DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, Vol. 44, No. 5, September 2024, pp.289-297, DOI : 10.14429/djlit.44.05.19669

Examining User Opinions, Satisfaction Levels, and Challenges Towards Institutional Repository: An Empirical Study

Unzila Hurum*, K.L. Mahawarand and Somipam R. Shimray

Department of Library and Information Science, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow - 226 025, India
**E-mail: unzilahurum1997@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This study investigates user opinion, satisfaction level, and challenges towards institutional repositories. The researchers adopted survey method, questionnaire tools, and simple random sampling techniques and collected 548 respondents from the autonomous institutions of the Department of Science and Technology. The mean analysis on opinion towards the benefits of an institutional repository reveals that "It promotes self-archiving 24*7" has the highest mean score, while concerning the satisfaction level of users "I am satisfied with membership facility" has the highest mean score, and vis-à-vis overall problems "Electricity problem" has the highest mean score. The result indicates that age has a significant difference with library facility (p=.001), retrieval (p=.000), searching and browsing facility (p=.001), usability (p=.012), and copyright issue (p=.002). Concerning respondent's designation, there is a significant difference in the library facility (p=0.027), retrieval (p=0.001), usability (p=0.005), awareness problem (p=0.005), and copyright issues (p=0.001). This study bridged the existing literature gap by determining various factors affecting users' opinions, satisfaction levels, and overall problems. Further, examine the significant difference between demographic variable and study variables.

Keywords: Users opinion; Usability; Satisfaction; Challenges; Retrieval; Copyright issue; Institutional repository

1. INTRODUCTION

Repositories are created by humans to organise records for storage, preservation, and long-term use. An institutional repository (IR) is a long-lasting, permanent, digital archive sponsored by institutions and driven by the community[1]. The necessity for university institutional repositories can be attributed to several factors, including the rising expense of libraries, the growth of peer-reviewed publications, and the influence of ICTs[2]. Materials are now digitised and preserved in repository databases.Use of IR for the preservation of information resources has significantly reduced the problem of management and preservation in terms of cost[3]. Several software can be used for operating repository collections. However, D-space[4] and E-prints[5] are the prominent software widely used by libraries. Knowledge availability is essential for several dimensions of human growth[6]. Pre-print servers, introduced in the 1990s, aimed to make scholarly journal articles more accessible to the public by allowing authors to upload unpublished works, enabling easy access to research findings without subscription fees and evolving from less formal publishing methods[7]. Institutional repositories are crucial in creating a digital collection of scholarly works. They enhance academic models, aid in resource expansion, and facilitate open archive initiatives, promoting university resource sharing[8]. Several studies have worked on the opportunities of IR for higher educational institutions,[9] the implementations of IR in college libraries,[10] impacts of institutional repositories,[1] and knowledge sharing.[12] All the aforesaid referred studies fail to examine users' opinions, satisfaction levels, and challenges faced in using the institutional repositories. Thus, the need was felt to investigate users' opinions, satisfaction, and challenges faced while using institutional repositories in the autonomous institutions of the Department of Science and Technology in India.

Received : 29 November 2023, Revised : 07 April 2024
Accepted : 26 April 2024, Online published : 24 September 2024

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The following objectives guided the research:

RO1. To examine user opinions toward the institutional repository.

RO2. To inspect the satisfaction levels of users to the institutional repository.

RO3. To identify the challenges while using the institutional repository.

3. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

H_1 There is a significant difference between gender with users' opinion, satisfaction levels, and challenges

H_2 There is a significant difference between age with users' opinion, satisfaction levels, and challenges

H_3 There is a significant difference between designation with users' opinion, satisfaction levels, and challenges

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

Universities and research organisations worldwide are increasingly focusing on digital document production and usage, including text, graphics, photographs, archival material, websites, blogs, video, audio, and broadcasts. Institutions are exploring methods to capture and reuse intellectual output from teaching and research, as traditional libraries are being replaced by the Internet. An institutional repository is a method that preserves and exploits the collective intellectual output of an institution in a form that can be preserved and accessed[13] . Thus, an institutional repository is a collection of digital assets, including academic journals, publications, and course notes, that are made freely available to various organisations, faculty, and students. It is a digital repository for intellectual works produced by academics, researchers, and students., accessible to end users, defined by institution, scholar, cumulative, perpetual, open, and interoperable,[14] essentially an organisational dedication to digital item maintenance[15]. There are four essential elements in IR i.e., content generated by the community in an institution, scholarly content, cumulative and perpetual, and interoperable and open access[13]. Thus, institution repositories offer a platform for disseminating research outcomes,[16] the adoption of IR increases the university's reputation and value[17]. The institutional repository engagement framework links an academic library's IR program to the strategic goals of the department and parent institution[18]. Therefore, there is a symbiotic relationship between IRs and research activities[19].

Previous studies identified a significant positive relationship between awareness and use of the repository[16,20-21]. This indicates that the use of IR is based on users' awareness level. Consequently, a higher level of user awareness results in increased access to IR[17]. Students used IR to deposit, retrieve, and carry out both tasks[22]. On the other hand, 71 % of respondents had never used IR except for depositing their intellectual works[23]. Moreover, IR boosts scholars' access to information and will make it easier to find, identify, and select research materials. This will also enhance their productivity and improve learning outcomes[24]. Specific problems are associated with IR, such as accessing,[25] awareness problems, plagiarism issues,[26] copyright issues,[7] unwillingness to deposit, long-term commitment to the contributors, etc[27]. Further there is also a significant difference between gender-wise responses and the purpose of using digital library[28]. Thus, institutional repositories are crucial for preserving scientific production and enhancing the rankings and impact of institutions and researchers, as measured by article citations, journal quality, and readership[29]. Institutional repositories help to increase the visibility and prestige of an institution and provide centralised, storage and long-term curation. Despite this, the awareness and use rate of users are very low. To tackle these kinds of problems, many countries are taking initiatives. Harvard University's DASH Project (Digital Access to Scholarship at Harvard), University of Southampton, England, established an EdShare repository, using e-Prints software, which makes it visible and popula[30].

4.1 Users' Opinion Towards IR

Scholarly works are stored, accessed, and retrieved from institutional repositories worldwide, which function as digital archives. An IR is recognised as a crucial library service that patrons utilise. Effective use of IR has many advantages, including increasing the author's visibility, which increases the citation rate, and serving as a marketing tool for both the authors and the institutions[31]. Therefore, Anistyasari, Kurniawan, Tri Rahayu, and Ruhana[32] propose the technology acceptance model as a suitable conceptual model for the intention to use IR. This model consists of three dimensions: perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEU), and intention to use (IU). These factors positively influence users' intentions to use IR.

4.2 Satisfaction

User satisfaction refers to the level of comfort or contentment a user experiences with a product or service. Rifai and Hasan[33] found that user expectations influence the majority (57.6 %) of the utilisation of IRs. The inefficient use of IR may be due to a lack of IT expertise and low internet bandwidth[22]. Many institutions are providing IRs on Local Area Network (LAN). Swarnalatha and Chandraiah[28] found that the respondents are satisfied with the LAN facility provided by the university library. A quality criterion called usability evaluates how user-friendly user interfaces are. Usability also encompasses techniques to enhance usability while designing a system. Usability can be described by certain criteria such as how simple it is for people to utilise the design to do fundamental activities when they first come across it, how quickly users can complete activities after learning the design, how simple it is for users to regain competence with the design when they come back to it after a break, how familiar are users' errors, what kind of faults are they, and readily they can be fixed? and to what extent is using the design enjoyable?[34]

4.3 Problem

A problem or circumstance seen as undesirable or detrimental must be resolved. Poor ICT skills, epileptic power supply, unwillingness to deposit,[35] copyright infringement issues and awareness problems about the publishers' policy as regards submitting published works in IR,[36] user's lack of awareness of IR, and absence of the importance of open access are the reasons behind a refusal to use and deposit scholarly work,[37] To overcome such issues, an institution must create awareness among the stakeholders through conferences, workshops, symposiums, library websites, orientation programs, etc. The literature review found clear inferences on user opinions, satisfaction levels, and challenges faced in using the institutional repositories. Thus, the study is conducted on these inferences and gaps, particularly in the autonomous institutions of the Department of Science and Technology in India.

5. METHODOLOGY

A study questionnaire consists of two parts, namely demographic details and study variables. The study variables were adopted from published literature, having 29 items and the factors consisted of users' opinions, satisfaction, and problems with the institutional repository. The institutional repositories of fifteen institutions under the Department of Science and Technology, India were considered for this study. The study total population consist of 5,281 registered users. Email IDs for all the participants were collected from the institution's websites. The researchers adopted survey, questionnaire tools, and simple random sampling techniques[38] and collected 548 respondents with a 10.38 % response rate. A pilot study was conducted to examine the validity of the questionnaire. After data screening, 420 were found eligible for further analysis. The instrument reliability was found to show internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha value greater than >0.70,[39] thus fulfilling the required alpha value. For data analysis, MS Excel and SPSS version 20 was used.

6. RESULT

6.1 Respondents Demographic Details

Table 1 shows the respondents' demographic details, in which 55.95 % of respondents were male and 44.05 % were female. More than one-third (40.24 %) belongs to the 26-30 years' age group, 36.67 % belongs to the 31-35 years' age group, 12.86 % belongs to the below 25 years' age group, 5.24 % belongs to the 36-40 years' age group and 5 % belongs to above 40 years age group. Most respondents (70.48 %) were researchers, followed by scientists (12.62 %). Researchers made an outmost attempt to collect equal sample of male and female respondents therefore there is a proportionate number of male and female respondents. Most of the participants are researchers, thus more than one third of the respondents belong to 26-30 years' age group.

Table 1. Respondents demographic details

Variable	Classification	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	235	55.95 %
	Female	185	44.05 %
Age (in years)	Below 25	54	12.86 %
	26-30	169	40.24 %
	31-35	154	36.67 %
	36-40	22	5.24 %
	above 40	21	5 %
Designation	Bachelor	8	1.91 %
	Master	34	8.10 %
	Researcher	296	70.48 %
	Scientist	53	12.62 %
	Faculty	21	5 %
	Any other (diploma)	8	1.91 %

6.2 Users Opinion Towards Benefits of Institutional Repository

Users' opinions consist of 9 items (Table 2). The item "It promotes self-archiving 24*7" was found to have the highest mean (ms=2.35) and rank first, followed by "It helps to increase citations and impact factor of authors" (ms=2.27) rank second, "Its file formats are compatible with users' devices" rank third, "Preservation and retrieval of information of rare and fragile material" rank fourth and "It is important platform to provide global visibility of an institution's intellectual" has the least mean score (ms=1.18). Self-archiving is the act of the author placing a free copy of an electronic document online for easy access, resulting into increase in visibility, readership, download and citation. For this reason "It promotes self-archiving 24*7" and "It helps to increase citations and impact factor of authors" has the highest mean score.

Table 2. Users opinion towards benefits of institutional repository

Users opinion	Mean	Rank
It promotes self-archiving 24*7	2.35	1
It helps to increase citations and impact factor of authors	2.27	2
Its file formats are compatible with users' devices	2.25	3
Preservation and retrieval of information of rare and fragile material	2.20	4
Contents are available at free of cost to its members	2.15	5
It enhances the skill/ability of online access	2.10	6
It is important library services provided by institutions	1.99	7
It provides easy and quick access to content	1.92	8
It is important platform to provide global visibility of institution's intellectual	1.81	9

6.3 Satisfaction Level of Users with Institutional Repository

Table 3 shows the satisfaction level of the users, which consists of 8 items. The item "I am satisfied with membership facility" variable got the highest mean score (ms=2.51) and rank first, followed by "I am satisfied with guidelines for content access" and "I am satisfied with guidelines for submission" rank second (ms=2.50), "I am satisfied with file format of documents" rank third, "I am satisfied with user's interface" rank fourth while "I am satisfied with the content provided in the repository" was rank least with a mean score of 2.11. Separate membership fee is not levied to library users, by default members of a library can avail institution repositories.

6.4 Overall Problems While Using the Institutional Repository

Most IRs are available on the Internet and one or two are available on the Intranet but required

login ID and password. It indicates that only institutional members can use the IR. Table 4 depicts the problems users faced while using IR and consists of 9 items. The item "Electricity problem" was the most critical problem and ranked first (ms=3.58) followed by "Language problem" rank second (ms=3.49), "Lack of devices" rank third (ms=3.19), "Restriction in submission and access" rank fourth (ms=3.16)and "lack of awareness" has the lowest mean score (ms=2.44). Although an institution repository solution gives more flexibility and control, it requires more resources for upkeep and physical protection. The primary sustainability issues for institutional repositories are electricity issue, language problem, lack of devices, inadequate IT proficiency among users and untrained staff with IT skills and unstable Internet speed among other issues.

6.5 Factor Analysis

The study aims to identify the factors influencing user opinion, satisfaction, and overall issues encountered while using IR. Therefore, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with principal component factor investigation with a Varimax rotation was employed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was utilised to assess sample adequacy and the study fulfilled an acceptable KMO i.e., 0.5.[40-41] In users' opinion, EFA was performed, factors with eigenvalues larger than one were preferred and yielded two factors named "library facility" and "retrieval", For users' opinions, the KMO value is 0.920, which is higher than the recommended value (0.5) and the *p*-value is less than 0.05, that shows the relationship between the variables. From Table 4, "Library facility" is the most prevalent user opinion towards institutional repositories, with an eigenvalue of 6.174, a variance value of 68.599, and a reliability value of 0.939 (Table 5).

EFA for satisfaction yields two factors named "searching and browsing facility" and "usability". The KMO value for satisfaction is 0.899, which is higher than the recommended value (0.5) and the *p*-value (p=0.000) is less than 0.05, indicating that the variables are related. The searching and browsing facility are the most prevalent factor, with an eigenvalue of 6.181, variance value of 77.264, and reliability value of 0.950 (Table 6)

For problems faced while using IR, EFA yields two factors namely "awareness problem", and "copyright issue". The KMO value for the problem faced while using

Table 3. Satisfaction level of users with institutional repository

Satisfaction level	Mean	Rank
I am satisfied with membership facility	2.51	1
I am satisfied with guidelines for content access	2.50	2
I am satisfied with guidelines for submission	2.50	2
I am satisfied with file format of documents	2.48	3
I am satisfied with user's interface	2.38	4
I am satisfied with searching and browsing facility	2.36	5
I am satisfied with internet connectivity	2.29	6
I am satisfied with content provided in repository	2.11	7

Table 4. Overall problems while using institutional repository

Problems	Mean	Rank
Electricity problem	3.58	1
Language problem	3.49	2
Lack of devices	3.19	3
Restriction in submission and access	3.16	4
Lack of IT skills	3.14	5
Internet speed	3.02	6
Lack of awareness about searching techniques	2.92	7
Copyright issue	2.72	8
Lack of Awareness	2.44	9

Table 5. Factor analysis of users' opinions

Factors	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance	Reliability
Library facility (LF)		6.174	68.599	.939
LF1	.887			
LF2	.881			
LF3	.847			
LF4	.833			
LF5	.670			
LF6	.620			
Retrieval (REV)		.710	76.484	.814
REV1	.863			
REV2	.750			
REV3	.578			

Table 6. Factor analysis of satisfaction levels

Factors	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance	Reliability
Searching and browsing facility (SBF)		6.181	77.264	.950
SBF1	.875			
SBF2	.853			
SBF3	.824			
SBF4	.718			
SBF5	.660			
Usability (USB)		.526	83.840	.890
USB1	.859			
USB2	.814			
USB3	.644			

Table 7. Factor analysis of problems faced

Factors	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance	Reliability
Awareness (AWR)				
AWR1	.870			
AWR2	.835	5.300	58.890	.901
AWR3	.829			
AWR4	.722			
AWR5	.607			
Copyright issue (CI)		1.035	11.497	.818
CI1	.907			
CI2	.756			
CI3	.660			
CI4	.579			

IR is 0.818, higher than the recommended value (0.5) and the *p*-value (p=0.000) is less than 0.05, indicating the variables are related. Awareness problem is the most prevalent factor users faced while using a repository with an eigenvalue of 5.300, variance value of 8.890, and reliability value of 0.901 (Table 7).

6.6 Research Hypothesis Testing

To determine the difference between gender and factors, a *t*-test was executed. The results (table 8) show that there is no significant difference in "library facility" (t=-1.515, p=0.131) among males (ms=11.8894, SD=5.03964) and females (ms=12.6865, SD=5.73027). In the same way, there is no significant difference in "retrieval" (t=-.865, p=.388) between males (ms=6.7149, SD=2.87332) and females (ms=6.9730, SD=3.23102), no significant difference in "searching and browsing facility" (t=-1.259, p=.209) between males (ms=11.7532, SD=4.78320) and females (ms=12.3514, SD=4.89907), no significant difference in "usability" (t=.-1.321, p=.187) between males (ms=6.9660, SD=2.63744) and females (ms=7.3243, SD=2.90665) and no significant difference in "awareness problem" (t=1.070, p=.285) among males (ms=15.2681, SD=5.44126) and females (ms=14.6973, SD=5.40584).also, no significant difference in "copyright issue" (t=1.696, p=.091) among males (ms=12.9447, SD=3.89843) and females (ms=12.2811, SD=4.08429). The results indicate that a significant difference did not exist between studied factors and genders. The study finding is in line with Safdar[22] findings, which also reported no significant difference between the genders and the statement regarding IR. Nevertheless, the results of the study counter to Jabbar, Rehman, and Hashmi,[42] where females are more aware of using IR than male respondents. Therefore, the respondents gender can inversely influence the use of IR.

The findings (Table 9) show that there is no significant difference in "awareness problem" (F=1.333, p=0.257), but a significant difference was found in "library facility" (F=4.925, p=0.001), "retrieval" (F=6.378, p=0.000), "searching and browsing facility" (F=4.479, p=0.001), "usability" (F=3.274, p=0.012), and "copyright issues" (F=4.469, p=0.002) within different age groups. Jabbar, Rehman, & Hashmi[42] also showed that there is a difference between the age group and the studied variable "need for guidance and training" in using IR. The findings indicate that utilising IR is significantly influenced by age.

The findings (Table 10) that show there is no significant difference in the "searching and browsing facility" (F=1.833, p=0.105), but a significant difference was found in the "library facility" (F=2.562, p=0.027), "retrieval" (F=4.077, p=0.001), "usability" (F=3.409, p=0.005), "awareness problem" (F=7.945, p=0.005), and "copyright issues" (F=4.455, p=0.001) with different designations. However, this finding is contrary to Safdar[22]findings, which found no significant difference between the variables and the various programs of the students. The results show that user designation plays an impactful role in using IR.

Table 8. Relationship between gender and users opinions, satisfaction levels and challenges

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	S D.	*t*	Sig
Library facility	Male	235	11.8894	5.03964	-1.515	.131
	Female	185	12.6865	5.73027		
Retrieval	Male	235	6.7149	2.87332	-.865	.388
	Female	185	6.9730	3.23102		
Searching and browsing facility	Male	235	11.7532	4.78320	-1.259	.209
	Female	185	12.3514	4.89907		
Usability	Male	235	6.9660	2.63744	-1.321	.187
	Female	185	7.3243	2.90665		
Awareness problem	Male	235	15.2681	5.44126	1.070	.285
	Female	185	14.6973	5.40584		
Copyright issue	Male	235	12.9447	3.89843	1.696	.091
	Female	185	12.2811	4.08429		

Table 9. Relationship between age and users opinions, satisfaction levels and challenges

Factors	Age	N	Mean	F-Value	Sig.
Library facility	Below 25	54	14.1667	4.925	.001
	26-30	169	12.1361		
	31-35	154	12.4545		
	36-40	22	9.8182		
	Above 40	21	9.0952		
Retrieval	Below 25	54	7.5556	6.378	.000
	26-30	169	6.7751		
	31-35	154	7.1558		
	36-40	22	4.1818		
	Above 40	21	5.7619		
Searching and browsing facility	Below 25	54	11.2593	4.479	.001
	26-30	169	12.4911		
	31-35	154	12.5000		
	36-40	22	9.3182		
	Above 40	21	9.4286		
Usability	Below 25	54	7.6296	3.274	.012
	26-30	169	7.3077		
	31-35	154	7.1169		
	36-40	22	5.5909		
	Above 40	21	6.0000		
Awareness problem	Below 25	54	14.6852	1.333	.257
	26-30	169	14.7929		
	31-35	154	14.9221		
	36-40	22	17.4091		
	Below 25	54	14.6852		
Copyright issue	Below 25	54	10.8333	4.469	.002
	26-30	169	12.4675		
	31-35	154	13.3377		
	36-40	22	12.8636		
	Above 40	21	13.5714		

7. DISCUSSION

The present study investigates the users' opinions, satisfaction levels, and the overall problems faced regarding institutional repositories. The vital reason for using IR is associated with "It promotes self-archiving 24*7" which has the highest mean score (ms=2.51). While, EFA on the user's opinion towards IR yields two factors, i.e., library facility and retrieval. The study findings support Abrizah's[43] findings. Considering the satisfactory level, "I am satisfied with membership facility" has the highest mean score (ms=2.51), and EFA on the satisfactory level generated two factors, i.e., searching and browsing facility and usability. Likewise, considering the problem faced in using IR, the "electricity problem" has the highest mean score (ms=3.58). Further, EFA on problems faced in using IR produces two factors, namely "awareness problems" and "copyright issues". To determine the difference between gender and factors, a *t*-test was executed. The results show that there is no significant difference in a library facility, retrieval, searching and browsing facilities, usability, awareness problems, and copyright issues with gender. Concerning respondents' age differences with the study factors, there is a significant difference with library facility (p=.001), retrieval (p=.000), searching and browsing facility (p=.001), usability (p=.012), and copyright issue (p=.002). Whereas, there is no difference

Table 10. Relationship between designation and users' opinions, satisfaction levels and challenges

Factors	Designation	N	Mean	F-Value	Sig.
Library facility	Bachelor	8	17.1250	2.562	.027
	Master	34	13.3824		
	Researcher	296	12.1047		
	Scientist	53	11.2642		
	Faculty	21	11.8095		
	Diploma	8	15.1250		
Retrieval	Bachelor	8	9.2500	4.077	.001
	Master	34	8.3529		
	Researcher	296	6.5743		
	Scientist	53	6.4717		
	Faculty	21	7.2381		
	Diploma	8	8.6250		
Searching and browsing facility	Bachelor	8	11.8750	1.833	.105
	Master	34	11.6765		
	Researcher	296	12.2973		
	Scientist	53	10.3019		
	Faculty	21	12.2857		
	Diploma	8	13.8750		
Usability	Bachelor	8	8.7500	3.409	.005
	Master	34	7.1176		
	Researcher	296	7.2635		
	Scientist	53	6.3774		
	Faculty	21	5.7143		
	Diploma	8	9.0000		
Awareness problem	Bachelor	8	16.2500	7.945	.000
	Master	34	17.3235		
	Researcher	296	14.2027		
	Scientist	53	17.3774		
	Faculty	21	13.7619		
	Diploma	8	21.7500		
Copyright issue	Bachelor	8	10.2500	4.455	.001
	Master	34	14.9118		
	Researcher	296	12.2365		
	Scientist	53	13.4906		
	Faculty	21	12.9048		
	Diploma	8	14.6250		

in awareness problem (p=.257). Therefore, to increase awareness about IR, library personnel should organise more awareness programs.[24] These programs can educate patrons and researchers about the benefits and functionalities of IRs, including how to access and contribute to them. By hosting workshops, webinars, and informational sessions, the library can engage users and demonstrate the value of IRs in preserving and disseminating scholarly work. Additionally, promoting IRs through various channels such as newsletters, social media, and library websites can further enhance visibility and encourage participation. The result of the respondent's designation shows that there is no significant difference in the searching and browsing facility (p=0.105), but a significant difference was found in the library facility (p=0.027), retrieval (p=0.001), usability (p=0.005), awareness problem (p=0.005), and copyright issues (p=0.001). The result of this study's findings doesn't support Safdar[22] findings. The results show that user designation plays an impactful role in using IR. So, creating a user-friendly repository will serve as a crucial bridge between information and its practical use, significantly enhancing the academic quality of the organisation under study[28]. A well-designed repository not only facilitates easy access to information but also encourages its effective utilisation. This, in turn, fosters continuous improvement and innovation within the academic community.

8. CONCLUSION

The mean analysis on opinions towards the benefits of an institutional repository reveals that an institution repository promotes self-archiving of researchers electronic document online for easy access, resulting into increase in visibility, readership, download and citation. Users are satisfied with membership facility, as users of libraries are not charged an additional membership fee, and members have default access to the institution's repositories. Of course institution repository offers greater control and flexibility, however maintaining it and providing physical security involve financial burden. The main sustainability concerns for institutional repositories include, continuous power supply, unstable Internet connectivity, adequate systems among other things.

The result indicates that age has a significant difference with library facility, retrieval, searching and browsing facility, usability, and copyright issue. Vis-à-vis respondent's designation, there is a significant difference in the library facility, retrieval, usability, awareness problem, and copyright issues. This study bridged the existing literature gap by determining various factors affecting users' opinions, satisfaction levels, and overall problems. It is suggested that training programs be provided according to their age groups to bring all the users to par. Further, institutions must promote IR facilities and their benefits. To fulfil the prime purpose of creating institution repositories, institution library can organise awareness program, moreover library association at national level such as Indian Library Association, Indian Association of Teachers of Library and Information Science and Indian Association of Special Libraries and Information Centres can organise training, workshop and webinar to create awareness among users. While INFLIBNET can organise training, workshops, and webinar to impart latest information technology tools to library professionals to provide effective services to users.

It is recommended that further study be conducted on perception and use of institution repositories, impact of institution repositories on academic performance and knowledge creation through institution repositories. Further, this study can be replicated to other institution.

REFERENCES

1. Gibbons, S. Defining an institutional repository. Library Technology Reports, 2004.
2. Lynch, C.A. Institutional repository: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *Libr. Acad.,* 2003, **3**(2), 327-336. doi: 10.1353/pla.2003.0039
3. Ukwoma, S.C. & Ngulube, P. Obstacles to the utilisation of institutional repositories by academics in higher education in Nigeria. *Webology,* 2019, **16**(1), 138-150.
4. Imoro, O. & Saurombe, N. Institutional repository infrastructure: A survey of Ghanaian public universities. *Collection and Curation*, 2023. doi: 10.1108/CC-11-2022-0038
5. Gurikar, R. & Hadagali, G.S. Use of open source software in Indian institutional digital repositories: A study. *Libr. Philos. Pract. (e-j.)*, 2021, **4738.**
6. Martin-Yeboah, E.; Filson, C.K. & Boohene, K. Towards institutional repository sustainability: Lecturers awareness, patronage, and content submission to the University of Cape Coast repository. *Libr. Philos. Pract. (e-journal),* 2020, **4284.**
7. Rogers, S.A. Developing an institutional knowledge bank at Ohio state university: From concept to action plan. *Libr. Acad.,* 2003, **3**(1), 125–136.
8. Omeluzor, S.U. Institutional Repository (IR) awareness and willingness of faculty staff to deposit research work: A study of faculty staff in selected public and private university in Nigeria. *Open Access Libr. J.,* 2014, **1**. doi: 10.4236/oalib.1101139
9. Khan, T.H. Institutional repository for higher educational institutions: A new. *Libr. Philos. Pract., 2023***7683**, 1-15.
10. Mahanta, P.K. A study on the implementation of institutional repository in the college libraries of Assam. *Libr. Philos. Pract.,* 2021, **5439**, 1-8.
11. Demetres, M.R.; Diana Delgado, A. & Wright, D.N. The impact of institutional repository: a systematic review. *J. Medical Libr. Assoc.,* 2020, **108**(2), 177-184.
12. Kodua-Ntim, K. Narrative review on open access institutional repository and knowledge sharing in South Africa. *J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.*, 2023, 1118-1123. doi: 10.1002/asi.24808

13. Rao, P.V. Institutional repositories: A key role for libraries. 2007.
14. Crow, R. The case for institutional repository*:* A sparc. washington: Scholarly publishing & academic resources coalition, 2002.
15. Elaturoti, A.B. & Jatto, O.V. Institutional repository awareness amongst library and information science students of Federal Polytechnic Offa, Kwara State, Nigeria. *Libr. Philos. Pract.,* 2021, 5990.
16. Fasae, J.K. & Adekoya, C.O. Awareness and perception of the academic staff of private universities towards the use of institutional repository in Nigeria. *Libr. Philos. Pract. (E-J.)*, 2021.
17. Anenene, E.; Alegbeleye, G. & Oyewole, O. Factors contributing to the adoption of institutional repository in Universities in South-West Nigeria: Perspectives of library staff. *Libr. Philos. Pract. (E-J.),* 2017.
18. Sabharwal, A. Institutional repository engagement framework: Harnessing resources, structure, and process for strategic plan support in higher education. *J. Electron. Resour. Libr.*, 2021, **33**(3), 137-155.
19. Mensah, C. & Chukwueke, C. The place of institutional repository in the research activities of academic staff of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. *Jewel J. Libr.,* 2021, **16**(1).
20. Bamigbola, A. & Adetimirin, A. Assessing determinants of perceived ease of use of institutional repository by lecturers in Nigerian universities. *Int. Inf. Libr. Rev.,* 2020, **52**(2), 95-107. doi: 10.1080/10572317.2019.1662261
21. Halder, S.N. & Chandra, S. Users' attitudes towards institutional repository in Jadavpur university: A critical study. *Int. J. Manage. Sustainability,* 2012, **1**(2), 45-52. doi: 10.18488/journal.11/2012.1.2/11.2.45.52.
22. Safdar, M. Students' perception about institutional repository and impact of electronic contents on their research: A Pakistani perspective. *Libr. Philos. Pract. (E-J.),* 2021.
23. Downing-Turner, M. & Sauer, J. Faculty awareness and use of an institutional repository at a Masters-Granting University. *J. Libr. Scholarly Commun.,* 2022, **10**(1).
24. Adaeze, N.N. Awareness and use of institutional repository for academic staff output in tertiary institutions. *Int. J. Libr. Inf. Sci. Studies*, 2020, **6**(1), 1-11.
25. Nunda, I.M. & Elia, E.F. Institutional repository adoption and use in selected Tanzanian higher learning institutions. *Int. J. Educ. Dev. using Inf. Commun. Technol. IJEDICT),* 2019, **15**(1), 150-164.
26. Bamigbola, A.A. Surveying attitude and use of institutional repository (IRs) by faculty in agriculture disciplines: A case study. *Procedia - Soc. Behavioral Sci.,* 2014, **147**, 505 – 509. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.145
27. Sankar, P. & Kavitha, E. Challenges in contributing in institutional repository system: A study. *Int. Refereed J. Rev. Res.,* 2017, **5**(6).
28. Swarnalatha, M. & Chandraiah, I. Planning and implementation of institutional repositories in university libraries- A study in Andhra Pradesh. *Int. J. Libr. Inf. Studies,* 2018, **8**(2), 454-461.
29. Ramírez-Montoya, M.S. & Ceballos, H.G. Institutional repositories. *In* Research Analytics. Auerbach Publications. 2017*,* 81-92.
30. Jain, P. New trends and future applications/directions of institutional repositories in academic institutions. *Libr. Rev.* 2011, **60**(2), 125-141.
31. Bamigbola, A.A. Awareness, anchor and adjustment actors in the use of institutional repository by Nigerian lecturers. *Int. Fed. Libr. Assoc. Inst.,* 2021*,* **47**(2), 182–195.
32. Anistyasari, Y.; Kurniawan, A.; Tri Rahayu, I.A. & Ruhana, A. Assessing student acceptance of digital repositoryas knowledge management system to support research activities. *In* International Conference on Indonesian Technical Vocational Education and Association (APTEKINDO 2018). 201. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR), 2018. doi: 10.2991/aptekindo-18.2018.26
33. Rifai, A. & Hasan, B. Exploring user expectancy with regard to the use of institutional repository among university academics in Indonesia: A case study at Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University. *Libr. Philos. Pract. (E-J.)*, 2016.
34. Nielsen, J. Usability 101: Introduction to usability*,* 2012, https://www.nngroup.com/articles/usability-101-introduction-to-usability/ (accessed on 07 November 2023).
35. Saliu, S.A.; Ngozi, O.V. & Lawal, A.M. Challenges and strategies to the use of institutional repository among academics staff in universities libraries in South-West, Nigeria. *Abraka Humanit. Rev.,* 2022, **12**(1), 89-97.
36. Akparobore, D.O. & Omosekejimi, A.F. Faculty members awareness and attitude towards the use of institutional repository (IRs) in Federal Universities in South South, Nigeria. *Libr. Progress (Int.),* 2020, **40**(2), 154-165. doi: 10.5958/2320-317X.2020.00018.5
37. Mahameed, M.A.; Sirhan, A.A.; Tawalbeh, S.; Mohsen, I.N. & Momani, H. A proposal for building an institutional digital repository: Stages and obstacles from librarian's perspectives. *Webology,* 2021, **18**(4).
38. Connelly, L.M. Pilot studies. *Med Surg Nursing,* 2008, **17**(6), 411-412.
39. Griethuijsen, R.A.; Eijck, M.W.; Haste, H.; Brok, P.J.; Skinner, N.C.; Mansour, N. & BouJa, S. Global patterns in students' views of science. *Res. Sci. Educ.,* 2015, **45**, 581–603. doi: 10.1007/s11165-014-9438-6
40. Kaiser, H.F. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika,* 1974, **39**, 31–36. doi: 10.1007/BF02291575
41. Shimray, S.R. & Ramaiah, C.K. Barriers faced by youth in seeking cultural heritage information. *DESIDOC J. Libr. Inf. Technol.,* 2023, **43**(2), 119-125. doi: 10.14429/djlit.43.2.18451
42. Jabbar, A.; Rehman, S.U. & Hashmi, M.A. Accessibility

and use of institutional repository among research scholars: A case of COMSATS institute of information scholars Ins. *Libr. Philos. Pract. (E-J.)*, 2020.
43. Abrizah, A. The cautious faculty: Their awareness and attitudes towards institutional repository. *Malaysian J. Libr. Inf. Sci.,* 2009, **14**(2), 17-37.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express their gratitude to anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback that significantly enhanced the manuscript's quality.

CONTRIBUTORS

Ms Unzila Hurum is a research scholar at the Department of Library & Information Science, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, India. Her interests are: Institutional repository, reference management, and user satisfaction.
Her contributions to the current study are: Data collection, preparing manuscript drafts and references.

Dr K.L. Mahawar is a Professor and Head at the Department of Library & Information Science, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, India. His research interests are: Academic library and information systems, user services/needs, information sources and systems.
His contribution to the present work are: Study design, revising the manuscript, and proofreading.

Dr Somipam R. Shimray is an Assistant Professor of Library and Information Science at the Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, India. His research includes: Research ethics, knowledge sharing, and cultural informatics.
His contributions to the present work are: Developing the study design, data analysis, editing, revising, proofreading the manuscript, and finalising the paper.