
User Awareness on Electronic Resources and Services in Select Deemed To Be University Libraries in Chennai Region: A Study

L. Bhuvanewari

Research Scholar
Department of Library & Information Science
Annamalai University
Annamalainagar-608 002, Tamil Nadu, India.

R. Revathi

Assistant Professor
Department of Library & Information Science
Annamalai University
Annamalainagar-608 002, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract

This paper studied about the e-resources and e-services knowledge and awareness among the users in select deemed to be universities in Chennai region. Now a days the academic libraries are having more varieties in the form electronics resources. The collection consists of open-access journals, electronic theses and dissertations, audio files and transcripts, maps, newspapers, photographs, manuscripts and rare books, and historical materials. These objects are the vital resource for members of the academic community. Even more exciting are the opportunities that such solutions have opened up for collaboration with other institutions around the globe. Researchers, at distant place, can deposit material directly into the system. Such systems give a real opportunity to develop and foster these relationships in the area of e-resources.

Keywords

E-Resources; E-Services; Deemed to be Universities'; Chennai Region

Electronic access

The journal is available at www.jalis.in



Journal of Advances in Library and Information Science
ISSN: 2277-2219 Vol. 8. No.4. 2019. pp.176-183

1. Introduction

Now a days the E-Resources plays a vital role in the development of higher education. Which include e-journals, e-books, online database, CD-ROM database and Internet that delivers a collection of data, be it text referring to full text basis, e-journal, image collection, other multimedia products and numerical, graphical or time based. Electronic publishing has lead to new era of communications and information sharing. It creates opportunities for the users as well as authors and publishers. Many of the electronic books or electronic publisher's web site freely permit and encourage the readers to provide feedback on works, often directly to the author rather than to the publisher. Nevertheless the users may establish their own accounts, charge services to credit cards or to pay by prearranged method, and have requested material delivered directly to them by fax, e-mail, etc. today, libraries of all kinds have been spending larger and larger shares of their budgets to adopt or gain access to electronic resources from the publishers and the vendors. This is due to the fact that e-resources have enabled libraries to improve services in a variety of ways. First, most e-resources are equipped with powerful search and retrieval tools that allow users to perform literature searches more effectively and efficiently. Moreover, since most relevant e-resources are now available through the web, the users can have desktop access to them 24 hours a day.

2. Review of literature

Mostofa (2013)¹ conducted a study and results show that half of the faculty members are consulted with expert as communication channel when they have a question asked. More than 50 % of faculty members depend on the library resources for teaching purpose. Fasola and Olabode (2014)² surveyed among the students of ajayi crowther university, oyo, Nigeria, how they seek information and this is what has prompted this study. It was discovered that majority of the students (66%) sought information for academic purposes and the library (62.8%) was their preferred place of searching and using information resources. Ngozi, Uche and Ejiro (2015)³ investigated, information seeking behaviour of faculty members of the Federal University of Petroleum Resources (FUPRE). The research finding show that the respondents use books, as their preferred source of information. They suggested improving the internet facilities to assist faculties in their research. Mahapatra (2017)⁴ has attempted to collect information related to the preferences on electronic information resources, types of e-resources used, the

use of statistical information in e-format, online databases in social science and satisfaction on the use of e-resources. The information has been analysed in the light of data collected from 90 social scientists from research institutes and universities in the city of Bhubaneswar. Gopinath (2017)⁵ assessed the perception and use of electronic information resources on the quality of education and research among the academic community in the Mahatma Gandhi University. The study has applied a standard survey. On the basis of the results, a few suggestions have been put forward for improving the use of electronic information resources among the academic community in the Mahatma Gandhi University. Nkem Emilia Orsu (2019)⁶ Recommended based on the study's findings such as more awareness creation on importance of open access repositories; re-training of lecturers and provision of adequate ICT infrastructures that will improve the utilization of open access repositories by lecturers which could enhance the global visibility of academic publications from the Nigerian Universities. Dauda Joshua., and Lizette King (2020)⁷ studied and found that the lack of sufficient Internet access for academics and students and lack of training and awareness campaigns. Conclusion has shown that e-resources did not impact research and teaching of academics in MAUTech, Yola.

3. Methodology

The present study intends to analyze the level of E-Resources and Services in Select Deemed to Be University Libraries in Tamil Nadu (Chennai only). The population of the present study includes U G & P.G Students and research scholars in who pursues their studies in three universities in Tamil Nadu. In this study, totally 1200 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents among the three Select deemed to be universities in Chennai regions only. Out of 1200, 1044 questionnaires were returned by the respondents. The response rate was 87.00%. These respondents were selected by using 'stratified random sampling' technique by giving equal weight age to discipline, type of University and gender. Thus, the total sample for the present study consists of 1044 respondents.

4. Objectives Of The Study

The following objectives are framed for the purpose of the present study.

1. To identify the frequency of visit the library

2. To know the purpose of using the library resources.
3. To identify the awareness and on e-resources and services.

5. Analysis and Interpretation

5.1 Distribution of Questionnaires

The population of the present study includes U G & P.G Students and research scholars in who pursues their studies in three deemed to be universities in Chennai region and shown in table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of Questionnaires

Respondent wise Distribution of questionnaires					
S. No	Category of the respondents	Questionnaire Distributed	%	Questionnaire Received	%
1	Research Scholars	275	22.92	208	19.90
2	P.G Students	175	14.58	139	13.30
3	U.G Students	750	62.50	697	66.80
	Total	1200	100.00	1044	100.00

The table 1 indicates the Category wise distribution of the questionnaire among the respondents in select deemed to be universities. The respondents were categorized like Research Scholars (Research Scholars. & P.G Students) and Under Graduate students (P.G). Among the 1200, a total of 275(22.92%) of the questionnaires were distributed to Research Scholars., 175(14.58%) of them were distributed to P.G and 750(62.50%) were to U.G. students. From the 1200, totally 208(19.90%) were filled and returned by the Research Scholars. students, 139(13.30%) were returned by P.G Students and 697(66.80%) were returned by the U.G. students. It is studied from the table the highest numbers of respondents were in the category of 'U.G' students.

5.2. Frequency of visit to the Library

The Frequency of visit to the Library among the respondents has been analyses based on the opinion and responses which is shown in the table 2.

Table 2: Frequency of visit to the Library

S. No	Frequency	Respondents			Total
		Research Scholars	P.G Students	U.G	
1	Daily	31 (2.97)	17 (1.63)	92 (8.81)	140 (13.41)
2	2-3 times in a week	47 (4.5)	37 (3.54)	171 (16.38)	255 (24.43)
3	Once in a week	87 (8.33)	63 (6.03)	293 (28.07)	443 (42.43)
4	Once in a month	40 (3.83)	15 (1.44)	110 (10.54)	165 (15.8)
5	Occasionally	3 (0.29)	7 (0.67)	31 (2.97)	41 (3.93)
	Total	208 (19.92)	139 (13.31)	697 (66.76)	1044 (100)

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

The frequency of visit to the library analyzed with their category of the respondents in table 2. Totally 208(19.92%) of the respondents were visiting the

Table 3: Purpose of visit to the Library

S. No	Purpose	SDA	DA	NO	A	SA	M	Std. Dev.	R
1	To Borrow and return Books	48 (4.6)	84 (8.05)	43 (4.12)	446 (42.72)	423 (40.52)	4.07	1.086	1
2	To read news paper	91 (8.72)	83 (7.95)	83 (7.95)	441 (42.24)	346 (33.14)	3.83	1.219	4
3	To consult print documents	112 (10.73)	101 (9.67)	58 (5.56)	450 (43.1)	323 (30.94)	3.74	1.285	6
4	To access e-resources	80 (7.66)	129 (12.36)	63 (6.03)	361 (34.58)	411 (39.37)	3.86	1.272	2
5	To enhance my knowledge	107 (10.25)	108 (10.34)	54 (5.17)	340 (32.57)	435 (41.67)	3.85	1.336	3
6	All the above	91 (8.72)	133 (12.74)	76 (7.28)	339 (32.47)	405 (38.79)	3.80	1.310	5

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

(SDA- Strongly Disagree, A-Disagree, NO- No Opinion, A-Agree, SA- Strongly Agree Std. Dev. – Standard Deviation, R-Rank)

Table 3 shows the respondents have given first priority to the purpose of ‘To Borrow and return Books’. ‘To access e-resources’ and ‘To enhance my knowledge’ are the purposes to visit the library and the second and third preference respectively given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given ‘To consult print documents’. The mean value

library in the category of Research Scholars. which includes 87(8.33%) as visiting ‘once in a week’, 47(4.5%) of them as visiting ‘2-3 times in a week’, 40(3.83%) as visiting ‘once in a month’ and only 3(0.29%) as visiting ‘occasionally’. 697(66.76%) of the respondents in the category of P.G. students visited the library, 92(8.81%) as using ‘Daily’, 171(16.38%) were visiting ‘2-3 times in a week’, 293(28.07%) were visiting ‘once in a week’, 110(10.54%) were visiting ‘once in a month’ and 31(2.97%) were visiting ‘occasionally’. It is identified from the table the highest number of respondents belongs to the category of U.G. students 293(28.07%) were visiting library ‘once in a week’.

5.3 Purpose of visit to the Library

The study has been analysed the Purpose of visit to the Library among the respondents in Select deemed to be universities. The five-point scales of Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree were used for the study. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for the purpose of visit to the Library have been calculated and the same are shown in table 3.

of all the variables ranges between 3.74 and 4.07. It can be inferred that all the six variables lie between ‘Strongly Agree’ and ‘Agree’. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.086 and 1.336.

5.4.Purpose of visit to the library

The study has been further extended to category of the respondents for the Purpose of visit to the library by

respondents in Select deemed to be universities. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for the

purpose have been calculated and shown in table 4.

Table 4: Purpose of visit to the library

S. No	E-Resource	Research Scholars			P.G Students			U.G			Chi-Square
		M	SD	R	M	SD	R	M	SD	R	
1	To Borrow and return Books	4.01	1.127	1	4.21	1.025	1	4.05	1.084	1	8.345
2	To read news paper	3.71	1.237	4	3.92	1.251	2	3.85	1.207	4	8.552
3	To consult print documents	3.66	1.356	6	3.87	1.227	3	3.74	1.274	6	10.509
4	To access e-resources	3.92	1.241	2	3.74	1.332	6	3.86	1.270	3	5.756
5	To enhance my knowledge	3.75	1.413	3	3.85	1.356	4	3.88	1.308	2	5.158
6	All the above	3.69	1.363	5	3.83	1.233	5	3.83	1.309	5	14.038

(M-Mean, SD-Standard Deviation, R-Rank, Degrees of freedom = 8, Table Value = 15.507)

It can be inferred from Table 4, the respondents in the category of Research Scholars have given first priority to the purpose of 'To Borrow and return Books'. 'To access e-resources' and 'To enhance my knowledge' are the purposes to visit the library and the second and third preference respectively given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given for 'To consult print documents'. In the case of respondents in the category of P.G Students has given first priority to the purpose of 'To Borrow and return Books'. 'To read newspaper' and 'To consult print documents' are the purposes to visit the library and the second and third preference respectively given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given for the 'To access e-resources'. Similarly, in the case of respondents in the category of U.G students has given first priority to the purpose of 'To Borrow and return Books'. 'To enhance my knowledge' and 'To access e-resources' are the purposes to visit the library and the second and third preference respectively given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given for the 'To consult print documents'. Further, the 'Chi square' has been administered to identify the significance. The table value is 15.507 at 5% level of significance, the calculated value for all the variables were lower than the table value which indicated the variables as not significant in their difference of opinion between the categories of institutes towards the purpose of visit to the library.

5.5. Overall Ranking for Purpose of visit to the library

The overall rank has been calculated towards the Purpose of visit to the library to get the information.

Table 5: Overall Ranking for Purpose of visit to the library

S. No	E-Resource	Respondent			Overall Ranking
		Research Scholars	P.G Students	U.G Students	
1	To Borrow and return Books	1	1	1	1
2	To read news paper	4	2	4	4
3	To consult print documents	6	3	6	6
4	To access e-resources	2	6	3	2
5	To enhance my knowledge	3	4	2	3
6	All the above	5	5	5	5

Table 5 shows, the first rank 'To Borrow and return Books' is unanimously agreed by all the categories of the respondents. The fifth preference 'All the above' is identical among the the respondents. The least preference (sixth rank) 'To consult print documents' is unanimously agreed by all the categories of the

institutes and all the categories of the respondents except P.G Students.

5.6. Reasons for not visiting the library

The study has been analyses the Reasons for not visiting the library among the respondents in Select

deemed to be universities. The five-point scales of Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree were used for the study. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for the Reasons for not visiting the library have been calculated and shown in the table6.

Table 6: Reasons for not visiting the library

S. No.	Description	SDA	DA	NO	A	SA	M	Std. Dev.	R
1	Library is far away from my department	85 (8.14)	88 (8.43)	83 (7.95)	447 (42.82)	341 (32.66)	3.83	1.204	4
2	Classroom teaching is enough	134 (12.84)	60 (5.75)	55 (5.27)	464 (44.44)	331 (31.7)	3.76	1.304	5
3	Library collection is not enough	96 (9.2)	91 (8.72)	59 (5.65)	360 (34.48)	438 (41.95)	3.91	1.283	3
4	Internet speed is very low	102 (9.77)	63 (6.03)	55 (5.27)	350 (33.52)	474 (45.4)	3.99	1.276	1
5	All the above	86 (8.24)	85 (8.14)	81 (7.76)	355 (34)	437 (41.86)	3.93	1.249	2

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

(SDA- Strongly Disagree, A-Disagree, NO- No Opinion, A-Agree, SA- Strongly Agree Std. Dev.. – Standard Deviation, R-Rank)

It is identified from Table 6 that the respondents have given first priority to the reason of ‘Internet speed is very low’. ‘Library collection is not enough’ was the reason for not to visit the library and the third preference given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given for the ‘Classroom teaching is enough’.

5.7. Reasons for not visiting the library Vs Respondents

The study has been further extended to category of the respondents for the Reasons for not visiting the library by the respondents in Select deemed to be universities. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for suggestions have been calculated and shown in table 7

Table 7: Reasons for not visiting the library

S. No.	Description	Research Scholars			P.G Students			U.G Students			Chi-Square
		M	SD	R	M	SD	R	M	SD	R	
1	Library is far away from my Department	3.74	1.189	4	3.94	1.238	2	3.84	1.201	4	10.893
2	Classroom teaching is enough	3.66	1.405	5	3.92	1.174	4	3.76	1.296	5	11.768
3	Library collection is not enough	4.00	1.259	1	3.85	1.307	5	3.90	1.286	3	9.006
4	Internet speed is very low	3.97	1.315	2	3.97	1.262	1	4.00	1.269	1	2.089
5	All the above	3.93	1.284	3	3.92	1.180	3	3.93	1.254	2	6.592

(M-Mean, SD-Standard Deviation, R-Rank, Degrees of freedom = 8, Table Value = 15.507)

It can be identified from Table 7, the respondents in the category of Research Scholars have given first priority to the reason of ‘Library collection is not enough’. ‘Internet speed is very low’ and ‘all the

above’ are the reasons not to visit the library and the second and third preference respectively given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given for the ‘Classroom teaching is enough’. The respondents in the category of P.G Students have given first priority to the reason of ‘Internet speed is

very low'. 'Library is far away from my Department' and 'all the above' are the reasons not to visit the library and the second and third preference respectively given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given for the 'Library is far away from my Department'.

The respondents in the category of U.G Students have given first priority to the reason of 'Internet speed is very low'. 'All the above' and 'Library collection is not enough' are the reasons not to visit the library and the second and third preference respectively given for them by the respondents. The least preference was given for the 'Classroom teaching is enough'. Further, the 'Chi square' has been administered to identify the significance. The table value is 15.507 at 5% level of significance, the calculated value for most of the values were lower than the table value which indicated the variables as not significant in their difference of opinion between the categories of institutes towards the reasons for not visiting the library.

5.8. Overall Ranking Reasons for not visiting the library

The overall rank has been calculated towards the reasons for not visiting the library among the respondents in select deemed to be universities in Chennai region.

Table 8: Overall Ranking Reasons for not visiting the library

S. No.	Description	Respondent			Overall Ranking
		Research Scholars	P.G Students	U.G Students	
1	Library is far away from my Department	4	2	4	4
2	Classroom teaching is enough	5	4	5	5
3	Library collection is not enough	1	5	3	3
4	Internet speed is very low	2	1	1	1
5	All the above	3	3	2	2

The first rank 'Internet speed is very low' is unanimously agreed by all the categories of the

institutes and all the categories of the respondents. The fourth preference 'Library is far away from my Department' is identical among the respondents of Research Scholars and P.G Students. The least preference (fifth rank) 'Classroom teaching is enough' is identical among the respondents of Research Scholars and U.G students.

5.9 Frequency of Awareness on E-Resources

The Frequency of Awareness on E-Resources among the respondents in Select deemed to be universities has been analysed based on the opinion and responses and shown in the table 9.

Table 9: Frequency of Awareness on E-Resources

S. No.	Frequency	Respondents			Total
		Research Scholars	P.G Students	U.G Students	
1	Below 1 yrs	14 (1.34)	10 (0.96)	29 (2.78)	53 (5.08)
2	1-2 yrs	15 (1.44)	9 (0.86)	27 (2.59)	51 (4.89)
3	2-3 yrs	11 (1.05)	17 (1.63)	70 (6.7)	98 (9.39)
4	3-4 yrs	69 (6.61)	41 (3.93)	230 (22.03)	340 (32.57)
5	More than 4 yrs	99 (9.48)	62 (5.94)	341 (32.66)	502 (48.08)
	Total	208 (19.92)	139 (13.31)	697 (66.76)	1044 (100)

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

The frequency of awareness of E-Resources analyzed with their category of the respondents in table 9.. Among the Research Scholars, 14(1.34%) got the awareness on E-Resources 'Below 1 years', 15(1.44%) got the awareness on E-Resources '1-2 years' were got the awareness on E-Resources, 11(1.05%) got the awareness on E-Resources '2-3 years', 69(6.61%) got the awareness on E-Resources '3-4 years and 99(9.48%) got the awareness on E-Resources 'More than 4 years'. Among the P.G Students, 10(0.96%) got the awareness on E-Resources 'Below 1 years', 9(0.86%) got the awareness on E-Resources '1-2 years' were got the awareness on E-Resources, 17(1.63%) got the awareness on E-Resources '2-3 years', 41(3.93%) got the awareness on E-Resources '3-4 years and 62(5.94%) got the awareness on E-Resources 'More than 4 years'. Among the U.G Students, 29(2.78%) got the awareness on E-Resources 'Below 1 years',

27(2.59%) got the awareness on E-Resources ‘1-2 years’ were got the awareness on E-Resources, 70(6.7%) got the awareness on E-Resources ‘2-3 years’, 230 (22.03%) got the awareness on E-Resources ‘3-4 years and 341(32.66%) got the awareness on E-

The study has been analyses the Awareness on E-Resources and E-Services among the respondents in Select deemed to be universities. The five-point scales of Not aware, Marginally, Moderately, Not aware, completely were used for the study. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for Awareness on E-Resources have been calculated and shown in the table 10.

5.10.Awareness on E-Resources and E-Services

Table 5.13: Awareness on E-Resources and E-Services

S. No.	Description	Notaware	Marginally	Moderately	Notaware	Completely	M	Std.Dev.	R
1	Library orientation programme	55 (5.27)	77 (7.38)	74 (7.09)	55 (5.27)	349 (33.43)	3.96	1.083	2
2	Friends and colleagues	76 (7.28)	91 (8.72)	82 (7.85)	76 (7.28)	428 (41)	3.94	1.221	3
3	Institution Website	88 (8.43)	67 (6.42)	82 (7.85)	88 (8.43)	489 (46.84)	4.01	1.250	1
4	Research guide	86 (8.24)	99 (9.48)	76 (7.28)	86 (8.24)	422 (40.42)	3.89	1.260	4
5	E-mail notification from library	103 (9.87)	80 (7.66)	72 (6.9)	103 (9.87)	389 (37.26)	3.85	1.271	5
6	Self-awareness	101 (9.67)	54 (5.17)	115 (11.02)	101 (9.67)	320 (30.65)	3.80	1.207	6

It is identified from Table 10 that the respondents have given first priority to the e-resources and e-resources through ‘Institution Website’. ‘Library orientation programme’ ‘Friends and colleagues’ stated as the second and third preference respectively given by the respondents. The least preference was given for the ‘Self-awareness’. The mean value of all the variables ranges between 3.80 and 4.01. It can be inferred that all the six variables lie between ‘Strongly Agree and ‘Agree’. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.083 and 1.271.

5.11. Awareness on E-Resources and E-Services Vs Respondents

The study has been further extended to category of the respondents for the Awareness on e-resources and e-services by the respondents in Select deemed to be universities. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for suggestions have been calculated and shown in table 11.

Table 11: Awareness on E-Resources and E-Services

S. No	Description	Research Scholars			P.G Students			U.G Students			Chi-Square
		M	SD	R	M	SD	R	M	SD	R	
1	Library orientation programme	3.97	1.137	2	3.88	1.136	5	3.97	1.057	2	8.980
2	Friends and colleagues	3.98	1.146	1	3.96	1.166	2	3.92	1.254	4	5.348
3	Institution Website	3.91	1.323	3	4.06	1.232	1	4.03	1.232	1	4.543
4	Research guide	3.75	1.395	6	3.94	1.226	3	3.93	1.223	3	20.441
5	E-mail notification from library	3.85	1.312	5	3.88	1.314	4	3.85	1.252	5	10.001
6	Self-awareness	3.89	1.151	4	3.71	1.253	6	3.79	1.214	6	3.630

(M-Mean, SD-Standard Deviation, R-Rank, Degrees of Freedom: 8, Table Value: 15.507)

It can be seen from Table 11 that the respondents in the category of Research Scholars have given first

priority to the awareness on e-resources and e-services through ‘Friends and colleagues’. ‘Library orientation programme’ and ‘Institution Website’ are the second

and third preference respectively given by the respondents. The least preference was given for the 'Research guide'..

The respondents in the category of P.G Students have given first priority to the awareness on e-resources and e-services through 'Institution Website '. 'Friends and colleagues' and 'Research guide' are the second and third preference respectively given by the respondents. It can be inferred that all the six variables. Similarly, the respondents in the category of U.G. have given first priority to the awareness on e-resources and e-services through 'Institution Website '. 'Library orientation programme' and 'Research guide' are the second and third preference respectively given by the respondents. The least preference was given for the 'Self-awareness'. Further, the 'Chi square' has been administered to identify the significance. The table value is 15.507 at 5% level of significance, the calculated value for most of the values were lower than the table value which indicated the variables as not significant in their difference of opinion between the categories of respondents towards the awareness on e-resources and e-services except the variable of 'Research guide'.

Conclusion

Library environment comprises of three factors such Collections, Infrastructures and Opinion and satisfaction. Library Resources and Services comprises of three factors such as traditional resources, Digital/E-Resources and Web Resources, Satisfaction environment level comprises of three factors such as Library Facilities, Services and Professionals support. Similarly, Opinion-environment comprises the Problems faced by the user and their suggestions. The awareness and satisfaction of library e-resources and e-services facilities are more satisfactory. But they will maintain and update regularly based on the need of user community.

References

1. Mostofa, S.M. (2013), A Study of Information Needs and Seeking Behaviour of Faculty Members of Darul Ihsan University in Bangladesh", *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 983. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/983>.
2. Fasola, O.S. & Olabode, S.O. (2014). Information seeking behaviour of students of ajayi crowther

university, oyo, Nigeria", *Brazilian journal Information Science, Marília* 7(2),47-60.

3. Ngozi, O V, Uche, EU & Ejiro, AK (2015), Information seeking behaviour of faculty members in a Nigerian University, *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 3(2), 95-102.
4. Mahapatra, R. K. (2017). Use of e-Resources among Social Scientists in Selected Institutes in Bhubaneswar: A study. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 7(2), 102-106
5. Gopinath, S. A. (2017). Perception & Use Electronic Information Resources Among the Academic Community: A case study. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 7(2), 142-145.
6. Nkem Emilia Orsu (2019). Utilization of Open Access Repositories for Visibility of Academic Publications by Lecturers in South-East, Nigeria,. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology*, 9(4), 47-68
7. Dauda Joshua., & Lizette King(2020). The Utilization of e-resources at Modibbo Adama University of Technology (MAUTech), Yola, Adamawa State,. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology*, 10(1), 47-70