

MARGINAL USE AND ABSOLUTE NONUSE OF DIGITAL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND SERVICES BY FACULTY MEMBERS IN AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA, NIGERIA.

By

Mohammed Monsurat Funmilola

Department of Library and Information Science

Ahmadu Bello University Zaria

mohammedmonsurat38@gmail.com

Abdullahi, Ibrahim Musa

University Librarian

Kaduna State University,

musob2@yahoo.com

Tijjani Abubakar

Department of Library and Information Science

Ahmadu Bello University Zaria

tjlibs@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study sought to explore the reasons for the nonuse of Digital Library Resources and Services (DLRS) by Faculty Members in Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), Zaria. The research questions raised were: What are the reasons for the nonuse of DLRS by Faculty Members in ABU and how does the constructs of Perceived Attributes of Innovation Theory (PAIT) explain the experiences of faculty members in ABU on the nonuse of DLRS. A qualitative methodology using a case study research design was adopted using in-depth interview for data collection. Purposive sampling technique was used to select fifteen participants for the study however, twelve recorded voices was found usable for analysis. The findings revealed that lack of communication of DLRS and lack of librarian hospitality were the main reasons for the nonuse of DLRS by faculty members in ABU and also relative advantage and trialability were the main constructs of PAIT that explained the experiences of Faculty Members in ABU on the nonuse of DLRS in ABU. The study therefore concluded that library management should take proactive measures on marketing of DLRS and training users on how to use the DLRS with hospitality so as to achieve a higher level of awareness and increased utilization of DLRS by faculty members in ABU.

Key words: Digital Library Resources and Service, Nonuse, Faculty members

Introduction

Over the last decades, there has been proliferation, diffusion, adoption, and use of ICT in university libraries which has transformed the way they provide services. University libraries are transforming into smart organizations providing digital services where e-books, e-journals and e-magazines have replaced the printed physical information resources and services (Abinew and Vuda, 2013; Akpojotor, 2016). The transformation of university libraries into virtual libraries have dramatically altered how information is accessed, stored, retrieved and disseminated in universities.

In order to move with this global trend in ICT, universities have made significant investment in acquiring digital technologies with the sole objective of making available Digital Information Sources and Services (DISS) where users can access information 24/7 regardless of time and space for improved quality teaching, learning and research. DISS are those information sources and services which are accessible to users remotely through digital technology. DISS refer to electronic representation of information which can be accessed via electronic system and computer networks (Johnson, Evensen, Gelfand, Lammer, Sipe & Zilper (2012). Examples of DISS are e-books, Digital Libraries Resources and Services, online journal and magazines, e-learning tutors, online tests, Internet, web technology, e- discussions, e-news, data archives, e-mail, chatting e.t.c.

The diffusion of DISS has permeated university libraries where librarians provide Digital Library Resources and Services (DLRS). DLRS refer to electronic resources and services provided by libraries which users can access locally or remotely via digital technology. Examples of these resources and services are: library website, online library catalog, on-line reference materials, online databases, electronic magazine and journals, electronic books, online librarian question services e.t.c. The importance of DLRS has been highlighted: enable rapid access to information, digital information can be copied and stored for preservation on right of access. Most importantly, information in digital content can easily be retrieved or accessed. However, despite the importance of DLRS and the huge sum of money invested in DLRS, the problem of nonuse of DLRS in libraries is a re-occurring feature especially in Nigeria (Mortenson Centre for International Library Programme, University of Illinois, 2005; Bashorun, Isah and Adisa, 2011; McCreadie, 2013). DLRS cannot be successful unless it is used effectively (Atilgan and Bayram, 2006) and in order to be able to make optimal use of DLRS, users are expected to be acquainted with the use of technology to acquire digital information hence, the need for users to be familiar with DISS.

In view of the above, the researcher is interested in identifying the causal factors responsible for the marginal use and absolute nonuse (duo-marginal use and absolute nonuse make up nonuse as was discussed in the study) of DLRS by Faculty Members in ABU and to explain the reasons for nonuse using Rogers (2003) Perceived Attribute of Innovation Theory (PAIT).

Statement Of The Problem

Ahmadu Bello University (ABU) Zaria, have invested a huge sum of money in providing Digital Library Resources and Services (DLRS) for staff and students. A sum of 71million naira was spent on ScienceDirect Journal and books annually, An offline resource, “The Essential Electronic Agricultural Library” (TEEAL) cost 5 thousand USD plus an update fee of 5hundred USD per year e.t.c (office of the University Librarian, ABU, Zaria). Digitization of all thesis and dissertations for Institutional Repository (IR) and the digitization machines came with a cost so also is the development of website for accessing DLRS and the installation of fiber optics cable. All these expenses are incurred with the aim that studentsand staffs can gain access to DLRS irrespective of their location.

Despite the importance of DLRS and the huge sum of money invested in DLRS, the problem of nonuse (marginal use and absolute nonuse) of DLRS persists (Bashorun, Isah and Adisa, 2011; McCreadie, 2013) and specifically in ABU Zaria (Mohammed, Ukashatu & Dauda, 2014). Researchers have looked at the problem of nonuse of DLRS from diverse perspectives some of which include lack of awareness and design factor (Harle, 2010; Ifijeh 2011, Creaser and Spezi, 2012). While these studies have helped in understanding issues of nonuse of DLRS, they were not approached from the perspective of DLRS as an innovation.

Innovation is any idea, object or practice that is perceived as new (Rogers, 2003). One of the prominent theories of innovation is that by Rogers which states that for innovation to diffuse, it must be communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system. Rogers propounded a unified theory of diffusion of innovation where he presented four of the most widely used theories of diffusion namely; innovation decision process theory; individual innovativeness theory; rate of adoption theory and Perceived Attributes of Innovation Theory (PAIT). Among the four theories by Rogers, PAIT is considered suitable to investigate nonuse of DLRS. The usefulness of PAIT is mainly to explain and predict the rates of adoption and diffusion of an innovation. The critical role of the attributes of innovation theory in the acceptance and use of innovation has been documented (Stachewicz, 2011; Neo and Calvert, 2012; Ntemana and Olatokun, 2012). Therefore, for innovative services to be effectively and efficiently diffused, adopted, and used, it must conform to the attributes of innovation theory (Rogers, 2003). Hence, the PAIT is appropriate for exploring issues related to nonuse. The constructs of PAIT are: Relative Advantage, Compatibility, Complexity, Trialability and Observability.

Research Questions

1. What are the reasons for the nonuse of Digital Library Resources and Services by Faculty Members in ABU?
2. How do the constructs of PAIT explain the experiences of Faculty Members in ABU on the nonuse of DLRS?

Literature Review

Several scholars from a variety of disciplines have used the theory of perceived attributes to investigate and explore why innovations are not adopted and used (Stachewicz, 2011; Ntemana and Olatokun, 2012; Neo and Calvert, 2012). This section discusses some of the previous studies that used PAIT to explain how potential adopters judge an innovation based on their perceptions in regard to the characteristics of innovation.

A research by Stachewicz (2011) aimed to test the applicability of Rogers' theory of innovation diffusion as it relates to measuring the perceived attributes of innovations of capacitive switch technology in user interface controls. Quantitative research method was adopted by using a Likert scale to collect data on the following perceived attributes of innovation- relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, demonstrability, visibility, ease of use, image, voluntariness, perceived risk, and perceived resources as outlined by Moore and Benbasat (1991); Rogers (1995) and Dupagne and Driscoll (2005). The study found out that the results for relative advantage, compatibility, ease of use, image, and perceived risk were statistically significant enough to indicate that a consumer is willing to accept capacitive switch innovation in industrially designed user interface controls while voluntariness, trialability, demonstrability, visibility, and perceived resources did not indicate that a consumer is willing to accept capacitive switch innovation in industrially designed user interface controls. However, the attributes of relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, demonstrability, visibility, ease of use, image, voluntariness, perceived risk, and perceived resources combined would also end up being statistically significant enough to indicate that a consumer is willing to accept capacitive switch innovation.

Using a quantitative research method, Ntemana & Olatokun (2012) examined the influence of the five attributes of diffusion innovation theory on lecturers' use of ICTs. The hypotheses tested was that the five attributes of innovation- relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability of using ICT will not positively affect the lecturers' attitude towards using the technology: A structured questionnaire was used to collect data

using multiple regressions to test the five hypotheses formulated. The findings revealed that relative advantage, complexity and observability were found to have a positive influence on the attitude of lecturers towards using ICTs with observability having the highest influence.

The study by Neo and Calvert (2012) on Facebook and the diffusion of innovation in New Zealand public libraries was based on how New Zealand public libraries assessed and evaluated Facebook and the motivating factors that cause New Zealand public libraries to adopt or not to adopt Facebook. Using a qualitative method, interview was used to gather data, the study found out that all the five characteristics were important in explaining the decision to adopt Facebook. Specifically, it found that relative advantage, compatibility and complexity were the most important factors to explain adoption because they have important implications for the rate of adoption and were motivating factors in the adoption/non-adoption of Facebook. Meanwhile, trialability and observability were found to be less important factors in the decision to adopt Facebook.

The research carried out by Cutler (2013) on the topic: How Static is the Statics Classroom?: An investigation into how innovations, specifically Research-Based Instructional Strategies are adopted into the Statics Classroom set out to investigate how educational research, specifically Research-Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) are adopted by education practice, specifically within the engineering Statics classroom. Using a systematic approach, changes in classroom teaching practices were investigated from the instructors' perspective. Both researchers and practitioners are included in the process, combining efforts to improve student learning, which is a critical goal for engineering education. The study was divided into 3 stages and each was discussed in an individual manuscript. Manuscript 1 provides an assessment of current teaching practices; Manuscript 2 explores RBIS' use by Statics instructors and perceived barriers of adoption; and Manuscript 3 evaluates adoption using Fidelity of Implementation. A common set of concurrent mixed methods was used for each stage of this study. A quantitative national survey of Statics instructors (n=166) and 18 qualitative interviews were conducted to examine activities used in the Statics classroom and familiarity with nine RBIS. The result showed that each of Rogers' characteristics influenced adoption for different reasons. For example, Complexity (level of difficulty with implementation of an RBIS) was most commonly identified as a barrier. His study also evaluated the Fidelity of Implementation for each RBIS and found it to be higher for RBIS that were less complex (in terms of the number of critical components). Many of the critical components (i.e. activities required for implementation, as described in the literature) were found to statistically distinguish RBIS users and non-users.

A study by Jwaifell and Gasaymeh (2013) titled "Using the Diffusion of Innovation Theory to Explain the Degree of English Teachers' Adoption of Interactive Whiteboards in the Modern Systems Schools in Jordan: A Case Study" aimed to explain the use of interactive whiteboards (IWBs) by English female teachers in Modern Systems School in Jordan. The study examined and reported teachers' use of IWB and its features that have impact on their decisions to adopt it in Modern Systems School. To achieve the main purpose of the study, the following research question was asked: How does Rogers's (2003) major attributes of innovation explain English teachers' perceptions of IWBs at Modern Systems School?

The study employed qualitative case study approach. Data was collected through semi-structured interviews, document reviews, and participatory observations. The study concluded that the extent of teachers' use of IWB is related to their perceptions of the five major attributes: Relative advantages, compatibility, simplicity, trialability, and observability.

The regular use of IWB has shifted the teachers' methodologies of teaching from traditional ways to using dialogues, open sources, and group work.

Carlet (2014) study on "Understanding perceptions and adoption of green stormwater infrastructure" the research question in respect to perceived attribute of innovation was: Is there a relationship between the following perceived attributes of innovations – relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, observability, perceived risk, and perceived resources as outlined by Moore and Benbasat (1991); Rogers (2003); Dupagne and Driscoll (2005) – and officials' positive attitudes toward adoption of green infrastructure?

Building on existing theories of diffusion of innovation and technology acceptance, the objective of this study was to investigate how municipal officials' perceptions of key attributes of green infrastructure influence their attitudes toward adoption. Findings indicate that municipal officials' perceptions of relative advantage, compatibility, trialability, and perceived resources are significant predictor of favorable disposition toward adoption, while perceived risk has a negative influence on attitudes.

All the previous studies reviewed adopted the PAIT in order to investigate the rate of adoption of a particular innovation in a setting. The present study is about the DLRS which are innovations in Kashim Ibrahim Library (KIL), ABU; therefore the constructs of PAIT will help to understand why faculty members in ABU do not use the DLRS.

Methodology

Qualitative research method, using a case study research design was adopted for this study. Due to the nature of the research questions and the interpretive position, a case study strategy is considered the most appropriate approach to employ because it provide a systematic way to collect data, analyze information, and report the results, hence aiding the in-depth understanding of the particular problem at hand which is the nonuse of DLRS by faculty members in ABU Zaria.

The population comprised of faculty members in the twelve faculties in ABU Zaria who are marginal users and absolute nonusers of DLRS in ABU Zaria. The 12 faculties are; Administration, Agriculture, Arts, Education, Engineering, Environmental Design, Medicine, Law, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Sciences, Social Sciences and Veterinary Medicine.

Research participants comprised faculty members who are marginal users and absolute nonusers in three of the twelve faculties in ABU. They are Faculty of Administration, Kongo campus; Faculty of Medicine (clinical), ABU Teaching Hospital Shika and Faculty of Social science, Samaru campus. These three campuses were selected in order to have the idea of the situation in regards of the infrastructural facilities in each of the campuses and the Faculty Members' experiences on the use of DLRS. This is in-line with the notion of multiple variation sampling (Patton 2001) that samples can be selected using a wide range of variation on dimension of interest. The sample size for this study was determined at the point of saturation. In essence, many interviews were conducted for this study, but after the 12th, there were no new concepts emerging. Therefore, 12 participants were used as the unit of analysis. The participants were purposively selected using the following criteria:

- a) Assistant lecturer and above
- b) Have knowledge about DLRS and have never used it (absolute nonuser)
- c) Have not used DLRS for the last six month prior to the day of the interview (marginal user)

Data were collected using in-depth interview. This method allowed the researcher to investigate and have in-depth understanding of each faculty member's personal perspective about the nonuse of DLRS. Twelve recorded interviews were found audible and usable enough for transcription. The recorded voices from the respondent were transcribed and each of the responses from the twelve respondents was read, examined and re-examined using analytical inductive process described by Creswell (2013) that "researchers works back and forth between themes and databases until the researchers has established a comprehensive set of themes". While reading the narratives, the researcher highlighted words, phrases, sentences that dealt with the research questions. 172 narratives on the nonuse of DLRS were recorded in a table. Qualitative content analysis approach was used for coding and identifying themes. The purpose of this approach usually is to validate or extend a conceptual framework or theory. Using this approach, the researcher was able to validate the theoretical framework and develop conceptual framework (see appendix 2).

Findings and Discussion:

Lack of communication: Lack of communication (5/172; 2.91%) category includes narratives related to the experiences of faculty members on why they do not use DLRS in ABU. This category has only one sub-category depicting no body informed us of its existence in the library (5/172; 2.91%). This sub-category is explained below.

Nobody informed us of DLRS existence in the library: This subcategory was observed from narrative by a faculty member who does not use the DLRS because there was no information passed to him that DLRS exist in the library. A lecturer I from the faculty of administration narrated *"There are so many things that I don't know pertaining the issue of this library resources and services. It is just now I am getting to know so many things, I am so surprise. There is lack of information and awareness; if I know there is something at my doorstep why should I move somewhere else and even buy textbooks?"*

Hospitality: Hospitality (5/172; 2.91%) category includes narratives related to the experiences of faculty members on why they do not use DLRS in ABU. This category has only one sub-category depicting I was not well attended to in the library (5/172; 2.91%). This sub-category is explained below.

I was not well attended to in the library: This subcategory was observed from narrative by a faculty member who due to the treatment received from the library staff discouraged him from knowing what DLRS is available in KIL and thereby not using it at all. A senior lecturer from faculty of administration lamented: *"There was a time I wanted to download some books I wanted to get from Jstor link and they kept on referring me to the university library, that's why I went to KIL and nobody attended to me. When I got someone willing to talk to me, he doesn't know what I was asking for and couldn't direct me to the appropriate section where I can get it. Since then I stopped going there"*

Relative advantage: Relative advantage (15/172; 8.72%) category includes narratives related to the experiences of faculty members on why they do not use DLRS in KIL. This category has five sub-categories depicting power constraint (3/172; 1.74%), I can always get what I need from other sources (3/172; 1.74%), accessibility problem (4/172; 2.33%), the DLRS is not close to us (2/172; 1.16%), bad network (3/172; 1.74%). These sub-categories are explained below.

Power constraint: This subcategory was observed from faculty members' narratives that were of the opinion that electricity should always be at a standby in order to enjoy the service. A senior lecturer from faculty of social science said *"Another problem here is, you*

know this power issue, if there is no power you cannot browse. You can always use a text book without light”.

I can always get what I need from other sources: This subcategory was observed from a narrative by a faculty member who felt that if they can get materials from other sources why bother about DLRS? A reader from faculty of social science narrated *“All what I need get them online provided they are uploaded to the Internet. I don’t even go there (to the library).I have all what I need; I see no need going there”.*

Accessibility problem: This subcategory was observed from the narrative by a faculty member who said that getting access to DLRS is a problem. A lecturer 1 from faculty of administration narrated *“What I know about the KIL is while I was doing my PhD, at that time I looked around I don’t have access to digital library facility and I was directed to Kennedy library (Kongo Campus). I went there, there was a particular room where an officer will be there to help us, link us to the website where we could get the materials and then all we did was to download whatever we needed and they print it for us I think that was the kind of access that was of help to me. I do not have direct access. It is not convenient for me as each time I have to be going to the library; meanwhile there are some resources that can equally help especially on-line without going to the library either through Google or whatever”.*

DLRS not close to us: This subcategory was observed from the narrative by a faculty member who said proximity to the DLRS is his main reason for not using it. This response is from a faculty member who works in Kongo campus, ABU. His response: A lecturer II from the faculty of administration *“The facility is not close to us. Sometimes it might be a whole month, nothing to do in Samaru Campus, how will I go there? You understand? Besides, it is what you know that exist and you have idea of how it works that you will try to see. If we have it in the Kennedy library here it is very close to us and very easy, except now that you are telling me I can be here and I can be accessing that one in Samaru”.*

Bad network: This subcategory was observed from the narrative of a faculty member who shares the same view concerning the epileptic network in ABU. A lecturer I from faculty of administration said *“If you have the Internet connection always available via the cable or wireless, you can be able to browse and get the information 24/7 but reverse is the case with ABU Internet facilities especially here in Kongo campus.”*

Trialability: Trialability (12/172; 6.98%) category includes narratives related to the experiences of faculty members on why they do not use DLRS in ABU. This category has three sub-categories depicting convenience (time) (7/172; 4.70%), colleagues from abroad assist in getting materials needed for research (2/172; 1.16%), nobody informed us on how it works (3/172; 1.74%). These sub-categories are explained below.

Convenience (Time): This subcategory was observed from a narrative by a faculty member who felt that time constraints hindered him from trying the DLRS in KIL. A senior lecturer from the faculty of social science said *“because of time constraint you have the next class to attend, you have defense to attend, and students are waiting for you all those things have reduced your time. If you can get what you want without going to the library, to me other ones are regarded as time wasting, ... You see me now, see what I am doing, I am marking, and why am fast on it is that more are coming and I don’t want to get confused”.*

Colleagues from abroad assist in getting materials needed for research: This subcategory was observed from the narrative by a faculty member who felt that getting material from colleagues to do their research has prevented him from trying DLRS long enough to know what it is capable of doing. A lecturer I from the faculty of administration narrated *“I have tried to use it... I think I even use that Science Direct, but I find it easier to liaise with colleagues, in other foreign universities that have free access. I will just give them the area and request them to send me material on what I need and they will send them from various libraries abroad and I will just use it for my research”*.

Nobody informed us on how it works: This subcategory was observed from the narrative by faculty members who do not use the DLRS because there was nobody to inform them on how they can use it. A lecturer II in the faculty of administration narrated *“maybe I would have tried it if somebody had come to educate me as to how I can sit down here and have access to it or how to use it generally unlike Google that you don’t need any one to put through”*.

Summary of Findings

1. Lack of communication and hospitality were the main reasons for the nonuse of DLRS Faculty Members” in ABU.
2. The constructs of relative advantage and trialability explained Faculty Members” nonuse of DLRS in ABU.

Discussion

Factors such as lack of communication and hospitality were discovered as the main reason hindering getting to use DLRS. Using an innovation is one thing and getting to use the innovation is another. Getting to use the innovation is the first step before using the innovation itself. However, some of the Faculty Members do not get to use the DLRS because of these factors. Lack of communication affirms Rogers’ diffusion of innovation theory which stated that innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system (Rogers, 2003). Therefore, it is not surprising to find out that lack of communication is a hindrance to the marginal and absolute nonuse of DLRS by Faculty Members in ABU. Hospitality is another factor that Rogers did not mention in his theory. This is very important in getting to use an innovation. It is however surprising to find out from this study that the librarians and information professionals working to increase the utilization of DLRS are not friendly, thereby discouraging Faculty Members in getting to use the DLRS.

ABU Faculty Members” nonuse of DLRS can be explained using relative advantage and trialability constructs of PAIT. Rogers (2003) defined relative advantage as the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being better than the idea it supersedes. Faculty members in ABU do not see any benefit of using DLRS that supersedes their daily use of Digital Information Sources and Services (DISS) and print sources. Most of the faculty members interviewed are technology savvy and are quite comfortable with using their print sources and DISS other than DLRS because they felt it is more convenient (thought they had to go to the library to access them), cost effective (thought they had to pay for the DLRS) and they gain more satisfaction from using them (especially DISS). Also, a trial period for an innovation is very important because it helps a user in getting used to the innovation. Rogers (2003) defined trialability as the degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis. However, faculty members do not try the DLRS either on a limited basis or long enough to know or see what it is capable of doing because apart from the fact that they do not know how it works, they rely on their colleague from abroad to send the material they need to do research. This is attributed to lack of time because of their tight schedules and it is

inconvenient for them to come down to KIL to access them (especially for that not on Samaru campus)

It is therefore not surprising that relative advantage and trialability were the attributes of innovation that explained the nonuse of DLRS by faculty members in ABU. In prominent diffusion research (Moore & Benbasat, 1991; Rogers, 2003; Venkatesh et al., 2003), relative advantage was emphasized as the strongest predictor and essential innovation attribute in determining the rate of adoption of innovations. While trialability is also positively connected with the rate of adoption; the more an innovation is tried, the faster its rate of adoption is. It is however important to know where to try, the ability to try, and the empowerment to try or experiment adequately. Specifically, the attribute of relative advantage and trialability have been found by many scholars to influence faculty members' use of technology (Cutler, 2013; Jwaifell and Gasaymeh, 2013).

From the preceding discussions, the nonuse of DLRS by Faculty Members based on findings 1 and 2 has implications. First, faculty members will not be aware of the existence of DLRS if they are not properly communicated to them. Second, the lack of hospitality by librarians will continue to discourage faculty members from approaching the library for help. Third, Faculty Members will continue to patronize the DISS if the potential benefits of DLRS are not made known to them. Fourth, Faculty Members will not use the DLRS if there is no proper training on how the DLRS work. Trying a new innovation involves adequate hands-on training. Training can also help a user group to be eager in trying an innovation. The training given to the Faculty Members in ABU on the use of DLRS is not adequate as only few of them were carried along. In some faculties very few Faculty Members were selected from each department for training, and some of them get to know about the training only when it is over. This training activity however, does not take place on a regular basis.

Conclusion

This study sought to explore the nonuse of DLRS by Faculty Members in ABU and has brought forth findings that deserve the attention of policy makers, administrators, librarians and ICT division. It was established that relative advantage and trialability were the attributes of DLRS that explained their nonuse by Faculty Members. However, the study found that the main reason apart from the attribute of innovation that prevented getting to use the DLRS were lack of communication (of what is available and how to use them) and also lack of hospitality from the part of the librarian. Since the university spends huge amount of money on DLRS to support teaching, learning and research, it is imperative that they get some value for the money spent. Additionally, underutilization of DLRS has a possible role to jeopardize the quality of research output, learning and teaching at the institution thereby making return on investment almost impossible. However, if this is to be prevented, the designers of DLRS should consider the characteristics of relative advantage and trialability in designing DLRS. Moreover, the university needs to provide useful insights for informing policy makers to formulate appropriate policy that will persuade maximum utilization of the DLRS by Faculty Members in ABU. Also, they need to establish the basis for the library management to take proactive measures on marketing of DLRS and training users on how to use the DLRS with hospitality so as to achieve a higher level of awareness and increased utilization of DLRS by Faculty Members in ABU.

Recommendations

Following the implication of the findings it was recommended that:

1. The potential benefits (in terms of cost, convenience, satisfaction, social prestige) of the DLRS over what is currently being used by the Faculty member for teaching and research should be emphasized through proper marketing by the information professionals in charge in KIL using appropriate channel.
2. Training in the use of DLRS should not be at the faculty level but at the departmental level. Librarians should be trained properly in both attitude and the use of DLRS and deployed to each department so that they can be in charge of training the Faculty Members in that department on a regular basis. This will take care of the inconveniences encountered by Faculty Members in that they will have access to a friendly librarian to take care of their needs in respect to DLRS such as access codes and any other operational problem that may be encountered by a Faculty Member. With this approach, the trainers will be close to the trainees in order to have very close and friendly interaction with each other.

References

- Abinew, A.A & Vuda, S. (2013). A Case Study of Acceptance and Use of Electronic Library Services in universities Based on SO-OTAUT model. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer and Communication Engineering* 1(4) 903-910. Retrieved at <http://ijircce.com> on 12 February, 2017
- Akpojotor, L.O (2016). Awareness and Usage of Electronic Information Resources among Postgraduate Students of Library and Information Science in Southern Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Paper 1408. Retrieved at <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1408> on 21st February, 2017.
- Atilgan, D. & Bayram, O. (2006). An Evaluation of Faculty Use of the Digital Library at Ankara University, Turkey. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32(1) 86-93. Retrieved at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/> on 20 April 2015
- Bashorun, M.T., Isah, A. and Adisa, M.Y. (2011). User Perception of Electronic Resources in the University of Ilorin Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Computing and Information Science*. Vol. 2 No. 11. Retrieved at <http://www.ieee-tcdl.org/Bulletin/current/papers/isah.pdf> on 31st December, 2014
- Carlet, F. (2014). Understanding Perceptions and Adoption of Green Stormwater Infrastructure (Doctoral dissertation Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University)
- Creaser, C. and Spezi, V. (2012). Working Together: Evolving Value for Academic Libraries. Retrieved at <https://libraryvalue.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/working-together-lisu-article.pdf> on 19th June 14.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed methods Approaches. SAGE Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

- Cutler, S.L. (2013). How Static is the Statics Classroom? An Investigation into How Innovations, Specifically Research-Based Instructional Strategies, are Adopted into the Statics Classroom. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University)
- Dupagne, M. & Driscoll, P. (2005). First Phase of a Scale Development Project to Measure Perceived Attributes of Consumer Communication Technologies. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, Sheraton, New York.
- Harle, J. (2010). Growing Knowledge: Access to Research in East and Southern African Universities. The Association of Commonwealth Universities. Retrieved at <https://www.acu.ac.uk/focus> on 11th June 2014.
- Johnson, S., Evensen, O.G., Gelfand, J., Lammers, G., Sipe, L. & Zilper, N. (2012). Key Issues for e-resources Development; A Guide for Libraries. International Federation for Library Associations and Institutions. Retrieved at <http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/acquisition-collectiondevelopment/publication/> on 12th January, 2017.
- Jwaifell, M. & Gasaymeh, A. (2013). Using the Diffusion of Innovation Theory to Explain the Degree of English Teachers' Adoption of Interactive Whiteboards in the Modern Systems School in Jordan: A Case Study. *Contemporary educational technology* 4(2)
- Lesk, M. (2005). Understanding Digital Libraries. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, Elsevier.
- McCreadie, N. (2013). Working Together: Library Value in the Developing World. Retrieved at <http://www.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/LibValReport-2013.pdf> on 19th May 2014.
- Mortenson Center for International Library Programs (2005). Developing Strong University Library in Nigeria: A Report for the MacArthur Foundation. University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Retrieved at <http://www.library.illinois.edu/mortenson/activities/projects/> on 21st March 2013
- Mohammed, M.F, Ukashatu, M.H. and Dauda, A.D. (2014). Awareness and Utilization of Online Databases by Academics of Faculty of Education, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria. *Ahmadu Bello University Journal of Vocational Studies (ABUJOVS)* 8(1).pp 158-170.
- Moore, G., & Benbasat, I. (1991). Development of an instrument to measure the perceived characteristics of adopting an information technology innovation. *Information Systems Research*, 1, 192-220. doi:10.1287/isre.2.3.192

- Muwanga, A. (2010). Impact of industrial activities on heavy metal loading and their physico- chemical effects on wetlands of Lake Victoria basin (Uganda). Retrieved at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267242212> on 23rd March 2016
- Neo, E. and Calvert P.J. (2012). Facebook and the Diffusion of Innovation in New Zealand Public Libraries. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. Accessed at www.sagepublications.com on 9th June 2014.
- Ntemana, T.J. and Olatokun, W.M (2012). Analyzing the Influence of Innovation Attributes on Lecturers' Attitude Towards Information and Communication Technologies. *Human Technology* 8(20), 179-197. Retrieved at <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/handle/123456789/40534> On 16th, June, 2014.
- Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Powelson, S.E. (2011). An Examination of Small Businesses' Propensity to Adopt Cloud-Computing Innovation. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Rogers, E.M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovation* 4thed. New York: the Free Press, 1995.
- Rogers, E.M (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations* 5th ed. New York: Free press, 2003
- Stachewicz, A.B. (2011). Measuring the Perceived Attributes of Innovation: A Study of Capacitive Switch Technology in Industrially Designed User Interface Controls. Retrieved at <http://commons.emich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1359&context=theses> on 16th, June, 2014.
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27, 425-478. Retrieved at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036540> on 19 March 2013

Conceptual Framework for Improving the Use of DLRS in ABU, Zaria



