

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

2022

## Attitude of Faculty Members Towards Open Access Institutional Repositories in Public Universities in North East, Nigeria

Chinyere A. Okezie Dr

*Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria, okezie.chinyere@mouau.edu.ng*

Israel Habibu Idris Dr

*Taraba State University, Taraba State, Nigeria, israel.h@tsuniversity.edu.ng*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#)

---

Okezie, Chinyere A. Dr and Idris, Israel Habibu Dr, "Attitude of Faculty Members Towards Open Access Institutional Repositories in Public Universities in North East, Nigeria" (2022). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 7138.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7138>

*ATTITUDE OF FACULTY MEMBERS TOWARDS OPEN ACCESS  
INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN  
NORTH EAST, NIGERIA*

BY

**CHINYERE A OKEZIE (PhD, CLN)**

**University Library**

**Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike,**

**PMB 7267, Umuahia**

**Abia State, Nigeria**

**okezie.chinyere@mouau.edu.ng**

AND

**ISRAEL HABIBU IDRIS (PhD)**

**Taraba State University**

**Taraba State, Nigeria**

**israel.h@tsuniversity.edu.ng**

## **Abstract**

This study investigated the *attitude of faculty members towards participation in open access institutional repositories in public universities in North East, Nigeria*. Two objectives with corresponding research questions guided the study. Two null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance. The descriptive survey design was adopted with a study population of 3,612 faculty members drawn from six (6) public universities in the North-East geopolitical zone. A sample of 316 respondents representing 10% of the entire population was used. A multi-stage purposive simple random sampling technique was adopted. Data for the study was collected using a 30-item structured questionnaire on a four point scale titled “Questionnaire on Attitude of Faculty Members towards Participation in Open Access Institutional Repositories (QAFMPOAIRs)”. Descriptive and inferential statistics of mean scores, and standard deviation were used for data analysis and t-test statistics to test the null hypotheses at .05 level of significance. The findings of the study show that the faculty members perceive OAIRs, to be useful in several ways, including; OAIRs making their research visible, provides an avenue for archiving research outputs, makes information search and retrieval easy. In addition, the perception of faculty members in the state universities on the usefulness of OAIRs is higher than that of their counterparts in the federal universities. Findings of the study also revealed different attitudes of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs in public universities, which include, strongly supporting the issue of OAIRs in their institution, often depositing their articles in the OAIRs, and feeling confident in searching information in the OAIRs. The test of hypothesis however, indicated that attitude and participation varies among faculty members in federal and state universities, with faculty members in the federal universities in North-East, Nigeria having a more positive attitude to participation in OAIRs than their colleagues in state owned universities. To this end, the study recommended that the authority and management of public universities in Nigeria should intensify efforts like organizing seminars, workshops and symposiums on the issue of OAIRs with a view to encourage faculty members develop a more positive attitudes towards participation in OAIRs.

**Key Words; *Attitude, Faculty Members, Open Access Institutional Repositories, Participation.***

## **Introduction**

Open access institutional repository (OAIR) is described as an online database on the internet, which guarantees full access to intellectual products of an author, freely and available, without any access restrictions as long as such access and use conform to the guiding principles of lawful use. It is a service offered by universities to their members through creation, management and dissemination of their scholarly output in electronic format resources such as e-prints, technical reports, theses and dissertations, data sets, and other teaching materials (Halder & Chandra, 2013). Therefore, it can be deduced that Open Access Institutional Repository is part of the effort of the institution to have control over the intellectual output emanating from its members with aim to support scholarship without recourse to economic barrier.

An institutional repository is referred to as open access institutional repository when it possesses the characteristics of being freely accessible to the users without any fee attached to it, except the cost of accessing the Internet. Universities adopt Open Access Institutional Repositories (OAIRs) as a means of providing better access to research materials to not only its own researchers and faculty, but also to a global audience. OAIRs remove price as an access barrier, while connecting authors to readers in the academic institution and beyond. It discourages plagiarism, as original works of authors can easily be traced on open access repositories. The gathering and preservation of a university's intellectual output can serve as a tangible indicator of the institution's quality (Crow, 2002), which in turn contributes to its visibility, prestige and public value. Thus, OAIRs improve a university's prestige among its peers and contribute to global circulation and access of their intellectual output.

However, It has been observed that faculty members who are considered the highest generators and users of information in the academic environment still find it difficult to

adequately contribute to building and utilizing IRs in their respective universities, because most of them have negative attitude towards, and do not participate in the use of OAIRs, possibly because they do not understand the operations and benefits, including the huge financial savings that accrue from open access research and publication. Based on this background, there is the need therefore, to investigate the extent to which attitude, as a factor, hinders faculty members' participation in open access institutional repositories in North-East geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Attitude can be considered as a behaviour based on conscious or unconscious mental views, developed through cumulative experience (Venes, 2001). Attitude exhibited can be implicit or explicit. Implicit when we are consciously aware of and explicit when we are unconscious about it but still have effect on our beliefs and behaviour. Attitude is equally defined as learned tendency to evaluate things as negative or positive, which at times can be uncertain. It is a set of emotions, beliefs, and behaviour targeted on a particular object, person, thing or event as a result of experience (Cherry & Susman, 2021).

It should be noted that attitude in the context of this study can be either positive or negative. There is no doubt that one's attitude towards an innovation affects his/her participation in such innovation. Attitude towards OAIRs becomes positive a when faculty member is found doing, performing and undertaking actions that promote OAIRs tasks. But in a situation where there is non-participatory approach such as not doing, performing and undertaking actions that promotes OAIRS tasks, attitude is termed to be negative in the context of this study. Having positive attitude to the OAIRs and participating in same is beneficial. One of such ways is the benefit of having access to vital research output free of charge, through which development of new knowledge is made possible.

Participation is the act of taking part in something (Hornby, 2010). Participation often refers to an individual's contribution towards the achievement of a defined goal. For faculty

members in public universities, to participate in OAIRs, there is need to put place certain determining factors that will encourage participation. It is believed that there are many determinants of one's attitude towards participation in anything. Such determinants include: level of awareness, perceived usefulness, and cost of use, among other things (Kim, 2011). The determining factors should be seen as those necessitating elements by stakeholders of OAIRs in universities. When this is considered relevant among stakeholders, and if action is taken to ensure their efficient execution, it will lead to high performance in terms of participation.

Sequel to the foregoing, it is remarkable to note that in spite of the obvious benefits of removing barriers to publishing, such as economic and access barriers, faculty members still do not maximize the available and free assess to make public their intellectual output, using OAIRs. Libraries have challenges with subscribing to journals due to escalating costs and this hinders users' access to vital information from scholarly communication. Open Access Institutional Repositories augment the library's role in making available, published materials for research, study and advancement of knowledge. OAIR is advocated and put in place to enable scholars share and communicate their intellectual output without recourse. Yet, attitude of faculty members seem to negate the very essence of OAIRs.

### **Problem Statement**

Communicating research findings is an issue that academics grapple with. The advent of open access repositories has paved the way through which information and intellectual output in journals, conference papers, reports, theses and dissertation, teaching materials, arts work and research data can be shared electronically. This is to say that technology has made it easier for academics to pool together their wealth of knowledge and disseminate same to a wider society, thereby helping scholars to collaboratively share and access resources, and

knowledge in borderless environments. Higher institutions of learning have taken advantage of technologies to bring OAIRs to the forefront, to help achieve the speedy and seamless access and utilization of research information by scholars, academics/faculty, and researchers. Notwithstanding, the establishment of OAIRs by universities might be an effort in futility, if the target user audience, the faculty, exhibit negative attitude towards participation in OAIRs.

The attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs is a major concern as it has the ability to negate or achieve the essence of research and development (R & D). Given that R & D is the principal mandate of universities, it becomes expedient to determine the reasons for this state of apathy towards participation in OAIRs, by faculty members. Based on this background, there is the need therefore, to investigate the extent to which attitude, as a factor, hinders faculty members' participation in open access institutional repositories in North-East geopolitical zone of Nigeria.

## **Objectives**

The objectives of this study are;

1. to ascertain the perception of the usefulness of OAIRs to faculty members in universities in North east Nigeria
2. to investigate the attitude of faculty members' towards participation in open access institutional repositories (OAIRs) in public universities in North-East, Nigeria.

## **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the perception of the usefulness of OAIRs by faculty members in public universities in North-East of Nigeria?
2. What is the attitude of faculty members in public universities in North-East of Nigeria towards participating in OAIRs

### **HYPOTHESES**

The following null hypotheses were postulated for the study and tested at 0.05 level of significance.

- Ho<sub>1</sub> There is no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the perceived usefulness of OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.
- Ho<sub>2</sub> There is no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.

## Literature Review

### Attitude and participation: A Conceptual delineation

The term “attitude” is derived from the Italian word *attitudine*, and from the Latin word *aptitūdō and aptitūdin*. Attitude is a behavior, based on conscious or unconscious mental views, developed through cumulative experience. Attitude simply means the way one thinks and feels about something or the way one behaves towards something or somebody that shows how you think and feel (Altmann, 2017). According to Hornby (2010), attitude is defined as a settled behavior, indicating opinion. Thurstone (as cited in Beri, 2009) defines attitude as the sum total of man’s inclination and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats and convictions about any specific issue. Furthermore, attitude is a subjective and personal affair. Beri (2009) observes that the term ‘opinion’ symbolizes an attitude. In fact, “opinion” can be said to be an expression of attitude.

Attitude could mean the individual’s mental processes, which determine both the actual and potential responses of each person in a social world (Cooper & Schindler, 2006). Since an attitude is always directed towards some object, it may be defined as the state of mind of the individual towards a value. In the words of Venes (2001), attitude is a mental and natural state of readiness organized through experience exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related. It is the predisposition of the individual to evaluate some symbol or object or aspect of his world in a favorable manner (Albarracin, Johnson, & Zanna, 2005). Attitude could also mean an enduring system of positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and pro and con action tendencies with respect to a social object. It is the degree of positive or negative effect associated with some psychological object (Cooper & Schindler, 2006). Psychologically, attitude is how positive or negative, favorable or unfavorable, or pro or con a person feels

towards an object (Beri, 2009). This definition views attitude as a feeling or an evaluative reaction to objects. It could also mean a learned predisposition to respond to an object or class of objects (e.g. a product, category, a brand, a service, an advertisement or a retail establishment) in a consistently favorable or unfavorable way (Beri, 2009). This definition incorporates the notion of a readiness to respond toward an object. Thus our orientation towards people, objects, and events is guided by attitudes.

For the purpose of this study, attitude is viewed as a residuum of experience, by which further activity is conditioned and controlled. It is an acquired tendency to act in specific ways towards the object of institutional repository. It entails the thinking and feeling of faculty members of public universities in North-East of Nigeria on the issue of OAIRs. Attitude may be positive or negative. Positive attitude allows individual to act in a way that appreciates innovations and new ideas and further contribute towards the promotion and sustenance of the innovation. Negative attitude rejects innovation and exhibits negative behaviors towards such development, which action directly or indirectly affects the individual's participation in such innovation.

On the other hand, participation is defined as an act of taking part in an activity or event (Hornby, 2010). To participate means to take part or become involved in something (Reitz, 2004). Participation does not happen in a vacuum. It is influenced and shaped by a range of societal and contextual factors. The researcher's approach to understanding and researching participation is also reflected in the terms used throughout the review. The term participation is contested and used in different ways by different authors in the bodies of literature examined. The term participation is frequently qualified with an array of prefixes, such as civic, civil, vertical, horizontal, individual, political, public, community, citizen and so on. To clarify the term as used in this review, the researcher refers to faculty participation. By faculty participation we mean the engagement of faculty with the various structures and

institutions of OAIRs. Participation is understood in a very broad sense as the act of taking part in a wide range of social and civic activities, such as volunteering to run a self-help phone line, being a member of a local community group, purchasing fair trade goods, etc

## **Methodology**

The descriptive survey research design was used for the study to collect and analyze data from a few people considered to be representative sample of the entire population through the use of questionnaire (Nworgu, 2015). The descriptive survey research design was suitable for this study since the study obtained data on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in open access institutional repositories (OAIRs) in North-East Nigeria.

The population of the study consisted of 3,612 comprising 1,962 and 1, 650 from both federal and state universities respectively. The distribution of the population for federal universities is drawn from Modibbo Adama University of Technology, (MAUTECH) Yola – 842; Federal University Wukari (FUW) – 571; and Federal University Kashere (FUK) – 549 with that of state universities drawn from three state universities namely; Adamawa State University Mubi (ADSU) - 631; Taraba State University (TSU), Jalingo - 504; and Gombe State University (GSU), Gombe - 515. (*Office of the Registrar, Academic Staff Matters* of each of the Universities in North- East, 2020). Therefore, the population of respondents for this study consisted of 3,612 faculty members spread across the six public universities (three federal universities and three state owned universities) from the North-East geopolitical zone of Nigeria (See Appendix I, P. 106).

The sample comprised of 196 federal university faculty members and 165 state university culminated to 361 faculty members drawn from six universities (viz, three federal universities and three states universities) namely; Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola, Adamawa State University Mubi, Taraba State University Jalingo, Federal University Wukari, Taraba State, Gombe State University and Federal University Kashere, Gombe. The 361 faculty members represent 10% of 3,612 (which is the total population of faculty members in the six (6) public universities sampled in this survey).

Three stages of sampling were used to draw the sample for the study. The first stage of sampling involved the use of purposive sampling to select three states out of six states that constitute North-East, using the existence of OAIRs in these selected universities. The states that were selected include Adamawa, Taraba and Gombe. The second stage of sampling involved the selection of all the six public universities (state and federal government-owned) in the states that was used for the study to make for equal representation. There are three (3) states and three (3) federal universities in the selected three states, making it six (6) public universities. The third stage involved the selection of faculty members or lecturers of the universities selected without considering the non-academic staff using purposive sampling technique.

Finally, proportionate stratified simple random sampling technique was used in selecting of the faculty in each of the universities using a sampling fraction of 0.1. Proportionate stratified in the sense that the public universities selected contributed different population sizes and to ensure equal representation. However, the simple random sampling gave every faculty equal chances of being selected as respondent. The breakdown is in shown in Appendix II (p. 107).

The instrument for data collection was a ninety (90) items structured questionnaire made up two (2) sections (viz. section A and B). The questionnaire is titled “Questionnaire on Attitude of Faculty Members towards Participation in Open Access Institutional Repositories (QAFMPOAIRs)”. The questionnaire items were derived from the related literature reviewed. The instrument was structured on a four (4) point scale of: Strongly Agree (SA) -4, Agree (A) -3, Disagree (D) -2, Strongly Disagree, (SD) -1.

## Results

Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, applying a decision rule, of a criterion mean of 2.50 to determine the degree of agreement or disagreement with item. This is to say that any item that has a mean score of 2.50 and above was considered as agreed while items with mean scores below 2.50 were considered as disagreed. The null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using t-test statistic. Hence, where the p-value was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected. But where the p-value was greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted.

### Research Question 1:

What is the perception of usefulness of OAIRs by faculty members in public universities in North-East of Nigeria?

**Table 1: Mean and standard deviation of the perception of the usefulness of OAIRs by faculty members in public universities in North-East of Nigeria**

S/n	Item Statements	State universities		Federal Universities		Average		Decision
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
1	OAIRs make my researches visible	3.36	.780	3.05	.744	<b>3.21</b>	<b>.762</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
2	It provides an avenue for archiving my articles in the OAIRs	2.99	.838	2.85	.752	<b>2.92</b>	<b>.795</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
3	It makes information searching easy	3.05	.873	2.93	.749	<b>2.99</b>	<b>.811</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
4	It provides an avenue for me to conduct my research	3.00	.846	2.84	.792	<b>2.92</b>	<b>.819</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
5	Retrieving information from the OAIRs is very easy	3.04	.914	2.86	.718	<b>2.95</b>	<b>.816</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
6	OAIRs helps in my academic progression	3.00	.805	2.90	.695	<b>2.95</b>	<b>.750</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
7	OAIRs helps in developing my writing skills	2.95	.884	2.90	.764	<b>2.93</b>	<b>.824</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
8	It provides ready avenue to publish my articles and earn marks	2.89	.894	2.79	.791	<b>2.84</b>	<b>.843</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
9	It assists me in obtaining information about my university	2.92	.801	2.91	.756	<b>2.92</b>	<b>.770</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

	research work.										
10	OAIRs attracts helps to scholarship for research	2.59	.901	2.79	.811	<b>2.69</b>	<b>.856</b>	<b>Agreed</b>			
11	It provides access to scholarly research	2.80	.885	2.76	.756	<b>2.78</b>	<b>.821</b>	<b>Agreed</b>			
12	With the OAIRs, I do not need to pay to download articles for my research	2.72	.831	2.80	.793	<b>2.76</b>	<b>.812</b>	<b>Agreed</b>			
13	Using the OAIRs helps me to discover new research areas	3.01	.830	2.87	.791	<b>2.94</b>	<b>.811</b>	<b>Agreed</b>			
14	Cost of publishing in OAIRs is low	2.72	.806	2.54	.939	<b>2.63</b>	<b>.873</b>	<b>Agreed</b>			
15	It makes research publication easy	2.80	.838	2.46	.873	<b>2.63</b>	<b>.856</b>	<b>Agreed</b>			
<b>Cluster Mean</b>		<b>2.93</b>	<b>.849</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>.782</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>.815</b>	<b>Agreed</b>			

**Key:**  $\bar{x}$  – Mean; SD – Standard Deviation

Table 1 shows data on the perceived usefulness of OAIRs by faculty members in public universities in North-East of Nigeria. The result reports a total agreement with the 15 item statements presented as the perceived usefulness of OAIRs by faculty members in public universities in North-East of Nigeria, with an average cluster mean score of 2.88 and a standard deviation (SD) of .815. Therefore, the faculty members in universities in North East Nigeria, perceive that OAIRs as useful. Furthermore, the decision of agreement is reached because, the average cluster mean surpasses the criterion mean of 2.50.

Furthermore, the result shows that the response from the state universities has a cluster mean and standard deviation of 2.93 and .849, which is higher than the responses of faculty members from federal universities as it pooled a cluster mean of 2.82 and standard deviation of .782. The implication is that the perception of faculty members in the state universities on the usefulness of OAIRs is higher than that of their counterparts in the federal universities. However, the two mean scores, of 2.93 and 2.82 fall within the agreement range.

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the perceived usefulness of OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.

**Table 2: t-Test analysis of the mean of perceived usefulness of OAIRs by faculty members of state and federal universities in public universities in North-East, Nigeria.**

Institution	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	t-value	sig	Decision
<b>State</b>	149	2.93	.60	335	1.82	.07	Accept Ho
<b>Federal</b>	188	2.82	.46				

df= degree of freedom, N – Number of respondents, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Data on Table 2 shows a p-value of .07 which is greater than the alpha value of .05. This means that Null hypotheses was accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the perception of the usefulness of OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria. Therefore, the hypothesis of no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the perceived usefulness of OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria was accepted..

**Research Question 2:**

What is the attitude of faculty members towards participating in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.

**Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.**

S/n	Item Statements	State Universities		Federal Universities		Average		Decision
		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
<b>16</b>	I strongly support the issue of OAIRs in my institution	3.40	.761	3.25	.683	<b>3.33</b>	<b>.722</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>17</b>	I often deposit my articles in the OAIRs	2.65	.922	2.80	.759	<b>2.73</b>	<b>.841</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>18</b>	I feel confident searching information in the OAIRs	2.71	.872	2.98	.701	<b>2.85</b>	<b>.787</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>19</b>	I cannot conduct research without using the OAIRs	2.41	.944	2.73	.856	<b>2.57</b>	<b>.900</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>20</b>	I often refer people to the OAIRs	2.64	.855	2.77	.787	<b>2.71</b>	<b>.821</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>21</b>	OAIR is the key to my academic progression, so I often use it	2.55	.873	2.83	.741	<b>2.69</b>	<b>.807</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

<b>22</b>	I always rely on OAIRs in developing my writing skills	2.55	.976	2.65	.756	<b>2.60</b>	<b>.866</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>23</b>	I depend on OAIRs when looking for where to publish my articles	2.40	.877	2.76	.783	<b>2.58</b>	<b>.830</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>24</b>	I rely on the OAIRs when I need information about my university research work	2.72	.958	2.96	.773	<b>2.84</b>	<b>.866</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>25</b>	I am not aware of OAIRs in my university	2.14	1.033	2.24	.998	<b>2.19</b>	<b>1.016</b>	<b>Disagreed</b>
<b>26</b>	Using the OAIRs in my institution is boring	2.10	.913	2.43	.866	<b>2.27</b>	<b>.890</b>	<b>Disagreed</b>
<b>27</b>	I engage in research, to seek ways to promote the acceptance and use of OAIRs in my institution	2.40	.965	2.80	.745	<b>2.60</b>	<b>.855</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>28</b>	I go to the OAIRs when I have exhausted other options in conducting research	2.57	.946	2.69	.711	<b>2.63</b>	<b>.829</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
<b>29</b>	OAIRs should be abolished in universities	1.97	.986	2.02	.933	<b>2.00</b>	<b>.960</b>	<b>Disagreed</b>
<b>30</b>	I do not interested in using OAIRs and have not used it at all.	1.79	.859	1.98	.871	<b>1.89</b>	<b>.865</b>	<b>Disagreed</b>
	<b>Cluster Mean</b>	2.47	.916	2.66	.798	<b>2.57</b>	<b>.857</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

**Key:**  $\bar{x}$  – Mean; SD – Standard Deviation

Table 2 shows data on the attitude of faculty members towards participating in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria. There are fifteen (15) item statements covering responses on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs. The result reports agreement with a majority, 11, of the 15 item statements captured in the Table as the attitude of faculty members towards participation in of OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria as it accounts an average cluster mean score of 2.57 with a standard deviation (SD) of .857. This indicates a positive attitude of faculty members in universities in North East, Nigeria, towards participation in OAIRs. Further reason for the decision of agreement is because the average cluster mean surpasses the criterion mean of 2.50 set for this study.

However, results of data analysis also showed a disagreement with 4, out of the 15 item statements. These are item statements 40, 41, 44 and 45. They include: I am not aware of

anything like OAIRs (with a  $\bar{x}$  of 2.19 and SD of 1.106), I feel bored using the OAIRs in my institution (with a  $\bar{x}$  of 2.27 and SD of .890), OAIRs in universities should be abolished (with a  $\bar{x}$  of 2.00 and SD of .960), and I do not like using OAIRs and have not used it at all (with a  $\bar{x}$  of 1.89 and SD of .865).

In addition, the response from the states' universities yielded a cluster mean and standard deviation of 2.47 and .916, which indicates a disagreement response on the attitude of faculty members towards participating in OAIRs about OAIRs, while data pooled from the federal universities gave a cluster mean of 2.66 and standard deviation of .798, indicating agreement on the attitude of faculty members towards participating in OAIRs. The implication of this result is that faculty members in the federal universities in North-East, Nigeria have a more positive attitude to participation in OAIRs than their colleagues in state owned universities. However, based on the fact that the study is not a co-relational study, the average cluster mean of 2.57, which indicates agreement, shall be the basis for decision.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.

**Table 4: t-Test analysis of the mean responses of faculty members of state and federal universities on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.**

Institution	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	t-value	Sig	Decision
State	149	2.47	.58	335	-3.60	.000	Reject Ho

df= degree of freedom, N – Number of respondents, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Data in Table 4 shows a p-value of .00 which is less than the alpha value of .05. This means that there is significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria. Therefore, the hypothesis of no significant

difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria was rejected.

### **Discussion**

The results of data analysis on research question 1 and null hypothesis 1 revealed that the perception of faculty members in universities in North East Nigeria of OAIRs, is that OAIRs are useful in many ways, including; It provides an avenue to conduct research, helps to retrieve information from the OAIRs, helps in academic progression, helps in developing writing skills, and provides ready avenue to publish articles and earn marks. The results also yielded a no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the perceived usefulness of OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria.

Given this result, the assumption in some quarters, towards the establishment and maintenance of OAIRs in public universities, that OAIRs is a wasted priority or an avenue for universities to lavish their limited resources has been negated, especially as there is no significant difference between the mean responses of faculty members in federal and state universities on the perceived usefulness of OAIRs in public universities in North-East of Nigeria. The result of the study, corroborates earlier reports, such as in the findings of Bamigbola and Adetimirin (2017), which indicate that the use of the repositories to prepare lecture notes and research works were among the perceived usefulness of the repositories by staff. This view is also in line with the report that majority of the respondents recognized the importance of the of OAIRs for self-archiving and disseminating scholarly work and teaching materials; and to serve as a criterion for measuring the quality of a university through the quality and quantity of research output by the faculty members (Chuang &Cheng 2010, Ezema 2011; and Ammrुकleat, 2017). It suffices to say that OAIRs are essential as they

provide an avenue for making the intellectual output of a university available and freely accessible for use. This will not only provide visibility of intellectual output for measuring quality and reputation but it will equally help in increasing the frontier of knowledge, hence researchers will find such resources as a viable means of building upon existing knowledge for the development of the society.

For research question 2 and null hypothesis 2, results of data analysis showed different attitudes towards participation in OAIRs by faculty members in public universities in North-East of Nigeria, with a significant difference between the mean data in federal and state universities. It is important to understand that most of these attitude either facilitate or mar the effectiveness and efficiency of the OAIRs in public universities in North-East Nigeria. This finding has shown more of positive attitude which invariably contributes to the participation in OAIRs, by faculty in the public universities studied. With this position, the study is at variance with the earlier submissions of scholars such as Van Westrienen and Lynch's (2005), Mischo and Schlembach (2011), Ukwoma and Dike (2017), which revealed the manifestation of negative attitude by faculty members in Nigerian universities towards OAIRs. Mischo and Schlembach (2011) report that the persistent lack of familiarity with university repositories and a very small uptake rate for depositing research output in them by the faculty members could constitute a determinant of the attitude expressed and reported in this study. The negation, may be as a result of the difference in the period of the research, or geographical locations where the researches were conducted compared to the location of the present study. However, the emphasis is that some faculty members are reported to express negative attitude towards the overall process of the OAIRs.

## **Conclusion**

OAIR is no longer a novelty in the academic environment, in public universities in North-East Nigeria. The perceived usefulness of OAIRs have been revealed, and include; assist in making research and research output visible, providing avenue for the faculty members and other categories of users to archive their articles, making information searching easier, as well as providing an avenue for effective and efficient research.

Other perceived usefulness of the OAIRs were revealed in the areas of enhancing institutional and author visibility, easy retrieval of information and research information, helping users to develop efficiency in research and publication. among other benefits to authors, researchers, institutions, and the community at large. The OAIRs are perceived as highly useful. Despite the perceived usefulness of OAIRs in universities, it was observed that the attitude faculty members towards participation is partially negative. This would negatively impact their participation in, and utilization of OAIRs.

## **Recommendations**

From the stand point of the findings of the study, faculty members' participation in OAIRs can be predicted by their attitude towards OAIRs. Therefore, the findings on the attitude of faculty members towards participation in OAIRs, can be used to assist university managements and OAIR managers and developers to implement strategies, derived from the users' perspective, to improve faculty participation in OAIRs in the North-East, Nigeria.

Furthermore, university managements need to understand that faculty members are central to the functionality of OAIRs in their universities. Therefore they should be facilitated to rise to the occasion and justify and maximize the funds invested in the

establishment of the IRs, by participating fully in the building and development of OAIRs in their respective universities. The findings of this study should arouse the consciousness of the faculty member to the fact that OAIRs are the boiling point for robust academic research globally.

## References

- Albarracin, D., Johnson, B. T., & Zanna, M. P (Eds.). (2005). *The handbook of attitudes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Altmann, T. K. (2017). Attitude: A concept analysis. *Nursing Forum* 43(3). Available at DOI:10.1111/j.1744-6198.2008.00106.x
- Ammurukleart, S. (2017). *Factors affecting faculty acceptance and use of institutional repositories in Thailand* (unpublished PhD. dissertation). University of Texas. Retrieved from [https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc984189/m2/1/high\\_res\\_d/AMMARUKLEART-DISSERTATION-2017.pdf](https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc984189/m2/1/high_res_d/AMMARUKLEART-DISSERTATION-2017.pdf)
- Bamigbola, A. A. & Adetimirin, A. E. (2017). Evaluating use of institutional repositories by lecturers in Nigerian universities. *Information Impact: Journal of Information and Knowledge Management* 8 (3), 83-102. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323332630\\_Evaluating\\_use\\_of\\_institutional\\_repositories\\_by\\_lecturers\\_in\\_Nigerian\\_universities](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323332630_Evaluating_use_of_institutional_repositories_by_lecturers_in_Nigerian_universities)
- Beri, G.C. (2009). *Marketing research* (4th ed). New York: Mc-Graw Hill.
- Cherry, K. & Susman, D. (2021). Attitude and behavior in Psychology. Retrieved from <https://www.verywellmind.com/attitudes-how-they-form-change-shape-behavior-2795897>
- Chuang, C. F. & Cheng, C. J. (2010). A study of institutional repository service quality and users' loyalty to college libraries in Taiwan: The mediating & moderating effects. *Journal of Convergence Information Technology*, 5, 89-99.

Cooper, R. D. & Schindler, P. (2006). *Business research methods*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill.

Crow, R. (2002). *The case of institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper*. Washington, DC: The Scholarly and Academic Resources Coalition. Retrieved from: <http://www.arl.org/sparc/IR/ir.html>.

Ezema, I. Z. (2011). Building open access institutional repositories for global visibility of Nigerian scholarly publication. *Library Review*, 60 (6), 473-485. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242531111147198>.

Halder, S. N. & Chandra, S. (2013). Essentials of institutional digital repository in academic library: A case study. *Indian Journal of Information and Services* 3(2), pp.1-5. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257207166\\_Essentials\\_of\\_Institutional\\_Digital\\_Repository\\_in\\_Academic\\_Library\\_A\\_Case\\_Study](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257207166_Essentials_of_Institutional_Digital_Repository_in_Academic_Library_A_Case_Study)

Hornby, A.S. (2010). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary* (8th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University.

Mischo, W. H. & Schlembach, M. C. (2011). Open access issues and engineering faculty attitudes and practices. *Journal of Library Administration*, 51 (5-6), 432-454. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.589349>.

Reitz, J. (2004). *Dictionary for library and information science*. Westport, Connecticut: Libraries Unlimited.

Ukwuoma, S.C. & Dike, V.W. (2017). Academics' attitudes toward the utilisation of institutional repositories in Nigerian universities. *Libraries and the Academy*, 17 (1), 17-32.

Van Westrienen, G. & Lynch, C. A. (2005). Academic institutional repositories: Development status in 13 nations as of mid-2005. *D-Lib Magazine*, 11 (9). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1045/september2005-westrienen>

Venes, D. (Ed.). (2001). *Taber's cyclopedic medical dictionary* (19th ed.). Philadelphia: F. A. Davis.

