e-ISSN : 2541-500X
p-ISSN : 2614-6010

INSANIYAT

Journal of Islam and Humanities

Vol 4, Number 2, May 2020

Published by Faculty of Adab and Humanities
Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, Jakarta, Indonesia
Website : http://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/insaniyat | **Email :** journal.insaniyat@uinjkt.ac.id

e-ISSN : 2541-500X
p-ISSN : 2614-6010

INSANIYAT

Journal of Islam and Humanities

Vol. 4(2) May 2020

EDITORIAL TEAM OF INSANIYAT

JOURNAL OF ISLAM AND HUMANITIES

Table of Contents

INSANIYAT
Journal of Islam and Humanities, Vol. 4 (2) May 2020 p. 75-87
e-ISSN : 2541-500X p-ISSN : 2614-6010

INSANIYAT
Journal of Islam and Humanities

Awareness and Usage of Reference Management Software: Perspectives of Faculty Members of University of Ilorin Nigeria

Ismail Olatunji Adeyemi, Kabir Alabi Sulaiman, Lawal Mohammed Akanbi

Pinheiro LP, Lagos, Nigeria

Tunde Idiagbon Library, Ilorin South Local Government, Ilorin, Nigeria

Departement of Library and Information Science, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

email: adeyemiismailolatunji@gmail.com
kabirsulaiman1983@gmail.com
amal@unilorin.edu.ng.com

Abstract

This study examined the awareness and usage of reference management software by faculty members of the University of Ilorin. Descriptive survey method was adopted for the study. The Web-based questionnaire was used to collect data for the study. The total population of the study is 1,496 people. From which the sample size of 306 was selected using Raosoft sample size calculator and total responses of 98 was returned, which represents the unit of analysis. Hence, the response rate for the study is 32%. The findings of the study revealed that EndNote and Mendeley are the most used reference management software by faculty members of the University of Ilorin (UNILORIN). Results show that faculty members were aware of EndNote and Mendeley to great extent. It was found that there is low usage of reference management software among faculty of the University of Ilorin; and that most of the faculty members have never used ProCites, Bookends, Papers and Qiqqa. It was concluded that there is a positive significant relationship between awareness and usage of reference management software by faculty members. It was recommended that faculty members should be trained on how to make use of the most used reference management software.

Keywords: *Reference management software, Mendeley, EndNote, University of Ilorin Nigeria*
How to cite**:** Adeyemi, I. O., Sulaiman, K. A., & Akanbi, L. M. (2020). Awareness and Usage of Reference Management Software: Perspectives of Faculty Members of University of Ilorin Nigeria. Insaniyat: Journal of Islam and Humanities, 4(2), 75–87.
https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

Introduction

Reference management has proven to be an arduous piece of work for researchers in a research process. Basically, academic writing is a research on what some other scholars have done in a particular area or field previously. To avoid being caught in the web of plagiarism, there is need for proper referencing of other research works cited in a study. Reference management software is also known as citation management software or bibliographic

management software. To ensure uniformity and consistency, this study would use reference management software. Ordinarily, the intricacies and challenges involved in keeping track with one's references manually cannot be overemphasized. Owing to the difficulty involved in the manual referencing, a researcher may end up committing some avoidable errors. This has necessitated the design and implementation of different reference management software to reduce the challenges of researchers in referencing. This software programs allow researchers to store, organize, output and share their bibliographic citations (Childress, 2011).

The development of first reference management software can be traced to the 1980s (Gilmour & Cobus-Kuo, 2011). Today, some of the trendy software packages in the academic or research community include viz: Mendeley, Zotero, EndNote, Citavi, JabRef, RefWorks, ProCite, Bookends, Papers and Qiqqa. All these reference management software packages are designed by different establishments or bodies. Just like many software packages, there are open source and subscription-based reference management software. Moreover, these software applications vary in features, which include capacity to machine-readable file formats that can be exported, file formats which can be imported into the software, referencing styles, reference list file formats, word processor integration, database connectivity, and password protection/network functionality.

Reference management software can be described as application software which aids in collecting, organizing, storing, annotating and sharing bibliographic citations adhering to a particular referencing style. Amrutha, Kumar, and Kabir (2018) noted that these specialized software packages allow researchers to manage a concise list of references which are available in numberless formats and efficiently disseminate the research findings with very little referencing flaws. Reference management software goes a long way in making work of researchers extremely easy as regards organization of references for researchers. Moreover, it would help through their process of academic writings as adherence to a uniform referencing style is given utmost consideration in peer-review (Sarrafzadeh & Hazeri, 2014). Reference management software is essential for every researcher as it helps in research writing and provides mechanisms into scientific production environment (Tramullas, Sanchez-Casabon, & Garrido-Picazo, 2015). Pathak and Johnson (2018) found that there is low awareness and use of RMS among community college students regardless of age, gender, race, field of study, undergraduate class level, English proficiency, academic level and ethnicity.

Bugyei, Kavi and Obeng-Korateng (2019) examined the levels of awareness and usage of reference management software among researchers of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Ghana. Results show that overwhelming majority of scientists were aware and know about RMS. However, it was shown that the adoption and usage of the tools was low. It was found that Mendeley was the most popularly used software among researchers. Results show that most of the respondents got to know about RMS through training workshops or seminars, majority of them noted that it was very easy to use and that the main purpose of using these tools was for research work and literature review. The challenges associated with the use of these tools were slow internet connection, lack of training, and technical support. The major benefits of using these tools are automatic generation of reference list, electronic creation of bibliographies and changing of referencing style by a click of a button.

Osmani, Mza, Ahmad and Arif (2016) found that RMS is considerably used by scientists, even though on a low level. Lorenzetti and Ghalli (2013) found that most of the respondents use RMS to prepare for review. Results also show that EndNote, Reference Manager and RefWorks were the most used reference management software. Melles and Unsworth (2015) found that most of the respondents do not use RMS always. It was also

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

shown that only the core features of RMS are used by postgraduate students and academics in humanities and social sciences. Francese (2011) carried out an online survey at Tallinn University (TLU), Estonia, with the aim of measuring the usage of RMS in an academic environment. Results show that only 25% of the respondents declare to know anything about RMS tools. Results also show that the effective non-usage is high with 44% of the respondents noting that they do not use RMS tools at all. It was concluded that the impact of library's communication is limited, although the library is generally acknowledged in promoting and providing assistance.

Sarrafzadeh and Hazeri (2014) investigated the familiarity and use of reference management software (RMS) by library and information science (LIS) faculties in Iran. Results show that over half of the respondents had a good familiarity with the various citation software packages and knew how to use them; 35% of the respondents have learned how to use these packages through formal education. "EndNote" is the most popular software among respondents. Respondents confirmed the need to offer some educational programs on how to use these software packages to bachelor students, and nominated the "Academic Writing" course as the proper place for teaching the topic. It was concluded that teaching students how to carry out referencing and how to use RMS packages will aid the promotion of scientific product.

Amrutha, Kumar and Kabir (2018) examined the use of reference management software (RMS) among research scholars in University of Kerala. It was found that majority of the respondents used Mendeley for their research work. Also, it was revealed that about half of the respondents chose to use reference management software that is free of cost; and that saving of references was ranked top of the important feature of reference management software and last preference was given to importing references from bibliographic databases. It was concluded that departments and university libraries should take a lead role in spreading knowledge about reference management software. Klock, Nakazoni, Gasparini and Hounsell (2016) assessed usability evaluation of reference management software. The focus in the study includes EndNote, Mendeley and Zotero. It was revealed that EndNote users had the highest completion rate of task required and Mendely users had the highest rate of satisfaction.

Ram and Anbu (2014) studied the use of bibliographic management software by Indian library and information science (LIS) professionals. The findings show that there is need to improve the LIS professionals' awareness of bibliographic management software at the institutional level and also hands-on experience is needed to help in the process of research writing and advocate for adopting correct referencing style while writing scholarly articles. Hristova (2012) found that while undergraduates and faculty conform to general assumptions, graduate students emerge as a group more similar to faculty. Graduate students' use of RefWorks is characterized by steady logins and large amount of references; thus, suggesting that personalized instruction might benefit graduate students more than scheduled workshops. The results from literature search shows that there have been different studies carried out on the awareness and use of reference management software (RMS). However, there is none that have addressed awareness and use of reference management software in Nigeria. It is on this gap in literature that it became imperative to examine awareness and usage of RMS among faculty members of the University of Ilorin.

In research, the importance of proper referencing cannot be overemphasized. It ensures the organization of the bibliographic details of the research works cited in a research. The core values of the University of Ilorin revolve learning, research and community development. Understanding the importance of research in the duties of faculty members of the university, it is believed that reference management becomes essential practice. Over the

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

years, there has been a shift from the traditional reference management approach to more sophisticated approach, which guarantees proper reference management with minimal errors. Francese (2013) reports that studies have shown that usage of RMS is low and inconsistent. Furthermore, taking a cursory look at available literature, it has been observed that there is gap on the awareness and usage of reference management software by faculty members of the University of Ilorin. Moreover, it has been observed that reference management seems to be unpopular amongst faculty members of the University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria. Also, Lorenzetti and Ghalli (2013) show that reference management software may affect the accuracy of reporting number of studies reviewed.

Francese (2013) found that EndNote was the most popular and most academic were aware of it. The least known were Citavi and Qiqqa and none of the respondents have made use of them. The findings of the study also revealed that most of the respondents use RMS because it was used or suggested by other colleagues. It was also shown that most of the respondents use RMS to insert citations into their research papers. Tramullas, Sanchez-Casabon, and Garrido-Picazo (2015) found that RMS helps to expedite the process of writing and publishing research results. With the known benefits of RMS, all the foregoing still left unanswered question on the extent of awareness and usage of reference management software by the faculty members of the University of Ilorin.

This research concern was the prime motivation for investigating the extent of aware and usage of reference management software by the faculty members of the University of Ilorin, as a case in point. The findings of this study answer the research questions: what are the types of reference management software used by faculty members of the University of Ilorin? what is the extent to which faculty members are aware of various reference management software? what is the frequency of usage of reference management software by the faculty members? what are the challenges associated with the usage of reference management software? and what are the probable solutions to the challenges associated with the usage of reference management software?

Based on the literature reviewed and the two variables present in this study, the following hypothesis was tested to determine the relationship that exists between awareness and usage of reference management software by faculty members:

H_{01}: There is no statistically significant relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of reference management software.

Method

Descriptive survey method was adopted as the study describes the opinions and data collected was used to describe respondents' opinions on reference management software. According to the Establishment Unit of the University of Ilorin (2018), the total number of faculty members in the University of Ilorin is 1496. Using Raosoft sample size calculator, at 95% confidence level, the sample size for this study is 306. Out of the sample size, total response of 98 was returned from the faculties, which represents 32% return rate. Fryrear (2015) noted that response rates from Web-based survey for internal studies are usually between 30-40%. Since response was collected from the respondents using Web survey method, the response rate was adjudged as valid. A web-based questionnaire was designed using Google Forms and generated link was shared to faculty members so as to participate in the survey. The link was shared to various faculty members of the University via WhatsApp and e-mails. The questionnaire link was shared and responses were collected for seven weeks so as to ensure possible increase in the response rate that may arise from the prolonged duration. The link was shared to private e-mails, personal WhatsApp contacts and WhatsApp groups of faculty members of the University of Ilorin. The responses collected were automatically analyzed

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

into descriptive statistics by the Google docs application. However, Pearson's product moment correlation was carried out using Microsoft Excel.

Results and Discussions

Based on the data taken from Google Form completed by the participants, the researchers analyzed them which answer the research questions. The following tables are the result of the research:

Table 1:
Demographic Information of the Respondents

Items	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age		
Less than 25 years	17	17.3
25-34 years	26	26.5
35-44 years	42	42.9
45-54 years	9	9.2
55 years and above	4	4.1
Total	**98**	**100.0**
Years of Experience		
Less than 5 years	28	28.6
6-10 years	34	34.7
11-15 years	17	17.3
16-20 years	13	13.3
21-25 years	5	5.1
26 years and above	1	1.0
Total	**98**	**100.0**
Highest Educational Qualification		
Bachelor degree	11	11.2
Master degree	56	57.1
Doctor of Philosophy	31	31.6
Total	**98**	**100.0**

Table 1 shows that the highest distribution (42.9%) of the respondents were between the ages 35-44 years. The Table also shows that lecturers that were 55 years and above had the least (4.1%) representation in the respondents. It can also be noted that most of the respondents were below 44 years of age (86.7%). This shows that most of the faculty members that participated in this study were still youthful. On the years of experience of the respondents, Table 1 shows that the highest distribution (34.7%) of the respondents have spent between 6-10 years lecturing in the University of Ilorin and only 1(1.0%) of the respondents have spent 26 years and above. This reflects that most (63.3%) of the respondents have less than ten years of experience in lecturing. On the highest educational background of the respondents, it can be seen in Table 1 that 11(11.2%) were Bachelor degree holders, 56(57.1%) were Master degree holder and 31(31.6%) were PhD degree holders. This illustrates that more than half of the respondents were Master degree holders and the least of the respondents were Bachelor degree holder.

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

Table 2:
Types of RMS used by faculty members of University of Ilorin

Items	Frequency	Percentage (%)
EndNote	95	96.9
Mendeley	83	84.7
Zotero	87	88.8
Citavi	5	5.1
JabRef	7	7.1
RefWorks	72	73.5
ProCites	18	18.4
Bookends	35	35.8
Papers	29	29.6
Qiqqa	0	0.0
Others	0	0.0

It can be seen in Table 2 that most (96.9%) of the faculty members in University of Ilorin make use of EndNote reference management software. Also, the Table shows some other reference management software that are used by majority of faculty members in University of Ilorin to include Mendeley (84.7%), Zotero (88.8%) and RefWorks (73.5%). Table 2 shows that only very small percentage of faculty members in University of Ilorin use Citavi (5.1%), JabRef (7.1%), ProCites (18.4%), Bookends (35.8%) and Papers (29.6%). It can also be observed in the Table that none of the respondents use Qiqqa or other types of reference management software.

Table 3:
Extent to which faculty members are aware of RMS

Items	Responses										Mean	SD
	Very great extent		Great extent		Moderate extent		Some extent		Not at all			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
EndNotes	27	27.5	53	54.1	18	18.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.10	1.17
Mendeley	61	62.2	22	22.5	10	10.2	5	6.1	0	0.0	4.41	1.32
Zotero	41	41.8	28	28.6	6	6.1	15	15.3	8	8.2	3.86	1.13
Citavi	25	25.5	28	28.6	27	27.6	6	6.1	12	12.2	3.54	1.00
JabRefs	9	9.2	14	14.3	38	38.8	19	19.3	18	18.4	2.75	0.78
RefWorks	10	10.2	29	29.6	11	11.2	35	35.7	13	13.3	2.92	0.83
ProCites	4	4.1	6	6.1	7	7.1	18	18.4	63	64.3	1.74	0.53
Bookends	0	0.0	5	5.1	20	20.4	18	18.4	55	56.1	1.75	0.54
Papers	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	23.5	14	14.3	61	62.2	1.61	0.37
Qiqqa	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	15.3	10	10.2	73	74.5	1.41	0.29
Others	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	12.2	17	17.4	69	70.4	1.42	0.29

It can be seen in Table 3 that most (81.6%) of the respondents were aware of EndNotes to a great extent and all of them were aware of the software as none of them were not aware at all. It was however shown that not many 27.5% of the respondents were aware of the software to a very great extent. The extent of awareness mean of EndNotes is 4.10. Also, it can be observed in the Table that highest distribution (84.7%) of the respondents were aware of Mendeley to a great extent and all of the respondents were aware of the software

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

as none of the respondents were not aware of the software at all. It was also shown that most (62.2%) of the respondents were aware of the Mendeley to a very great extent. The mean of awareness of Mendeley is 4.41. Moreover, Table 3 shows that the 70.4% of the respondents were aware of Zotero to a great and very great extent and only 41.8% of the respondents were aware of the software to a very great extent. Table 3 shows that 8.2% were not aware of Zotero reference management software (RMS) at all. The mean for the extent of awareness of Zotero is 3.86. This shows that RMS with the highest mean of awareness was Mendeley.

Table 3 shows that only 54.1% of the respondents were aware of Citavi to a great extent, 27.8% were aware to a moderate extent and 12.2% of them were not aware at all. This shows that though 87.8% of the respondents were aware of Citavi, there are some of the respondents that were not aware of it. The extent of awareness mean of Citavi is 3.54. It was also shown in the Table that 38.8% of the respondents were aware of JabRefs to a moderate extent, 19.3% were aware to some extent and 18.4% were not aware at all. Only 23.5% of the respondents were aware of JabRefs to a great extent. This shows that albeit faculty members of the University of Ilorin were aware of JabRefs, the distribution of the respondents shows that awareness was not to a great extent. The mean for the extent of awareness of JabRef is 2.75.

It can be seen in Table 3 that 35.7% of the respondents were aware of RefWorks to some extent, 29.6% were aware to a great extent and 13.3% were not aware at all. This shows that the awareness level was not significant. Table 3 shows that 64.3% of the respondents were not aware of ProCites at all and only 4.1% were aware to a very great extent. This depicts that most of the respondents were not aware of ProCites RMS at all. Also, it can be seen in the Table that 56.1% of the respondents were not aware of Bookends while none of them were aware of the software to a very great extent. Nevertheless, some 5.1% of the respondents were aware of the software to a great extent and 20.4% were aware to a moderate extent. Above all, it can be surmise that more than half of the respondents were not aware of Bookends RMS.

Table 3 illustrates that 62.2% of the respondents were not aware of Papers and none of the respondents were aware to the software to either great extent or very great extent. This shows that most of the respondents were not aware of Papers RMS. Also, it can be seen from the Table that 74.5% of the respondents were not aware of Qiqqa reference management software, none of them were aware of the software to a very great extent and none was aware to a great extent. The RMS with least mean is Qiqqa It is shown in Table 3 that 70.4% of the respondents were not aware of other types of RMS, 17.4% were aware to some extent, 12.2% were aware to a moderate extent and none were aware to great and very great extent.

Table 4:
Usage of RMS by faculty members of University of Ilorin

Items	Responses										Mean	SD
	Very frequently		Somewhat frequently		Occasionally		Rarely		Never			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
EndNotes	12	12.3	36	36.7	24	24.5	17	17.3	9	9.2	3.26	0.96
Mendeley	20	20.4	56	57.1	15	15.3	2	2.1	5	5.1	3.86	1.13
Zotero	27	27.5	32	32.6	18	18.4	12	12.3	9	9.2	3.57	1.04
Citavi	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	21.4	51	52.0	26	26.6	1.95	0.78
JabRefs	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	19.4	64	65.3	15	15.3	2.04	0.82
RefWorks	0	0.0	0	0.0	59	60.2	10	10.2	29	29.6	2.31	0.87
ProCites	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	13.3	17	17.3	68	69.4	1.44	0.54
Bookends	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	14.3	8	8.2	76	77.5	1.37	0.42
Papers	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	10.2	88	89.8	1.10	0.23
Qiqqa	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.1	7	7.1	89	90.8	1.11	0.24

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

It can be seen in Table 4 that 49.0% of the respondents made use of EndNotes frequently, 24.5% used the software occasionally and 9.2% of the respondents never used it. This denotes that most of the respondents used EndNotes but only about half of them use it frequently. The mean for the frequency of usage of EndNote is 3.26. Also, it can be seen in the Table that 77.5% of the respondents made use of Mendeley frequently while only 5.1% of them have never used the software. This shows that most of the respondents made use of Mendeley frequently. Mendeley has the highest mean of frequency of usage with 3.86. Moreover, Table 4 shows that 60.1% of the respondents made use of Zotero software frequently and 9.2% of them never made use of the software. This suggests that more than half (50.1%) of the respondents made use of Zotero software frequently. It was also show that the frequency of usage of Zotero is 3.57.

Table 4 shows that 52.0% of the respondents rarely use Citavi software and 26.6% of them have never used it. This shows that more than half of the respondents rarely use Citavi software. Besides, it is worthy of note that none of the respondents frequently use the software. It can be seen in the Table that 65.3% of the respondents rarely made use of JabRefs software and none of them frequently use the software. Moreover, the Table shows that 60.2% of the respondents occasionally use RefWorks software and none of them use the software frequently. Additionally, Table 4 shows that 69.4% of the respondents have never used ProCites software and none of them used it frequently. It can be seen in the Table that 77.5% of the respondents have never used Bookends and none of them used it frequently. Furthermore, Table 4 shows that 89.8% of the respondents have never used Papers software and none the respondents use it either frequently or occasionally. It can be noted that only 10.2% use Papers software rarely. Lastly, it can be observed in Table 4 that 90.8% of the respondents have never used Qiqqa software and none of the respondents have never used the software. All these depict that most of the respondents have never used RefWorks, ProCites, Papers and Qiqqa RMS.

Table 5:
Challenges associated with the usage of RMS

Items	Responses										Mean	SD
	Strongly Agreed		Agreed		Undecided		Disagreed		Strongly Disagreed			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Internet connection	61	62.2	19	19.4	12	12.3	2	2.0	4	4.1	4.34	1.27
Technical support	30	30.6	55	56.1	8	8.2	5	5.1	0	0.0	4.12	1.18
Learning to use	19	19.4	41	41.8	4	4.1	21	21.4	13	13.3	3.33	0.98
Understanding	11	11.2	15	15.3	39	39.8	14	14.3	19	19.4	2.85	0.80
Conformity	13	13.3	19	19.4	42	42.8	9	9.2	15	15.3	3.06	0.95

Table 5 shows that 81.6% of the respondents agreed that slow Internet connection is a challenge associated with the usage of RMS, 12.3% were undecided and 4.1% disagreed. This shows that an overwhelming percentage of the respondents agreed that slow Internet connection is a challenge associated with the usage of RMS. Further to that, 86.7% agreed that lack of technical support can be a challenge in the usage of RMS, 8.2% were undecided and 5.1% disagreed. This suggests that most of the respondents agreed that lack of technical support pose a challenge to faculty members in the usage of RMS. It can be seen in Table 5 that 61.2% of the respondents agreed that difficulty in learning to use RMS is a challenge

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

associated with the usage of RMS, 4.1% were undecided and 34.7% disagreed. This shows that most of the respondents perceived difficulty in learning to use RMS as a challenge that is associated with its usage.

Also, the Table shows that 26.5% of the respondents agreed that the usage of RMS reduces faculty members' understanding of referencing style, 39.8% were undecided and 33.7% disagreed. This depicts that the highest distribution of the respondents were either unsure or disagreed that the usage of RMS reduces faculty members' understanding of referencing style. This could mean that usage of RMS reduces the UNILORIN faculty members understanding of referencing style. Furthermore, it can be seen in Table 5 that 32.7% of the respondents agreed that the RMS does not conform to a referencing style completely, 42.8% were undecided and 24.5% disagreed. This reflects that 67.3% of the respondents were either unsure or disagreed that RMS does not conform to a referencing style completely. This suggests that UNILORIN faculty members have the challenge of non-conformity of RMS to a referencing style completely. The challenge with the highest mean is Internet connection and technical support, which show that the two challenges are the most commonly faced by faculty members of the UNILORIN in the usage of reference management software. The least of the mean in all the challenges was that of reduction in the understanding of referencing style. This shows that the reference management software does not pose a threat on the understanding of faculty members in the mechanical understanding of referencing style.

Table 6:
Probable solutions to challenges associated with the usage of RMS

Items	Responses										Mean	SD
	Strongly Agreed		Agreed		Undecided		Disagreed		Strongly Disagreed			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Provision of internet	43	43.9	40	40.8	2	2.0	9	9.2	4	4.1	4.11	1.18
Provision of assistance	28	28.6	52	53.0	0	0.0	8	8.2	10	10.2	3.82	1.11
Ease of learning	32	32.7	51	52.0	4	4.1	11	11.2	0	0.0	4.06	1.14
Conformity	25	25.5	34	34.7	12	12.3	20	20.4	7	7.1	3.51	1.02

Table 6 shows that 84.7% of the respondents agreed that provision of fast Internet connectivity will solve the challenges associated with the usage of RMS, 2.0% were undecided and 13.3% disagreed. This suggests that a vast number of the respondents agreed that provision of fast Internet connectivity will solve the challenges associated with the usage of RMS. Also, it can be seen in the Table that 81.6% agreed that provision technical assistance will solve the challenges associated with the usage of RMS, none of the respondents were undecided while 18.4% disagreed. This shows that majority of the respondents agreed that provision of technical assistance is a solution to challenges associated with the usage of RMS. Table 6 illustrates that 84.7% agreed that ease of learning the usage of RMS is a probable solution to the challenges associated with the usage of RMS, 4.1% were undecided and 11.2% disagreed. This reflects that significant fraction of the respondents agreed that ease of learning the usage of RMS is a solution to the challenges associated with the usage of RMS.

Table shows that 60.2% agreed that the conformity of RMS to adhere completely with referencing style guide is a solution to challenges associated with the usage of RMS, 12.3% were undecided and 27.5% disagreed. This reflects that most of the respondents agreed that

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

the conformity of RMS to adhere completely with referencing style guide is a solution to challenges associated with the usage of RMS. Table 6 also shows that the possible solution with the highest mean was provision of Internet with 1.18, followed by ease of learning the reference management software with 1.14, followed by provision of technical assistance with 1.11, and conformity with reference style guide with 1.02. This indicates that the most probable solution to the usage of reference management software among faculty members of the University of Ilorin is the provision of Internet facility.

Table 7 shows that there is significant relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of reference management software, which reject the H_{01} proposed in this study.

Table 7
Relationship faculty members' perceived awareness and usage of RMS

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Df	R-value	P-value	Remark
Awareness of RMS	98	3.46	1.17	96	.791**	0.01	Sig...
Usage of RMS		2.75	0.96				

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 7 above shows that the r-value of 0.791 shows a positive significant relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of RMS. It was also shown in the Table that the p-value is 0.01, which suggests that the null hypothesis that states there is no significant relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of RMS will hereby be rejected. Hence, this means that there is positive significant relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of RMS. In other words, this illustrates that there is linear relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of reference management software.

The findings of the study show that the EndNote is used by majority of faculty members of University of Ilorin (UNILORIN). This is contrary to the findings of Bugyei, Kavi and Obeng-Korateng (2019) that Mendeley was the most popularly used software among researchers in Ghana. Moreover, Klock, Nakazoni, Gasparini and Hounsell (2016) found that EndNote users had the highest completion rate of task required. This may be a pointer to the common usage of EndNote among the faculty members. The findings of this study however corroborate that of Sarrafzadeh and Hazeri (2014), which show that EndNote is the most popularly used software among academics. After EndNote, the other types of RMS used by faculty members of UNILORIN include Zotero, Mendeley and RefWorks respectively in descending order. These reference management software are heavily used by faculty members of UNILORIN. Results show that RMS applications like Bookends, Papers, Procites, JabRef and Citavi did not enjoy high use among faculty members of UNILORIN, with less than average usage. Lastly, it was found that none of the faculty members of University of Ilorin made use of Qiqqa.

Results of this study show that most of the faculty members of UNILORIN were aware of EndNotes to a great extent and the entire faculty members were aware of the software. Similarly, the findings of this study also show that overwhelming number of the UNILORIN faculty members were aware of Mendeley to a great extent and all of them were of the software application. This reflects that faculty members of UNILORIN were more aware of Mendeley than EndNotes, as there were more faculty members who were aware of Mendeley compared to EndNotes. This is consistent with the findings of Bugyei, Kavi and Obeng-Korateng (2019) that Mendeley is the most popular RMS among researchers. The popularity of the software may be the reason why significant number of the faculty

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

members was aware of the software. The level of awareness of these two software systems may be as a result of the popularity they have enjoyed in usage among faculty members as it was revealed in the study. The findings also show that less than half of the respondents were aware of Zotero, Citavi, JabRefs, RefWorks, ProCites, Bookends, Papers, Qiqqa and other types of RMS. It was also shown that Qiqqa has the least of awareness among faculty members of UNILORIN. This corresponds with the findings of Pathak and Johnson (2018); and Francese (2011) that RMS awareness is low.

The results of this study suggest that more than half of the faculty members of UNILORIN make use of EndNotes frequently. Also, it was found that most of the faculty members use Mendeley frequently. The findings also show that faculty members use Zotero software very frequently or somewhat frequently. The findings of this study more than half of the faculty members of UNILORIN rarely use Citavi software. It was also found that none of the faculty members frequently use Citavi software. Furthermore, results show that most of the faculty members rarely use JabRefs and RefWorks software and none of them frequently use the two softwares. It was found that most of the faculty members in UNILORIN have never used ProCites, Bookends, Papers and Qiqqa. This corroborates the findings of Pathak and Johnson (2018) that there is low usage of RMS. Francese (2011) also found that the effective non-usage of RMS is high.

On the challenges associated with the usage of RMS by faculty members, this study found that some of the challenges associated with the usage of RMS include slow Internet connection and lack of technical assistance. This supports the findings of Bugyei, Kavi and Obeng-Korateng (2019) that the challenges associated with the use of these RMS tools were slow Internet connection, lack of training, and technical support. This study also found that difficulty in learning the usage of RMS, reduced understanding of faculty members with referencing style and non-conformity of RMS with the guidelines of referencing style completely. Above all, the findings of the study revealed that Internet is the most threatening challenge to faculty members of the University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria. This is followed by technical support required in the usage of the software.

The findings of this study show that some of the probable solutions to the challenges associated with the usage of RMS are provision of fast Internet connectivity. This is important because if the Internet Service Provider (ISP) offers poor services the RMS users may become frustrated with the usage. It was also found that provision of technical assistance will solve challenges associated with the usage of RMS. This will involve developer of the RMS answering queries of the users. It was also found that ease in learning the usage of RMS will help solve challenges associated with the usage of RMS. Moreover, it was revealed that conformity of RMS to referencing style guide completely is a probable solution to the challenges associated with the usage of RMS by faculty members. The study also found that there is significant relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of reference management software.

Conclusion

This study established that both EndNotes and Mendeley reference management software are the most popular and most used among faculty members. This may be the reason why UNILORIN faculty members have great awareness of both Mendeley and EndNotes. Above all, the study concludes that there is positive significant relationship between faculty members' awareness and usage of reference management software. The findings also add to the body of knowledge that faculty members perceived reference management software not to conform completely to their desired referencing style. The limitation of the study is the small sample size and the focus on only the UNILORIN faculty members as the

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

study population. Subsequent studies can look to carry out similar study with larger sample size and possibly spread the focus to faculty members in universities in Kwara State of Nigeria or the whole of the North Central, Nigeria. Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made: university management should collaborate with developers of reference management software so that faculty members will leverage on benefits such as cost of subscription and user training; university management should come up with strategies to increase the awareness and usage of RMS among faculty members; university library should also take the responsibility to train or guide faculty members on the effective usage of reference management software; and faculty members that have not been using RMS should endeavor to download and make use of preferred RMS based on choice features.

References

Amrutha, R. V., Kumar, K. S., & Kabir, S. H. (2018). Use of reference management software among science research scholars in University of Kerala. *Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services*, 8(1), 54-57.

Bugyei, K. A., Kavi, R. K., & Obeng-Korateng, G. (2019). Assessing the awareness and usage of Reference Management Software (RMS) among researchers of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Ghana. *Journal of Information and Knowledge Management,* 1950031.

Childress, D. (2011). Citation tools in academic libraries best practices for reference and instruction. *Reference and Users Service Quality*, 51(2), 143-152.

Establishment Unit, University of Ilorin. Records of Academic and Non-academic Staff of the University (accessed August 28, 2019).

Francese, E. (2011). The usage of reference management software (RMS) in an academic environment: a survey at Tallinn University. Presented in 1st International Conference on Integrated Information, Kos (Greece), 29 September - 04 October 2011.

Francese, E. (2013). Usage of reference management software at the University of Toronto. *Italian Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 4(2), 145-174. DOI: 10.4403/jlis.it-8679

Fryrear, A. (2019). "What is a good survey response rate?" Survey Gizmo. https://www.surveygizmo.com/resources/blog/survey-response-rates/ (accessed on October 12, 2019)

Gilmour, R., & Cobus-Kuo, L. (2011). Reference management software: a comparative analysis of four products. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship, 66*, 63-75. Retrieved from www.istl.org/11-summer/refereed2.html

Hristova, M. (2012). RefWorks usage patterns: exploring the first four semesters of use by faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 17(2), 45-64.

Klock, A. C. T., Nakazoni, I. A. H. C., Gasparini, I., & Hounsell, M. S. (2016). Usability evaluation of reference management software. Paper presented at the XII Brazilian Symposium on Information Systems in the Cloud Computing Era – Volume 1, May 2016, Pages 494-501.

Lindemann, N. (2019). What is the average survey response rate? [2019 benchmark]. Retrieved from https://surveyanyplace.com/average-survey-response-rate/

Lorenzetti, D. L., & Ghalli, W. A. (2013). Reference management software for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: An exploration of usage and usability. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 13(1), 1-5.

Melles, A., & Unsworth, K. (2015). Examining the reference management practices of humanities and social science postgraduate students and academics. *Australian*

Academic & Research Libraries, *46*(4), 250-276. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00048623.2015.1104790

Osmani, M., Mza, R., Ahmad, B. A., & Arif, A. S. (2016). Reference management software (RMS) in an academic environment: a survey at a research university in Malaysia. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology, 88*(1), 135-144.

Pathak, A., & Johnson, S. (2018). Use and awareness of reference management software among community college students. *Journal of New Librarianship*, 3(2018), 229-256.

Ram, S., & Anbu, P. K. J. (2014). The use of bibliographic management software by Indian library and information science professionals. *Reference Services Review*, 42(3), 499-513.

Sarrafzadeh, M., & Hazeri, A. (2014). The familiarity and use of reference management software by LIS faculties in Iran. *New Library World, 115*(11/12), 558-570

Tramullas, J., Sanchez-Casabon, A. I., & Garrido-Picazo, P. (2015). Studies and analysis of reference management software: A literature review. *El Profesional de la Informacion, 24*(5), 680-688.

DOI : https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v4i2.14003

INSANIYAT
Journal of Islam and Humanities

Author Guidelines

It is a scholarly journal published by the Faculty of Adab and Humanities, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, Indonesia. It is a medium for scholarly discussion, description, and surveys concerning Islamic studies, literature, linguistics, culture, religion, art, archaeology, history, philosophy, library and information studies, and interdisciplinary studies. The journal is published twice a year (May and November).

Guidelines:

1. It has not been published elsewhere.
2. The paper is research findings, conceptual idea, science development on a certain field, and theory application study.
3. The Manuscript typed with Microsoft Word, Font Times New Roman size 12, spacing 1 on A4 size paper with a margin of 3.5 cm from the left edge, 3 cm from the right edge, 3 cm from the top and bottom edges. The length of 15-20 manuscript pages including a list of references. Writer (s) must follow the journal template that can be downloaded at Insaniyat Open Journal System http://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/insaniyat
4. The article should be written in Arabic or English.
5. Article contains title; writer's name, author affiliation (department, faculty, university / or institution), and Author's corresponding email.
6. Abstract is written in italic English or Arabic with a maximum of 250 words. It should briefly describe the purpose of the study, method(s), results and discussion, conclusion and significance of the study. The abstract is clearly described the core of the study. The author should provide keywords consist of 3 to 5 important words or phrase chosen to reflect the concept of the article and to help access to searches on the Internet
7. The article consists of **Introduction, Method, Result and discussion, Conclusion**, and **References.**

   Introduction
   This part pervades the background of the study and provides the significance of the study. A brief description of the theory used in this research should be explained in this section. It is containing the previous research to show the gap analysis and the author's position in this study. It must also give state of the art and it must point out the research questions. In this part, the author(s) should use references (quotations) to support the argumentation. For instance: Rosida (2015). It should use APA style sixth edition and are expected to use reference manager such as Mendeley, Zotero, and those kinds of thing.

   Method
   In this section, the author(s) has to mention the method and the approach used in this study. It should explain the details of research procedures; design of the study; data collection; and data analysis.
   Results and Discussions
   This section shows the results of the study and deep analysis or discussion which answer the research questions. In addition, the author (s) must discuss the findings by strengthening the

reason with supporting details taken from any references such as scientific journal, book, and the other reliable sources.

Conclusion
It contains the concluding paragraph and provides the implication, limitation, and suggestion for further study.

Reference
The References must consist of all sources cited in the article. All the sources should be under 10 years from its publication unless historical study. Sixty percent (60%) of the references should be taken from journal. Citation and reference must follow APA style (American Psychological Association) sixth edition and using reference manager software (Mendeley or Zotero).

8. Tables and figures in the article are numbered consecutively using Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3, so on) andwritten with caption and source of the figure and table. The table captions are written above the table,while the figure captions below the figure.
9. The manuscript must free from plagiarism. Self-Check must be done before the submission. It should be under 20% of unique.
10. Manuscript is submitted online on our open Journal System at http://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/insaniyat. Click register, then follow five steps of a new submission. Please do not hesitate to contact muh.azwar@uinjkt.ac.id for assistance.
11. Article which does not comply with the journal writing guidelines will be returned to the writer(s) for reformatting. Writer(s) may revise and resend the article after the article is upgraded in the accepted format.
12. The article will be single or double blind peer-reviewed.
13. Writer (s) whose article either needs to be revised or is rejected will be informed by email.
14. There is no publication fee.
15. Online publication is available at http://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/insaniyat
16. Arabic Romanization should be written as follow:Letters: ʾ, b, t, th, j, h, kh, d, dh, r, z, s, sh, s,d, t,z, ʿ, gh, f, q, l, m, n, h, w, y. Short vowels: a, i, u. long vowels: ā, ī, ū. Diphthongs: aw, ay. Tā marbūtā: t. Article: al-. For detail information on Arabic Romanization, please refer the transliteration system of the Library of Congress (LC) Guidelines.

Thank you for choosing Insaniyat:Journal of Islam and Humanities as a venue of your work.

e-ISSN : 2541-500X
p-ISSN : 2614-6010

إنسانيات

مجلّة جامعية إسلامية إنسانية

Vol 4, Number 2, May 2020

إصدار كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية
جامعة شريف هداية الله الإسلامية الحكومية، جاكرتا-إندونيسيا
Website : http://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/insaniyat | **Email :** journal.insaniyat@uinjkt.ac.id

العددالرابع الرقم ٢ الصفحات من ٧٥-١٥٣ مايو ٢٠٢٠ e-ISSN : 2541-500X