about the brand of a company. They emphasize on providing electronic tools to enable customer for customizing product according to their requirement. Lee-Mortimer (1991) indicated that the competition among the manufacturing industries for becoming world class manufacturers compelled urge of achieving, creating and maintaining best quality product which can be achieved by treating customer as King. Seth (2000) emphasizes on creating perfect customer experience along with maintaining high quality of product and services. Satisfied customers are indication of companies' performance and profit (Andaleeb, 2016). According to Kotler, Kartajaya and Setiawan, (2010) Marketing 2.0 incepted with information era with the evolution of information technology and internet. The marketers of Marketing 2.0 era accept consumers as whole human being with mind and heart. The "consumer is king" concept is popularized in the era. The consumers are tracking information on the products required by them through the information technology and comparing price offering on same product by different companies. The consumer became decision maker of price and quality design. It satisfies consumer in better way as their requirement were fulfilled. The authors' further say that the companies were seems more concentrating on passive target campaigns in Marketing 2.0 era.

Human-centric Marketing

According to Kotler, Kartajaya and Setiawan (2010) Marketing 3.0 is a simple extension of Marketing 2.0's customer-centric marketing. According to authors -

- Marketing 3.0 is human centric marketing where profits gained by companies are balanced with corporate social responsibility by making their products accessible to every growing lower income group of the society. The marketers of this era stayed connected with their customers

through social media. The authors gave emphasis to creativity and human spirit marketing.

- Marketing 3.0 is also collaborative marketing where customers are connected to other customers through social media where they share their experiences and opinions about a particular product or company. They are no longer isolated individuals. Therefore it becomes more important to understand the attitude of the customers and involve their consumers through co-creation programs.
- Marketing 3.0 is cultural, where companies try to understand the local consumer and culture for adapting local culture in designing of product and deciding promotional strategies. Here customer segmentation became more significant.
- Marketing 3.0 is spiritual where companies should include lifestyle and philosophical approach to their products which matches with consumers search for positivity in product. As a part of social awareness many companies are manufacturing products that will not harm our environment.

Transition to digitalization Marketing

Swieczak (2017) reveals that Marketing 4.0 is a result of vigorous global competition, increasing customer demand, innovative developments in marketing, frequency of emerging technologies. The author further describes that Marketing 4.0 is 24/7 real time service, in a way of value added information and continuous interaction, offered by enterprise to the digitally acclaimed customers through cloud computing, social media, mobile apps to create personal emotion experience and motivate client to use their products through customer preference analysis. Jara et.al. (2012) reveals that Marketing 4.0 is simple progressive development of Marketing 3.0. Yeh et.al (2016) emphasizes that Marketing 4.0 changes the way companies interacted with customers and became more dynamic with real-time monitoring in every part of the world. That is Marketing 4.0 give raise to Client 4.0 where it entrust business to give holistic consideration to customers' need and inventiveness of customers (Wereda and Wozniak, 2019). The paper by Todor (2016) indicates that usage of media by customers

and companies has increased 10 times in last few years. This intensive use of technology in marketing enables customer participation in brand integration and building trustable relationship among customer and brand (Jara et. al, 2012). That is now business can monitor customer navigation preferences, influential factors behind customer's preference and their buying behavior (McAfee et. al, 2012, Jimenez-Zarco et.al. 2017). The dynamism in consumer behavior requires thorough knowledge of business rules and also customer centric new digitized marketing systems (Swieczak, 2017; Wereda and Wozniak, 2019; Moldovan et. al., 2015). Vassileva (2017) recommends to have proper application marketing metrics for finding the digital properties require transition, involvement of top management in designing and planning of digital marketing strategies and knowledge expertise for implementation of marketing strategies. Basyazicioglu and Karmastufa (2018) recommended to invest in manpower skill development to handle Marketing 4.0 to speed up the marketing activities in their businesses. As per Vassileva (2017) Marketing 4.0 differs in terms of timing, talent management, data and analytics, degree of centralization and marketing organization models. The transformation in mindset of companies is required for success of Marketing 4.0 (Vassileva, 2017).

Dewi and Darma (2019) shows that Grab Taxi's is successful in implementing Marketing 4.0 principles by changing companies old logo and introducing human centric brand image while launching its services in Indonesia. The company combines information technology, creativity and marketing 4.0 strategy of mix marketing method. Beditz (2018) research signifies that the traditional marketing methods are equally important in the era of online/digital marketing to reach out all levels and genres of age group; especially in case of children and older generation.

Digital Transition of Library

Digital Transition may be defined as "*the realignment of, or new investment in, technology and business models to more effectively engage digital customers at every touch point in the customer experience lifecycle.*" (Brian Solis of Altimeter Group -The 2014 State of Digital Transformation).

Digital transition involves vision of organization, strategies involved, interest taken by people from all levels of organization, processes and technology implemented (Sandhu, 2018). Australian Library and Information Association (2014) reports that library should collaborate with technology companies, publishers and government to bring in change. The work should extend at national and international level resulting in libraries with rich content and creating positive customer experience. Virtual Library System of Brunei, North American Research Libraries and North Carolina State University Libraries are the good example of such collaborations (Suhaimi, 2004; Hunt Video, 2015).

The advancement in web technology has shown its impact on digitization of library. Every stage of library digitization matches with that of web technology.

Traditional Library

Library 1.0 is associated with Web 1.0. The term was introduced to compare the features to Library 1.0 and Library 2.0 by Michael Casey (2015). Library 1.0 is conservational traditional library with initial footprints of digital services like Marc i.e one-to-many and in read only format. The users here are passive and the approach of library is librarian centric (Noh, 2015).

Web-Enable Services

Michael Casey (2005) has introduced the term Library 2.0 to the world through his blog "librarycrunch". He indicated association of Web 2.0 with web-enabled services of library. According to Noh (2015) Library 2.0 is major transition of traditional library to digital library. The conservational services are converting to user-centric service. The communication between the libraries and users has increase in this era. The information reproduction through user participation has increased (Noh, 2015). According to Maness (2006) four essential elements of Library 2.0 are-

- Library 2.0 is user-centric. The consumption and creation of information became dynamic, popularized and centralized. The information became more flexible and adaptive in nature. The users can create content and view within the

library's web presence through easy smart systems i.e mobile. The services like open stacks, Library suggestion box, user tagging, OPAC, team-built blogs were introduced.

- Library 2.0 gave multimedia experience. The video and audio content were shared with the users through channels like Youtube. Though it is not considered as an important feature of Library 2.0 it is a major feature of change in communication from library to users.
- Library 2.0 is social. Users are well connected with one another and librarians through the social technologies like wiki, blog, flickr, instant messaging etc. The social web technologies bring in the change in interaction between users and libraries (Chandra, 2015).
- Library 2.0 is communally innovative. Libraries are inventing their services with the invention of technology that are popular in users (Noh, 2015; Chandra, 2015).
- Library 2.0 is human. Libraries have adopted openness in services and communication. Now users will be able to connect with the library through various modes of connectivity. The services can be provided in various modes by adapting Web 2.0 apps and services (Noh, 2015; Chandra, 2015).

Hybrid Model

Library 3.0 is a hybrid model including features of Library 1.0 and Library 2.0 (Noh, 2015). Habib (2006) defines Library 2.0 as *subset of library services designed to meet user requirements triggered by the direct and peripheral effect of Web 2.0*. Belling et al. (2011) indicates Library 3.0 is an extension of "borderless Library"- library collection is available to users regardless of their physical location through its virtual existence. The authors explain that the use of emerging technologies like semantic web, cloud computing, mobile devices and re-visiting established technologies such as federated search, to facilitate, organize, promote and share user-generated information through continuous participation among users, experts and librarians. Noh (2010) proposes Library 3.0 model featuring Social Semantic Digital Library- resources shared through social networking services and big data managed by semantic web technology, The Linked Library – resource shared through linked data which

connects library with other libraries of the world and the Mobile Library – universally present library well furnished with technologies like RFID and mobile technology. Noh (2013) paper discusses importance of context-awareness technology to Library 3.0 and proposed context-awareness services. Therefore, Kwanya, Stilwell and Underwood (2012) propose five principal features of Library 3.0 as 1) intelligent, 2) Organized, 3) federal network of information pathways, 4) Apomediated, 5) my library i.e personalized. Kwanya, Stilwell and Underwood (2015) envision the role of librarian as guide and mentor of information retrieval where librarians are using social media and emerging technologies for delivering services required by users. Library 3.0 brings back the old principles of librarianship where librarians compared more than one information resource to deliver rightful information to users (Giustini, 2007; Schultz, 2006)

Digitalization of Services

The scarcity of literature was observed on Library 4.0. Library 4.0 is a technological environment created by library such as makerspace, Google Glass, Context-aware technology, digitization of contents, big data, cloud computing and augmented reality (Noh, 2015). Library 4.0 is cooperation among various professional academic networks through virtual library network (Chauhan, 2009). According to Noh (2015) features of Library 4.0 are-

- Library 4.0 is intelligent. The information is analyzed by the system and discussed with users like peer member.
- Library 4.0 manages and analyzes big data. The data which cannot be collected, stored, managed or analyzed by single library software.
- Library 4.0 embraces context-aware computing technology. The system which searches, identifies, analyzes and provides contextual information or services that users require in current situation.
- Library is augmented reality library. The involvement of 3D spaces i.e mixing real world with virtual world. Mostly used for tracking information.
- Library 4.0 has cutting-edge recognition capability. For example, Google Glass, Flexible display, Hub and Transparent display.

- Library 4.0 is infinite creative space. A space encourages and teaches users to think creatively and explore solutions.

Research Methodology

The exploratory research was done through literature review to understand the evolution of marketing activity and digital transition of library. The review of literature was done based on articles from national and international peer reviewed journals. The primary research was carried out to understand digital tool preferences, transition effect on marketing, and constraint faced by library through structured questionnaire. Questionnaire categorizes users in three categories – traditional user, online user and mix of both. Respondents were asked to provide their responses in 5 pointer Likert scale, where 5 been the highest and 1 been the lowest. Sample of 192 responses were collected from convenience sampling. Data analysis was done using factor analysis test and Kruskal Wallis test. Since the data was not normalised and the object was comparison between three sets of library users.

Data analysis

Since, there were 20 items in the questionnaire for analysis, the first step was to identify the principal components which was done using factor analysis test. The KMO value came out as 0.720 which is considered adequate for carrying out factor analysis. The factors were grouped in the following manner
 Preferential factors – PR
 Transition factors – TR
 Constraints – CR

Table 1
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.720
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	658.435
	df	190
	Sig.	.000

Inference

The results of KMO and Bartlett test show that the KMO value is 0.720. This indicates the adequacy of sample size for carrying out factor analysis.

Table 2 Results of factor analysis test

Pattern Matrix^a

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
PR7	.855				
PR10	.852				
PR8	.778				
PR9	.772				
PR6					
TR3		.847			
TR4		.768			
TR2		.718			
TR5		.704			
TR1					
CR3			.879		
CR4			.852		
CR2			.806		
PR1				.881	
PR3					
PR5					
PR4					
CR1					
PR11					
PR2					

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization. ^a

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

The results of factor analysis have provided the following principal components

PR – PR1, PR7, PR8, PR9, PR10

TR – TR2, TR3, TR4, TR5

CR – CR2, CR3, CR4

Further the factors are subjected to Kruskal Wallis test to understand how transition of libraries from conventional to digital has impacted traditional user, digital user and users availing a combination of traditional and digital.

Hypothesis testing

H1 : There is a significant difference between the preferential factors based on usage pattern

Table 3 Results of Kruskal Wallis test for preferential factors

Ranks			
	library usage pattern	N	Mean Rank
RFID preference	traditional	65	82.49
	digital	48	99.61
	both	74	100.47
	Total	187	
eresource preference	traditional	67	92.72
	digital	48	111.69
	both	77	90.32
	Total	192	
MOOC	traditional	67	94.07
	digital	48	98.04
	both	77	97.66
	Total	192	
Digital interactive wall preference	traditional	64	84.52
	digital	47	92.73
	both	77	103.87
	Total	188	
COIL preference	traditional	67	97.07
	digital	48	94.71
	both	77	97.12
	Total	192	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

	RFID preference	eresource preference	MOOC	Digital interactive wall preference	COIL preference
Chi-Square	5.075	7.329	.244	5.641	.082
df	2	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.079	.026	.885	.060	.960

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: library usage pattern

Inference

The results indicate that there is a significant difference with respect to usage of e-resources. The digital library user is more inclined towards usage of e-resources. The means table clearly indicates that traditional customer is less inclined towards digitalization while the digital user is most inclined towards digitalization.

H2 : There is a significant difference in inclination towards transition based on usage pattern

Table 4 Results of Kruskal Wallis test for transitional factors

Ranks

	library usage pattern	N	Mean Rank
Transformation leads to branding	traditional	67	86.78
	digital	48	114.51
	both	77	93.73
	Total	192	
Transformation leads to promotion	traditional	67	88.98
	digital	47	108.01
	both	76	93.51
	Total	190	
Transformation leads to visibility	traditional	67	83.59
	digital	48	115.44
	both	77	95.93
	Total	192	
Transformation leads to usage	traditional	67	87.55
	digital	48	114.52
	both	77	93.05
	Total	192	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

	Transformation leads to branding	Transformation leads to promotion	Transformation leads to visibility	Transformation leads to usage
Chi-Square	8.407	4.298	11.550	9.981
df	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.015	.117	.003	.007

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: library usage pattern

Inference

The results clearly indicate that transition leads branding, visibility and increased usage where significant difference in user pattern is seen. The mean ranks clearly highlight that transition has highest influence on digital user, followed by digital+ traditional user and least for traditional user.
H3 : There is a significant difference in constraints among users in transition from traditional to digital

Table 5 Kruskal Wallis test for identifying constraints in digital transition amongst users

Ranks

	library usage pattern	N	Mean Rank
Financial constraint	traditional	65	92.08
	digital	47	99.97
	both	74	90.64
	Total	186	
Management constraint	traditional	67	97.29
	digital	48	95.16
	both	77	96.65
	Total	192	
Manpower constraint	traditional	67	93.12
	digital	47	99.31
	both	76	95.24
	Total	190	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

	Financial constraint	Management constraint	Manpower constraint
Chi-Square	1.475	.053	.426
df	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.478	.974	.808

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: library usage pattern

Inference

The null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference in constraints amongst all three type of users. The three type of users face similar issues related to financial constraint, management constraint and manpower constraint.

H4 : There is a significant difference in user experience and effectiveness of digital transition with respect to usage pattern.

Table 6 Kruskal Wallis test to check difference in User experience and Effectiveness

Ranks

	library usage pattern	N	Mean Rank
User experience	traditional	66	87.10
	digital	47	105.21
	both	76	95.55
	Total	189	
Effectiveness	traditional	67	90.52
	digital	48	101.16
	both	77	98.80
	Total	192	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

	User experience	Effectiveness
Chi-Square	3.374	1.406
df	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.185	.495

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: library usage pattern

Inference

The statistical test proves the null hypothesis indicating no significant difference. However, the mean ranks clearly highlight that user experience and effectiveness of digital transition is highest for

digital user, followed by traditional + digital user and least for traditional user.

Discussion

User experience has been important factor of the competitive world. The tech savvy users are demanding instantaneous delivery, expecting information at their fingertips and feasible with their personal instrument. User experience is primary related to digital services provided by the organisation (Dagstushi seminar, 2010). User experience covers everything – marketing and awareness, acquisition and installation of system, product and services, product support and removal (Sward, 2007). The organisations included co-creation process in their marketing strategy succeeded in engaging their customers. These organisations have competitive advantage (Chepurna and Criado, 2018). Jordon (2002) proposed a need for abstraction model of user experience showing people engagement at three level – functionality, usability and user experience. The robust model of purchase intention by Papagiannidis et al. (2017) proposes that presence of technology has a positive impact on user experience which positively effects on customer engagement. Attractive and informative websites also encourage customers to use these services (Jiménez-Barreto, 2018).

Certain component which came out to be more effective in the usage of technology. Factor like RFID, E-resources, MOOCs, Digital interactive walls and collaborative interactive learning are preferred more by users when it comes to adopting digital tools in the library. The students of A.C. Joshi Library of Punjab University find RFID system most interesting and time saving resulting in encouraging them to visit library regularly (Khanna, 2014). Digitization of special material by Michigan Library has observed significant increase in usage of rare material, contributed in new forms of research and also attracts new users to library collection (Hirtle, 2002). Libraries applying strategy of selective method of purchase in collection development of e-resources experience significant growth in usage ratio (Lamothe, 2013; Kumar and Kumar, 2010).

For the transition of library from conventional to digital there are many challenges involved. Not only does this transition include the branding and

advertising of library but also emphasizes on certain other factors which have proven to be more significant in enhancing the user experience. These factors are as follows – branding, promotion, visibility and usage.

The transition also involves many constraints and is a herculean task to achieve. For instance, the users expectations from library could be abundant like 24/7 timing, comfortable furniture, coffee/ tea vending machines, different kind of spaces etc. that will enable users to spend more time in the library. Though these are the factors which can be easily implemented in the library, they are not in place yet because the entire decision making has to be done by the management. This is a strategic decision. The budgets or funds that are allocated for enhancing the appeal part in the library are miniscule. This curtails the motive of moving towards the digital library. Though libraries have moved ahead from 3.0 to 4.0 and are now updated with facilities like RFID, Digital walls, marketplace, collaborative interactive learning, all of them together contributing to enhance the user experience, certain loopholes still exist in the system. The example of this is absence of facilities like discussion rooms, collaborative learning, and digital book locator to name a few.

Tools were also used to determine how the transition of libraries from traditional to digital has impacted the different categories of users. As an outcome it was observed that the user of digital tools was more incline towards getting adopted with e-resources. This also indicated traditional user is least incline towards usage of digital tools. With the technological advancement and transition by way of digitalization of libraries one can ensure the visibility and branding of specific libraries. This clearly indicates that the transition has maximum of its influence on digital users, moderate on the digital plus traditional users and least on the traditional users. Though it has been observed that there are extremely different patterns in the usage of library, the constraints that each category face remains similar. These constraints include financial constraints, management constraints, and manpower constraints. The mean ranks of the test conducted clearly highlight that the user experience and

effectiveness of digital transition is highest for digital user, moderate for traditional plus digital user and least for digital users.

CONCLUSION

The advent of information technology in the intense competitive world has fast track on the timelines of demand and delivery of information to users. This ensures utmost satisfaction to users among different categories. Therefore *competitive intelligence and marketing intelligence* should work together as both are processing data the required by industry 4.0, where *competitive intelligence*, being part of corporate strategy, will decide the work process for *marketing intelligence* (Darma, 2019 as noted in Dewi and Darma, 2019). With marketing 4.0 in place, there will be more demand coming from users for digital interactive wall, marketplace, collaborative learning space, Chabot's etc. However, in the transition of libraries from traditional to that of digital there are tremendous challenges faced by Indian academic libraries, These challenges like constraints in funds, improper budget allocation toward enhancing the infrastructure of libraries thereby leading failure of providing comfortable ambience for the users. This implies that the traditional user may stick to the conventional methods itself in his usage pattern and may not switch to digitalised world. On the other hand, certain libraries spend adequate amount of budget in procuring e-resource, book locating system, library administrative software etc. The aim behind this is to ensure that the users' convenience. In spite, it is observed from the analysis that there are certain number of users who prefer a combination of both online and offline resources. The third category highlights the user preferring digital tools do not refer to any of the traditional resources.

REFERENCES

1. Andaleeb, Syed Saad., Rashid, Mamunur., & Rahman, Quazi Akhlaqur (2016). A model of customer-centric banking practices for corporate

- clients in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 34(4), 458-475.
2. Australian Library and Information Association (2014) Future of the Library and Information Science Profession. www.alia.org.au/futureoftheprofession_ (accessed on 30/07/2019)
 3. Basayazicioglu, H. N., & Karamustafa, K. (2018). Marketing 4.0: Impacts of Technological Developments on Marketing Activities, *Kirikkale University Journal of Social Sciences (KUJSS)*, 8(2), 621-640.
 4. Belling, A., Rhodes, A., Smith, J., Thomson, S., & Thorn, B. (2011). Exploring Library 3.0 and beyond. Retrieved from: http://www.libraries.vic.gov.au/downloads/20102011_Shared_Leadership_Program_Presentation_Day_exploring_library_3.pdf.
 5. Bistra Vassileva (2017). Marketing 4.0: How Technologies Transform Marketing Organization. *Óbuda University e-Bulletin*, 7(1), 47-56.
 6. Bosomworth, Danyl (2011). Marketing 3.0: seven ways to move to human-centric marketing. Retrieved from <https://www.mycustomer.com/marketing/strategy/marketing-30-seven-ways-to-move-to-human-centric-marketing> (accessed on 30/07/2019)
 7. Chandra, Joydip (2015). Librarian to librarian 2.0: scope and responsibilities. Paper presented in seminar on Library services: new scopes, West Bengal.
 8. Chauhan, S K (2009). Key 2 information: Library 3.0. Retrieved from <http://key2information.blogspot.com/2009/09/library-30.html> (Accessed on 25/07/2019)
 9. Chepurna, Maryna & Criado, Josep Rialp (2018). Identification of barriers to co-create on-line: the perspectives of customers and companies, *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 12(4), 452-471.
 10. Darma, G.S. (2019). *Kacamata Media, Kesuksesan Bersyarat*. Indonesia: Pustaka Larasan Press.
 11. Dewi, M.V. K., & Darma, Gede Sri (2019) The Role of Marketing & Competitive Intelligence In Industrial Revolution 4.0, *Journal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 16(1), 1-12.
 12. ET Bureau (2010) Marketing 3.0: Evolution driven by understanding. Retrieved from [//economictimes.indiatimes.com/articleshow/5656045.cms?from=mdr&utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/articleshow/5656045.cms?from=mdr&utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst) (accessed on 30/07/2019)
 13. Geraghty, G. and Conway, A. (2016) The Study of Traditional and Non-traditional Marketing Communications: Target Marketing in the Events Sector. Paper presented at the 12th Annual *Tourism and Hospitality Research in Ireland Conference*, THRIC 2016, 16th and 17th June, Limerick Institute of Technology.
 14. Giustini, D (2007). Web 3.0 and medicine. *British Medical Journal*, 335, 1273-1274.
 15. Habib, M C (2006). Toward academic Library 2.0: Development and application of a library 2.0 methodology. MS Thesis, University of North Carolina, USA
 16. Hanekom, J., & Scriven, C (2002). Traditional and online advertising; an explanation of current and future trends. *Communication*, 28(1), 49-59.
 17. Hirtle, PeterB. (2002), The Impact of Digitization on Special Collections in Libraries. <https://ecommons.cornell.edu/bitstream/handle/1813/14206/37.1hirtle.pdf;sequence=2> (accessed on 07/08/19)
 18. Jara, A. J., Parra, M. C., & Skarmeta, A. F. (2012). Marketing 4.0: A New Value Added to the Marketing through the Internet of Things. *Sixth International Conference on Innovative Mobile and Internet Services in Ubiquitous Computing*, 852-857.
 19. Jimenez-Zarco, Ana., Rospigliosi, Asher., Martinez-Ruiz, María Pilar., & Yusta, Alicia (2017). Marketing 4.0. Retrieved from [10.4018/978-1-5225-2139-6.ch005](https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-2139-6.ch005). (accessed on 07/07/2019)
 20. Jiménez-Barreto, J & Campo-Martínez, S (2018). Destination website quality, users' attitudes and the willingness to participate in online co-creation experiences. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 27(1), 26-41.
 21. Jordan, P.W. (2000). Designing pleasurable products: An introduction to the new human factors. Taylor & Francis.

22. Kotler, Philip., Kartajaya, Hermawan & Setiawan, Iwan (2010). *Marketing 3.0: From Products to Customers to the Human Spirit*. New Delhi: Times Group Books.
23. KOTLER, PHILIP., KARTAJAYA, HERMAWAN & SETIAWAN, IWAN (2017). *MARKETING 4.0: MOVING FROM TRADITIONAL TO DIGITAL*. NEW DELHI: TIMES GROUP BOOKS.
24. Kumar, B.T. Sampath., & Kumar, G.T. (2010). Perception and usage of e-resources and the internet by Indian academics. *The Electronic Library*, 28(1), 137 – 156.
25. Kwanya, T., Stilwell, C., & Peter, G (2012). Intelligent libraries and apomediators: Distinguishing between Library 3.0 and Library 2.0. *Underwood Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 43(3), 187-197.
26. Kwanya, T., Stilwell, C., & Peter, U (2015). *Library 3.0: Intelligent Libraries and Apomediation*. Waltham, MA: Chandos.
27. Lamothe, Alire R (2013). Factors Influencing the Usage of an Electronic Book Collection: Size of the E-book Collection, the Student Population, and the Faculty Population. *College & Research Libraries*, 30-59.
28. Lee-Mortimer, A. (1991). The customer is King. *The TQM Magazine*, 3(1).
29. Maness, J. M. (2006) Library 2.0 Theory: Web 2.0 and its Implications for Libraries. *Webology*, 3(2).
30. Margret Beditz (2018). The Dynamic Landscape of Marketing Children's Books: Publishers Find Consistent Success Through a Combination of Online and Traditional Marketing to Adults and Children. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 34(4), 157–169.
31. Moldovan, A., Bacali, L., Vaida, Răzvan., & Lakatos, Elena-Simina (2015). Quantitative Research on the Psychological Aspects [Archetypes] of Young Consumer. A Proposal for a New Concept: Marketing 4.0. *Revista de Management și Inginerie Economică*, 14(2), 307-318.
32. Noh, Y. (2010). A study on Library 3.0 concept and its service model. *Journal of the Korean Society for Information Management*, 27(4), 283–307.
33. Noh, Y (2013) A study on next-generation digital library using context-awareness technology. *Library Hi Tech*, 31(2), 236-253.
34. Papagiannidis, Savvas., Pantano, Eleonora., See-To, Eric W.K., Dennis, Charles., & Bourlakis, Michael (2017). To immerse or not? Experimenting with two virtual retail environments. *Information Technology & People*, 30 (1), 163-188.
35. Parasuraman A. & Zinkhan P. M. (2002). Marketing to and serving customers through the internet: an overview and research agenda. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 30, 286–295.
36. Schultz, W (2006). To a temporary place in time: On the way to the library experience of the future. *OCLC Newsletter*. Retrieved from <http://www.oclc.org/nextspace/002/6.htm> (accessed on 25/07/2019)
37. Sheth, J. N., Sisodia, R. S., & Sharma A. (2000). The antecedents and consequences of customer-centric marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1), 55–66.
38. Solis, Brian (2014) 2014 State of Digital Transformation. <https://www.briansolis.com/2014/07/2014-state-digital-transformation/> (accessed on 30/07/2019)
39. Suhaimi Bin Haji Abdul Karim, H. (2004). Digital transformation of libraries in Brunei Darussalam: addressing the sustainability issues of VILIS Brunei. *Program: electronic library and information systems*, 38(3), 184-193.
40. Sunaina Khanna (2014). Impact of RFID Technology on Library Services: a Case Study of A.C Joshi Library, Punjab University, Chandigarh. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 4(2), 117-126.
41. Sward, David (2007). User Experience Design: A Strategy for Competitive Advantage. *AMCIS 2007 Proceedings*. 163. Retrieved from <http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2007/163> (accessed on 30/07/2019)
42. Swieczak, W (2017). The Impact of Modern Technology on Changing Marketing Actions in Organisations Marketing 4.0. *MINIB*, 26(4), 161–186.
43. Todor, R D (2016). Blending traditional and Digital Marketing, *Bulletin of the Transilvania*

- University of Braşov, Series V: Economic Sciences*, 9(1).
44. Tseng, Mitchell, & Piller, Frank. (2011). The customer Centric Enterprise: Advances in Mass Customization and Personalization. *Springer Science and Business Media*, 536.
 45. Ungerma, O., Dedkova, J., & Gurinova, Katerina (2018) The Impact of Marketing Innovation on the Competitiveness of Enterprises in the Context of Industry 4.0. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 10(2), 132 – 148.
 46. Wereda, Wioletta & Wozniak, Jacek (2019). Building Relationships with Customer 4.0 in the Era of Marketing 4.0: The Case Study of Innovative Enterprises in Poland. *Social Sciences*, 8,(177), 1-27.
 47. Wright, L.T., Stone, M., & Abbott, J. (2002b). The CRM imperative – practice vs theory in the telecommunications industry. *The Journal of Database Marketing*, 9(4), 339-49.
 48. Wright, L., Nancarrow, C. and Michel, S. (2002a). The branding of IT: marketing and research issues. *International Journal of Information Technology and Management*, 1(4), 425-41.
 49. Yadav M. S. & Varadarajan P. R. (2005). Interactivity in the electronic marketplace: an exposition of the concept and implications for research. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 33, 585–603.
 50. Yeh, C. H., Wang, Y. S., & Yieh, K. (2016). Predicting smartphone brand loyalty: Consumer value and consumer-brand identification perspectives. *International Journal of Information Management*, 36(3), 245–257.