

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

2023

Lecturers' Awareness, Perception, and Utilization of Institutional Repositories in Two Universities in Nigeria

Jemilat Iyabo Arilesere

Federal College of Animal Health and Production Technology, Moor Plantation, Apata, Ibadan,
jemilatiyaboarilesere@gmail.com

Gafar Abiodun Akinosho Mr

Federal College of Animal Health and Production Technology, Moor Plantation, Ibadan, Nigeria,
gafarakinosho@gmail.com

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



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#)

Arilesere, Jemilat Iyabo and Akinosho, Gafar Abiodun Mr, "Lecturers' Awareness, Perception, and Utilization of Institutional Repositories in Two Universities in Nigeria" (2023). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 7600.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7600>

LECTURERS' AWARENESS, PERCEPTION AND UTILIZATION OF INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES IN TWO UNIVERSITIES IN NIGERIA

BY

Jemilat Iyabo Arilesere and Gafar Abiodun Akinosho

Federal College of Animal Health and Production

Moore Plantation, Ibadan

Email: arilesereiyabo@yahoo.com.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the lecturer's awareness, perception, and utilization of institutional repositories in two universities in Nigeria. The universities include Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, and the University of Jos. The research design adopted for the study was correlational research design, while the questionnaire was the instrument used for data collection. The questionnaire was grouped into five sections and most of the questions were close-ended. Also, the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were done in order to obtain the desired results. Out of 642 questionnaires distributed, 473 were completed, returned, and found suitable for use. Descriptive and inferential statistics were then used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that lecturers' level of awareness of IRs was moderate, this was indicated by a weighted average of 2.58 (65%). The findings also revealed the lecturer's major sources of awareness of IRs were through University's website 417 (88.2%), library sensitizations 286 (60.5%), and colleagues 288 (60.9%). The Majority of the lecturers slightly utilized IRs 243 (51.4%) for depositing scholarly materials. However, the majority of the lecturers indicated that they did not encounter many constraints when utilizing the repositories. In the course of the study, three hypotheses were tested and the findings from the hypotheses revealed that there was a positive significant relationship between awareness and utilization of IRs, perception, and utilization of IRs, awareness, and perception of the importance of IRs. It was concluded that an increase in the awareness and perception of IRs by lecturers increases their utilization of the IRs. Hence, recommendations were made to the library management of the two universities to

intensify their advocacies, awareness campaigns, and sensitization excises in order to increase awareness and perception of lecturers which would in turn increase the utilization of the repositories.

Key words: Lecturers Awareness, Perception, Utilization, Institutional Repositories, Universities and Nigeria.

Introduction

Various authors have defined Institutional Repositories differently; two frequently cited definitions of IR are that of Crow (2002) and Lynch (2003). Crow (2002) defines Institutional Repositories as the digital collection used for capturing and preserving the intellectual output of a single or multi- university community. Furthermore, Akintunde (2010) defines IR as the digital preservation of the intellectual output of scholars in an institution that is accessible to enquirers and researchers world wide, he further stated that it is online, interactive and has the capacity for growth. Although various authors have defined IR differently, their definitions have certain characteristics in common. Majority of the authors describe IR as digital in nature, mainly used for preserving and disseminating the intellectual outputs of institutions. Hence an IR can be perceived as a locus, a store, a collection, a depository, an archive or a place for collecting in one place the intellectual outputs of institutions. Some scholarly publications that can be uploaded into repositories include: preprints and post prints of journal articles, technical reports, theses and dissertations, work in progress, conference proceedings, teaching and learning materials. There are a number of open- source soft-wares for running IRs such as Dspace, Bprints, Fedora and Greenstone. IRs offer tremendous benefits to the institutions that have them, to depositors and to the society at large. For the institution, the repository can raise the visibility of faculty research and help preserve the intellectual output of the institution (Crow, 2002; Drake, 2004). Institutional Repository utilisation is the act of using repositories either by depositing research outputs or by retrieving information from the repository (Rieh et al, 2007). From this definition, IR utilisation could be understood

as the manner or way lecturers and researchers use repositories through the deposition of their works and the way the end- users also use the repositories by accessing and retrieving the deposited works. From previous researches, most repositories are underpopulated and underutilised by academic staff (Davis and Connolly, 2007; Gardner 2008). Cullen and Chawner (2009) carried out a study assessing the value of IR to the academic community; the result of the study reveals that academics have been slow to embrace. Nicholas et al (2012) found a low level of preference amongst authors to deposit their works in IRs. More so, Carr and Brody (2017) conducted a research by evaluating 20 repositories and monitoring their daily deposit rate by counting the number of items in the repository. The result reveals that some repositories have many days of inactivity between deposits.

In order to find a lasting solution to the problem of under-utilisation of repositories, some institutions have adopted mandate deposit policies to boost repository content. McDowell (2007), conducted a census of IRs in the US, the result reveals that all respondents reported having difficulty recruiting content from faculty and graduate students. He further reported that even institutions with mandates requiring faculty deposits face the enduring task of encouraging and enforcing the mandate. Pickton and Mckay (2017) study of graduate students at loughborough University found science students to be more willing to comply with mandatory submission of their theses to the university repository than their fellow students in the humanities. Barwick (2007) asserts that mandatory self- archiving policies are a good solution but wide implementation of such policies is another challenge. In the same vein, Sale, (2016) also asserts that some repository developers propose that mandates damage goodwill towards the repository.

The first two Universities to establish IR in Nigeria include Ahmadu Bello University Zaria and University of Jos. The Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Kaduna State Nigeria was founded on October 4, 1962. The University is located at the North-West geopolitical zone of the country. Currently, the University has fourteen academic Faculties, a post graduate school and eighty- two academic Departments. The Kashim Ibrahim Library, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, was established in 1962 and it comprises the main library and eleven other satellite libraries located in different campuses of the University. The library has a total holding of over 1.2 million volumes of books and 66,000

periodical titles. With the advent of information and Communication Technology (ICT), the library was able to establish a repository in 2005, being the first of its kind in the country (Musa and Musa, 2012 cited in Umar Musa and Aliyu 2014). Thus, as at November 2022, the Ahmadu Bello University has 3,679 issues in its repository which may be described as relatively low compared to the number of lecturers and publications the lecturers have. On the other hand, University of Jos located in Plateau State Nigeria, is situated in the North- Central geo-political zone of the country. The University started as a campus of the University of Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria in November 1971. Later, in October 1975 the then Military Government announced the establishment of seven new Universities and University Colleges including the University of Jos. Presently; the University has twelve Faculties, academic Departments and a main library. The main library was established in February 1972 and is presently divided into three broad units - administration and Systems Unit, Subject Libraries and Support Service. Like other traditional libraries, the University of Jos library has a physical structure which houses about 169, 404 volumes of books, 25, 824 bound journals and 20, 263 materials in the document section. The library also has a seating capacity for about 1, 869 for its users. With the emergence of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), the library in 2009 also established an Institutional Repository, being the second of its kind in the whole Federation. As at November 2022, University of Jos has only 88 issues in its repository which is also relatively low. Although the very low figure recorded in University of Jos is due to the fact that the University server developed fault in 2013. Hence the repository administrators started afresh to archive intellectual outputs into the Repository. Nigeria that have only few IRs because the concept is still new to many lecturers. According to Hubbard, (2015), "while the process of setting up IRs has proved to be relatively unproblematic, populating them with scholarly content has turned out to be more of challenge". Foster and Gibbons (2005) also asserted that "unless IRs are populated with relevant content they will be unable to fulfill their potential as useful information resources and there is a very real risk that universities will not reap many benefits from their investments in IRs". Hence the present study was designed to investigate lecturers' awareness, perception and utilisation of Institutional Repositories in two selected Universities in Nigeria.

Methodology

The correlational research design was adopted. The study population consisted all the lecturers of the faculties of Arts, Social Sciences and Science of Ahmadu Bello University (ABU) Zaria and University of Jos. The population for ABU Zaria was 487 while that of University of Jos was 444 which gave a total population of 931. The sample size for both was 642, questionnaires was used to collect data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data collected.

Table 1: Sample size of faculties in ABU Zaria and University of Jos

S/N	Faculty	Population of lecturers	Sample
For ABU			
1	Arts	117	92
2	Social Science	91	73
3	Science	279	162
Total	487	327	
For University of Jos			
1	Arts	141	103
2	Social Science	105	80
3	Science	178	132
Total		444	315

Statement of the problem

In spite of the benefits that IRs offer to depositors, institutions and the society at large, results of various past studies have shown that most repositories are under-utilised. Despite the fact that most institutions have tried several strategies to encourage full utilisation of the repositories by researchers the problem still persists. The problem of under-utilisation is even more pronounced in developing countries like Nigeria that have only few IRs because the concept is still new to many academics and researchers. The

lecturers that are supposed to populate the IRs with their research works appear to be unaware and uninterested, while some seem to have a wrong perception about the IRs. It is in the light of the foregoing, that this study is designed to investigate lecturers' awareness, perception and utilisation of Institutional Repositories in two universities in Nigeria.

Objectives of the study

The objectives of this paper are to:

1. Examine the lecturers' level and source of awareness about Institutional Repositories.
2. Find out lecturers' perception about the importance of Institutional Repositories.
3. Determine the lecturers' level of utilisation of Institutional Repositories, find out how lecturers' awareness and perception of Institutional Repositories affect their utilisation of the Repositories.
4. Find out the constraints that lecturers encounter when utilising the Repositories.

Research questions

The research study seek to answers the following questions:

1. What is the lecturers' level and source of awareness about Institutional Repositories?
2. What is the lecturers' perception of the importance of Institutional Repositories?
3. What is the level of utilisation of Institutional Repositories by the lecturers?
4. What are the constraints that lecturers encounter when utilising Repositories?

Research Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between awareness and utilisation of Institutional Repositories by lecturers.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between perception and utilisation of Institutional Repositories by lecturers.

H0₃: There is no significant relationship between awareness and perception of Institutional Repositories by lecturers.

Literature Review

According to Hubbard (2015), the process of setting up online archives has proved to be relatively unproblematic, but populating them with scholarly content has turned out to be more of a challenge. The results of many researches have actually revealed that populating IRs with scholarly content has turned out to be a challenge. Some of these researches include that of Stanton and Liew, (2011) who surveyed 119 respondents at New Zealand University. The result of the survey reveals that only 7.6% (43) of respondents had lodged a piece of work in an IR. While 51.2% (125) indicated that they had accessed a repository. 61.3% of the 119 survey respondents giving primary reason for non- use to lack of awareness. Awareness of IR concepts was highest among the college of education and college of Business respondents at 58.3% and 53.7%. While respondents from the colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences were found to be the least frequent users of repositories (39.3%). Nicholas et al (2012) also carried out an international survey of digital repositories using 1695 respondents. The finding of the research reveals that 1079 (63.7%) respondents have distributed a research output in an IR, while 240 (14.2%) respondents have not. The main reasons given by respondents for not distributing their research output are unawareness 65 (26.3%), lack of time 43 (17.7%) and lack of knowledge of how to deposit material into IR, 51 (20.6%). On the other hand, 26 (10.5%) respondents were unconvinced there is any personal benefit in depositing their output in an IR. Fuchs (2015) study using 191 respondents also reveals that more than half of respondents (51%) did not know whether their employing institution had established an IR. Respondents from physics displayed a slightly higher level of awareness (53%) than did respondents from classics (44%). In 2005, Foster and Gibbons carried out a research at the University of Rochester to find out how the local IR can facilitate the work of academics. The findings reveal that many of the concepts and much of the terminologies which are commonly used to promote IRs were meaningless to academics. The academics further stated that they did not recognize any benefit they could derive from utilising IRs, while others view IRs as designed to support and achieve

the needs and goals of the institution, not necessarily of the individuals. The finding further reveals that faculty members perceive that IR contribution involves additional work. Christian (2018) also carried out a study to investigate the issues and challenges to the development of OA IRs in academic and research institutes in Nigeria using 72 respondents. Amongst the findings, 55(78.4%) respondents perceive IR as very important to them, while 10 (13.9%) perceive it as being important to the institution, 5 (6,9%) respondents were neutral and none see it as unimportant. Manjunatha and Thandavamoorthy (2014) also investigated academic scholars' attitude towards deposit in IR of universities in Karnataka, India using a total of 1736 researchers. Amongst their findings, it was discovered that majority of the researchers are not willing to publish their work in the IRs, they prefer prestigious journals and well- known publication mediums. For IRs to be fully utilised, depositors must be aware of their existence and should have the perception that the repositories are important to them, their institutions and the end-users in the society. They should be willing to disseminate their research outputs freely without expecting any monetary rewards. According to Foster and Gibbons (2005) "unless IRs are populated with relevant content they will be unable to fulfill their potential as useful information resources and there is a very real risk that universities will not reap many benefits from their investments in IRs". Moahi (2009) also stated that "universities should avoid the mistake of implementing a repository that simply has no depositors or users.

Results and Findings

Demographic information of respondents

Out of the 642 number of questionnaire distributed, 473 (74%) were completed, returned and found usable. Hence, all respondents (473) were used for the analysis of results of the study.

Table 2: Distribution of the participants based on institution and faculty

Variable	Frequency	%
Institution		
University of Jos	241	51.0
Ahmadu Bello University	232	49.0
Total	473	100
Faculty		

Arts	152	32.1
Social Sciences	128	27n
Sciences	193	40.8
Total	473	100

The above table revealed that 473 respondents fully participated in this study, out of which 51% were from University of Jos and 49% were from Ahmadu Bello University Zaria. Also, 32% were in Faculty of Arts, 27% from Social Sciences and 41% from sciences.

Table 3: Distribution of the participants based on gender, age qualification, cadre, and teaching experience

Variable	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	231	48.8
Female	235	49.7
Not indicated	07	1.7
Total	473	100
Age		
Less than 30 years	18	3.8
30 - 40 years	108	22.8
41 - 50 years	298	63.0
51 - 70 years	40	8.5
Not indicated	09	1.9
Total	473	100
Qualification		
Bachelor Degree	21	4.4
PGD	10	2.1
Master Degree	177	37.4
M.Phil	165	34.9
PhD	100	21.1
Others	-	-
Total	473	100
Cadre		
Graduate assistant	14	3%
Assistant lecturer	80	17%
Lecturer II	118	25%
Lecturer I	123	26%
Senior lecturer	99	21%
Reader	24	5%
Professor	15	3%

Not indicated	1	0.2%
Total	473	100
Teaching Experience		
Less than 3 years	8-	1.7
4-6 years	76	16.1
7- 10 years	288	60.9
11-15 years	92	19.5
16 years and above	7	1.5
Not indicated	2	0.4
Total	473	100

Table 3 reported the distribution of the participants based on gender, age, qualification, cadre and based on teaching experience. Based on gender and age, out of the total participants, 49% were male and 50% were female, while 1 % failed to indicate their gender. Furthermore, 4% of the participants were less than 30 years of age, 23% were between 30 to 40 years, 63% were between 41 and 50 years and 9% were between 51 and 70 years while 2% failed to indicate their age bracket. Based on qualification and cadre, out of the total participants, 4% had Bachelor Degree, 2% PGD, 37% Master Degree, 35% M.Phil and 21% had PhD. On the other hand, distribution according to cadre revealed that 3% are Graduate Assistants, 15% Lecturer II, 16% Lecturer I, 47% Senior Lecturer, 6% Reader and 3% Professor, while 0.2% failed to indicate their cadre. Based on teaching experience, out of the total participants, 2% had less than 3 years teaching experience, 16% had 4-6 years working experience, 61% had 7-10 years teaching experience, 20% had 11-15 years teaching experience, 2% had 16 years and above teaching experience while 0.4% did not indicated their teaching experience.

Answers to the research questions

Research question 1: What is the lecturers' level and source of awareness about institutional repositories?

Table 4: Level of awareness of institutional repositories

S/N	ITEM	NA (%)	SA (%)	MA	EA	Mean	Std. D.
1.	Are you aware of the term "Institutional Repositories"?	155 (32.8)	62 (13.1)	179 (37.8)	77 (16.3)	2.38	1.10

2.	Are you aware that your university has an Institutional Repository?	49 (10.4)	265 (56.0)	84 (17.8)	75 (15.9)	2.39	.87
3.	Are you aware of the existence of other repositories apart from your	255 (53.9)	65 (13.7)	30 (6.3)	123 (26.0)	2.04	1.28
4.	Are you aware of its functions?	9 (1.9)	108 (22.8)	182 (38.5)	173 (36.6)	3.09	.83
5.	Are you aware of what it contains?	80 (16.9)	33 (7.0)	164 (34.7)	195 (41.2)	3.00	1.09
Weighted Average 2.58 (64.5%)							

Key: NA= Not Aware, SA= Slightly Aware, MA= Moderately Aware, EA= Extremely Aware

Table 4 showed that the lecturers were moderately aware of the functions of IRs (mean = 3.09) and what IRs contain (mean = 2.38). But they were slightly aware of the term "Institutional Repository" (mean = 2.38); that their institutions have repositories (mean = 2.39) and the existence of other IRs apart from their own (mean = 2.04). The weighted average is 2.58 which can be rates as 64.5%. This implies that the level of awareness of IRs by the lecturers in the institution under study is moderate.

Table 5: Lecturers' source of awareness of institutional repositories

S/N	Items	Agree (%)	Disagree%	Comment
1.	From university's website	417(88.2)	51 (10.8)	Source
2.	Through internet browsing	258(54.5)	136(28.8)	Source
3.	From institution's bulletin	199(42.1)	197(41.6)	Source
4.	From colleagues	288 (60.9)	106(22.4)	Source
5.	Through library sensitization	286(60.5)	185(39,1)	Source
6.	Through publishers 'handbills/ flyers in the internet	201 (42.5)	193(40.8)	Source
7.	Through workshops	103(21.8)	(61.5)	Not a source

Table 5 indicated that the sources of awareness of IRs by lecturers include university's website (88%), from colleagues (61%), library sensitization (60.5%), through internet browsing (55%), from institutions' bulletin (42%), and through publisher's

handbills/flyers in the internet (43%). On the other hand, lecturers indicated that they were not aware of IRs through workshops (62%).

Research question 2: What is the lecturers' perception of the importance of institutional repositories?

Table 6: Lecturers' perception of the importance of institutional repositories

S/N	ITEM	VU (%)	UT (%)	T (%)	VT (%)	Mean	Std. D
1	Do you perceive that IRs help to disseminate research outputs as wide as possible for greater visibility, increased citation rates and for reputation building?	175 (37.0)	65 (13.7)	141 (29.8)	88 (18.6)	2.29	1.17
2	Do you perceive that IRs provide alternative to the expensive journal subscription costs that make access to published materials extremely difficult?	61 (12.9)	58 (12.3)	261 (55.2)	89 (18.8)	2.79	.92
3	Do you perceive that IRs act as medium for the centralization, storage and long term preservation of all types of institutional outputs?	3 (0.6)	165 (34.9)	215 (45.5)	86 (18.2)	2.80	.76
4	Do you perceive that IRs are only designed to achieve the needs and goals of the institution and not necessarily of the lecturers?	65 (13.7)	173 (36.6)	64 (13.5)	158 (33.4)	2.52	1.16
5	Do you perceive that end-users benefit more from IRs?	159 (33.6)	80 (16.9)	78 (16.5)	153 (32.3)	2.47	1.26
6	Do you perceive IRs as unimportant to lecturers?	132 (27.9)	263 (55.6)	63 (13.3)	3 (0.6)	1.82	.71

Weighted Average = 2.47 (61.6%)

Key: VU= Very Untrue of what I perceive, UT= Untrue of what I perceive, T= True of what I perceive, VT= Very True of what I perceive.

Table 6 showed that the lecturers indicated the following as true: IR provides alternative to the expensive journal subscription costs that make access to published materials extremely difficult (mean = 2.79); IR serves as medium of centralization, storage and long term preservation of all types of institutional outputs (mean = 2.80): IRs are designed to achieve the needs and goals of the institution and not necessarily of the lecturers (mean = 2.62) and IR benefits the end-users (mean = 2.47). But they indicated the following as untrue: IRs disseminate research outputs as wide as possible for greater visibility, for increased citation rates and for reputation building (mean = 2.31) and IRs are unimportant to lecturers (mean = 1.82). The weighted average is 2.47 which can be rated as 61.6%. This implies that the lecturers have positive perception about IRs.

Research question 3: What is the lecturers' level of utilisation of institutional repositories?

Table 7: Level of utilisation of institutional repositories by lecturers

S/N	Items	Response option	Frequency	%
1	Do you utilise your IR by depositing materials?	Not at all	55	11.6
		Slightly	243	51.4
		Moderately	149	4.9
		Highly	23	
2	If you have deposited materials in your repository, what type of materials have you deposited?	Thesis/dissertation	147	31.1
		Articles	310	65.5
		Lecture notes	110	0.0
		Conference paper	291	
		Others	-	
3	If you have deposited materials in your IR, do you deposit by	Self-archiving	28	5.9
		Or Mediated archiving	273	57.7

4	Which do you prefer?	Self-archiving	242	51.2	46.5
		Mediated archiving	220		
5	Have you utilise your repository by accessing scholarly materials held in it?	Not at all	93	19.7	
		Slightly	45	9.5	
		Moderately	118	24.9	
		Highly	72	15.2	
6	If yes, what kind of material have you accessed in this way?	Thesis/dissertation	140	29.6	65.8
		Articles	311	42.5	42.3
		Lecture notes	201	0.2	
		Conference paper	200		
		Others	1		

Table 7 revealed that 51% of the lecturers had slightly utilised their IR while 32% had utilised it moderately. Furthermore, 31% of the lecturers deposited either thesis or dissertation, 66% deposited articles, while 23% deposited lecture notes and 61% deposited conference paper. Majority of the lecturers (58%) deposited through mediated-archiving while only few (6%) deposited through self-archiving. Although most of the lecturers (51%) preferred self-archiving while 47% preferred mediated-archiving. Largest proportion of the lecturers utilised articles on the IR (66%); 43% lecture notes, 42% utilised conference paper and 30% utilised thesis and dissertation. Generally, the level of utilisation of IRs by lecturers is moderate.

Research question 4: What are the constraints that lecturers encounter during the utilisation of institutional repositories?

Table 8: Constraints lecturers encounter during the utilisation of institutional repositories?

S/N	ITEM	UD (%)	SD (%)	D (%)	A (%)	SA (%)	Mean	Std. D.
1	Depositing items into	52	354	4 (.8)	53	-	2.085	.7989

	repositories is time-consuming	(11.0)	(74.8)		(11.2)	-		
2	Self-archiving items into repositories is difficult and complex.	1 (1.5)	239 (50.5)	165 (34.9)	51 (10.8)	1 (.2)	2.5191	.78984
3	My institution's copyright statement is unclear to me.	6 (1.3)	203 (42.9)	106 (22.4)	56 (11.8)	1 (2)	2.0318	1.25727
4	I am worried about infringing the publisher's copyright of my publication.	45 (9.5)	236 (49.9)	32 (6.8)	148 (31.3)	1 (.2)	2.5636	1.09825
5	I have fear that when I deposit my research work into repositories, I may not be able to publish the work elsewhere.	5 (1.1)	112 (23.7)	186 (39.3)	157 (33.2)	2 (.4)	3.0191	.90625
6	There is inadequate advocacy about the Institutional Repository.	162 (34.2)	89 (18.8)	8 (1.7)	52 (11.0)	152 (32.1)	2.8220	1.76246
7	There is lack of trust in institution's commitment to the long term maintenance of the repository.	3 (.6)	72 (15.2)	279 (59.0)	56 (11.8)	53 (11.2)	2.8919	1.31421
8	Deposited materials may not be accessible in the long run due to insecurity.	45 (9.5)	187 39.5	27 (5.7)	150 (31.7)	53 (11.2)	2.8919	1.31421

Key: UD= Undecided, SD= Strongly Disagree, D= Disagree, A= Agree and SA Strongly Agree

Table 8 revealed that majority of the lecturers strongly disagree that depositing items into repositories is time consuming (mean = 2.085) and the institution's copyright statement is unclear to them (mean = 2.032). The lecturers also disagree that self-archiving items into repositories is difficult and complex (mean = 2.5191), that they were worried about

infringing the publishers' copyright of their publication (mean = 3); they also disagree that their deposited materials may not be published elsewhere (mean = 3); disagree that there is inadequate advocacy about the IR by the library (mean = 3); that there is lack of trust in institutions commitment to the long term maintenance of the repository (mean = 3), and deposited materials may not be accessible in the long run due to insecurity (mean = 3.1).

Research hypotheses

Testing and Null Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between awareness and utilisation of IR by lecturers

Table 9: Relationship between awareness and utilisation of institutional repositories

Variable	N	Mean	Std.D.	r	Sig.	Remark
Awareness of IRs	473	12.90	3.99	.195	.000	Significant
Utilisation of IRs	473	10.33	2.91			

Table 9 shows that there is a positive significant relationship between awareness and utilisation of IRs ($r = 0.20$; $p < 0.05$). Therefore H_{01} is rejected. The positive relationship implies that increase in awareness brings about increase in utilisation.

H₀₂: There is no significant between perception of the importance of IRs and IR utilisation

Table 10: Relationship between perception and repository utilisation

Variable	N	Mean	Std.D.	r	Sig.	Remark
Utilisation of IRs	473	10.33	2.91	.168	.000	Significant
Perception of importance of IR	473	14.78	3.11			

Table 10 reported that there is a positive significant relationship between perception of the importance of IR and IR utilisation ($r = 0.17$; $p < 0.05$). Therefore H_{02} is rejected. The positive relationship implies that increase in the perception of the importance of IR brings about increase in utilisation.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between awareness of IRs and perception of the

importance of IRs

Table 11: Relationship between awareness and perception of institutional repositories

Variable	N	Mean	Std.D.	r	Sig.	Remark
Awareness of IR	473	12.90	3.99			
Perception of IR importance	473	14.78	3.11	.106	.000	Significant

Table 11 revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between awareness of IR and perception of the importance of IR ($r = 0.16$; $p < 0.05$). Therefore H_{03} is rejected. The positive relationship implies that increase in the awareness of IR, brings about increase in the perception of the importance of IR.

Discussion of the findings

The findings revealed the lecturers' level of awareness of IR in the institution under study was moderate 64.5%, with a weighted average of 2.58. This finding supported the work of Abrizah (2009) of ten European countries on IR awareness, which revealed that 91 (69.5%) respondents knew about OA IR. The finding also supported the work of Pellizari (2013) who surveyed 62 Social Science faculty members at Brescia University on Open Access IR use, perception and expectation. The finding of the research showed that majority of the respondents were aware of the existence of the IR. Dolan (2011) also carried out a research assessing the awareness of repositories and the open access movement among electronic depositors of theses and dissertations (ETD) faculty advisors of the West Virginia University using 278 respondents. The finding of the research showed that 94% of the respondents were aware of the repository known as WVUScholar, while 6% of the respondents were not aware. In contrast, the findings of most researches on IR awareness revealed a low level of awareness amongst depositors. Watson (2007) carried out a study of authors' awareness, attitude and use of a university IR. The result of the study revealed that despite a reasonable amount of advocacy many authors have not heard about IRs and were not aware of its purpose. A similar study conducted by Kim (2010) also reveals a low level of awareness of IR. Ahmad et al (2012) also reported a general lack of awareness of IRs in Saudi Arabia institutions by authors

and researchers. Nicholas et al (2012) also carried out an international survey of digital repositories to determine how well they are used, what they are used for and what researchers think of them. The result revealed that a number of researchers have not deposited a research output into a repository. The reason for non-use of the repositories was lack of awareness amongst others. Although some researchers said that they have come across the concept of open access institutional repositories but knew nothing about it. Also, Christian (2018) carried out a research to investigate the issues and challenges to the development of Open Access IRs in academic and research institutions in Nigeria. The result of the study revealed that some academics are completely unfamiliar with OA IR concepts. Dawe and Ramachandran (2016) findings also reveals a low level of awareness 6 (8%). Furthermore, findings of the study revealed that lecturer's sources of awareness of IRs were mostly through the university's website 417 (88.2), library sensitization 286 (60.5%) and from colleagues 288 (60.9). This finding supported the finding of Pinfield et al (2002) who also discovered in a research that the University of Edinburgh and Nottingham have used a number of different general awareness methods such as setting up a project website, using university magazines to publicize including the library user newsletter, making presentations at departmental meetings and university committees and organizing special events for university staff. In contrast, despite the widespread use of different awareness techniques such as leaflets and other mass instruction, the finding of a research on different types of repository awareness programs reveals that publications such as websites and brochures are ineffective, with only 18% of respondents judging websites as effective, slightly less. The study reveals that the most effective means of delivering the scholarly communication message to faculty is one-on-one conversation. The finding of this Investigation revealed that lecturers have positive perception about IRs, weighted average 2.47 (61.6%). Most findings of researches about the perception of IRs also revealed that majority of depositors have positive perception about the importance of IRs. According to Pellizari (2003) most academics showed positive acceptance of OA principles.

On IR utilisation, the finding showed that majority of the lecturers utilised IRs slightly 243 (51.4%) for depositing scholarly materials. The finding also showed that majority of the lecturers deposit mainly articles 310 (66%) and conference papers 291

(62%) into the repository. This corroborated the work of Sawant (2012) whose finding revealed that majority of the respondents 113(61.08%) were willing to deposit symposium/ conference/seminar papers. Majority of the lecturers also admitted that they moderately access articles, lecture notes and conference papers held in the IRs. This finding supports the finding of Fuchs (2015) which reveals that the most frequently accessed scholarly materials in repositories are journal articles, conference papers and unpublished research findings. Furthermore, the finding of the research revealed that majority of the lecturers indicated that they did not encounter much constraint in the course of utilizing the repository. This could be due to the fact that they clearly understand how to utilize the repository. However most researches conducted on IRs reported some constraints encountered by depositors. Foster and Gibbons (2005) interviewed 25 professors in order to investigate the factors affecting their contributions to IRs. Copyright infringement worries and disciplinary work practices were some of the factors mentioned. The result obtained from the tested hypotheses revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between awareness and utilisation, awareness and perception and perception and utilisation of IRs. This implies that increase in awareness and perception of IRs increases the level of IR utilisation by lecturers. On the other hand, decrease in awareness and perception of IRs also decreases the level of IR utilisation. Hence, it therefore goes without saying that for IRs to be fully utilized by lecturers it is imperative to raise their level of awareness and perception about the IRs.

Conclusion

The major sources of awareness of the repositories are through the Universities was site and through colleagues. Majority of the lecturers agreed the IR are important, hence they have a positive perception about the importance of IRs. Therefore, the lecturers slightly utilized the IRs in depositing and accessing scholarly materials. The most deposited and most accessed scholarly materials by the lecturers include articles, conference papers and lecture notes. Also, there is a positive significant relationship between awareness of institutional repositories and utilisation of the repositories and also between perception of importance of the institutional repositories and utilisation of the repositories by the lecturers, hence the null hypotheses is rejected.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Library management of the institutions under study should intensify their advocacies and awareness campaign so to ** the level of awareness of IRs among lecturers.
2. Sensitizations should be carried out more often about the benefits of lecturers could derive when utilizing the IRs so as to increase their perception about the importance of the repositories.
3. Sensitizations should also be carried out more often in order to teach the lecturers how to self-archive their intellectual works into the repositories.
4. Lecturers should be encouraged to deposit variety of their intellectual output into the repository such as lecture notes, course outlines, assignments, books, theses and dissertations. This would boost the repository and definitely utilisation by end-users.

References

- Abrizah, A. 2009. The cautious faculty: their awareness and attitude towards institutional repositories *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*. 14.2:17-37. Retrieved Jul 8, 2014 from <http://www.icmsm2009.um.ed.my/filebank/publiishedarticle/2392/746.pd>
- Ahmad, P., Aquil, M. and Siddique, M. 2012. Open institutional repositories in Saudi Arabia: present and future prospects. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*.2.2. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://www.ijodis.in>
- Akintunde, S.A. 2010. Blazing the trail: institutional repository at the University of Jos. *Nigerian Libraries*. 43.1:1-19.

- Barwick, J. 2007. Building an institutional repository at Loughborough University: some experiences. *Electronic Library and Information Systems*. 41.2:113-123. Retrieved Oct 16, 2014 from <https://dspace.iboro.ac.uk/barwickrev2.pdf>.
- Brody, M.A. 2017. A research conducted on repositories institutions: An evaluative study. *Ledir workbook*. 82-92.
- Carr, L. and Brody, T. 2007. Size isn't everything: sustainable repositories evidenced by sustainable deposit profiles. *D-lib magazine*. 13.7/8. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://eprintsecs.soton.ac.uk/13872>
- Christian, G.E. 2018. Open access initiative and the developing world. *African Journal of Library Archives and Information Science*. 18.2: 23-29. Retrieved Oct 16, 2014 from https://idl.bnc.idrc.ca/dspace/bitstream/10625/36986/1/1_27792.pdf
- Crow, R. 2002. The case for institutional repositories: a SPARC position paper. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm.doc/ir>
- Cullen, R. and Chawner, B. 2009. Institutional repositories and the role of academic libraries in scholarly communication. *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific conference on Library Education and Practice*. 6-8 March 2009. Japan. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://www.researcharchive.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10063/866/conference%20>
- Davis, P.M. and Connolly, M.Y.2007. Institutional repositories: evaluating the reason for non-use of Cornell University and installation of Dspace. *DLibMagazine*.\13.3/4. Retrieved Jul 9, 2014 from www.dlib.org/dlib/march/07/davis/03davis.htm/

- Dawe, G. and Ramachandran, S, 2016. Enabling knowledge sharing with an institutional repository. Seventh IEEE International Conference on Advance Learning Technology, Nigata. 432-3. Retrieved Nov 24, 2022 from <http://www.tlrst.emeraldinsight.com/casestudies.hm?id>
- Dolan, M. 2011. Assessing awareness of repositories and the open access movement among ETD faculty advisers. Proceeding of the 14th International Symposium on Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 13- 17 September 2011 .Capetown, South Africa. Retrieved Oct 16, 2014 from <http://www.dl.cs.uct.ac.za/conference/etd2011/proceeding>
- Drake, M.A. 2004. Institutional repositories: hidden treasures. Search Magazines. 12.5. Retrieved Jul 8,20 14 from <http://www.infoday.com/searcherr/may04/drake.shtm/>
- Foster, N.F. and Gibbons, S. 2005. Understanding faculty to improve content recruitment for institutional repositories. D-Lib magazines. 111. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/January05/foster.html>
- Fuchs, I. 2015. Institutional repositories from the author's perspective: a study of the attitudes of UK academics from two different subject disciplines. Msc project Dept of Information Science. City University. Xii+ 143pp. Retrieved Nov 24, 2014 from <http://www soi.city.ac.uk/project/dissertations/soi/fuchsireenc.pdf>
- Gardner, J. 2008. Open access and institutional repositories: issues in today's digital libraries. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://www.archive.org/details/openaccessandinstitutionalrepositories>
- Hubbard, B. 2015. Ways to open access: the emergence of a national repository

- infrastructure. *Relay*. 57:7-13. Retrieved Oct 16 2014 from <http://uksg.metapress.com>.
- Kim, J. 2010. Faculty self- archiving: motivation and barriers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*. 61.9:1909-1922. Retrieved Oct 16, 2014 from <http://www.journals.tandf.co.uk/journals/10.1080/152370210.3.1.1909>.
- Lynch, C.A. 2003. Institutional repositories: essential infrastructure and scholarship in the digital age. *Library Science and Publishing*. 3.2:327-336. Retrieved Jul 9, 2014 from <http://www.muse.jhu.edu/login>.
- Manjunatha, L., and Thandavamoorthy, P. 2014. Academic scholar attitudes and behaviour towards institutional repositories. A research project submitted in University Library in Kamataka, in India.
- McDowell, C. 2007. Evaluating institutional repository deployment in American academic since early 2005: repositories by the numbers, part 2. *D- lib magazine*. 13.9. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september07/mcdowell/09mcdowell.html>
- Mckay, D. 2017. Institutional repositories and their other users: usability beyond authors. *Ariadne*. 52. www.ariadne.ac.uk/issues2/mckay
- Moahi, K.H. 2009. Institutional repositories: towards harnessing knowledge for African development. *Proceedings of the First International Conference on African Digital Libraries and Archives (ICADLA)*. 1st- 3rd July 2009. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Retrieved Oct 16, 2014 from <http://www.mobile.wesedspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/8950/35>.

- Nicholas, D., Rowlands, I., Watkinson, A., Brown, D. and Jamali, H. 2012. Digital repositories ten years on: what do scientific researchers think of them and how do they use them? *Learned publishing*. 25: 195-206. Retrieved Oct 16, 2014 from <http://docserver.ingentaconnet.com>
- Pelizzari, E. 2013. Academic staff use, perception and expectations about Open Access archives. A survey of Social Science Sector at Brescia University. Brescia. Retrieved Nov 16, 2014 from <http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/academicstaffperceptionabout>
- Pinfield, S., Gardner, M. and McColl, J. 2002. Setting up an institutional E-print archive. *Ariadne*. 31. Retrieved Oct 16, 2014 from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issues31/eprint-archives>
- Rich, S.Y., Markey, K., St. Jean, B., Kim, J., and Yakel, E. 2007. Census of institutional repositories in the United States. *D-lib magazines*. 13.11/12. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub140abst.html>
- Sale, A. 2016. The acquisition of open access research articles. *First Mondays*. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin>.
- Sawant, S. 2012. Management of Indian institutional repositories. *OCLC Systems and Services*. 28:130-143. Retrieved Jul 9, 2014 from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleied=170478>
- Stanton, K.V. and Liew, C. L. 2011. Open access theses in institutional repositories: perceptions of doctoral students. *Information Research*. 16.4. Retrieved Oct 10, 2014 from <http://inforrmationR.net/ir/17-I/paper507.html>

Umar, M.A., Musa, S. and Aliyu, A. 2014. Institutional digital repositories in Nigeria: issues and challenges. IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. 19.1.16-21. Retrieved Jul 9, 2014 from <http://www.iosrjournals.org>.

Watson, S. 2007. Authors' attitude, awareness and use of a university institutional repository. *Serials*, 20.3:225-230. Retrieved Jul 9, 2014 from <http://www.digitalscholarship.org/irb/archive>