Asian Journal of Information Science and Technology
ISSN: 2231-6108 (P) Vol.12 No.2, 2022, pp.1-7

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51983/ajist-2022.12.2.3104

Awareness and Usage Reference Management Tools and Referencing Styles among Faculty Members of University of Tamil Nadu, India

M. S. Jegan[1] and P. Balasubramanian[2]
[1]Research Scholar, [2]University Librarian & Head,
Department of Library and Information Science, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India
E-mail: jeganmsj@gmail.com, bala_phd2010@yahoo.com
(Received 7 March 2022; Revised 23 May 2022; Accepted 2 June 2022; Available online 27 October 2022)

Abstract - **This paper studied to identify the Awareness and Usage Reference Management Tools and Referencing Styles among Faculty Members of the University of Tamil Nadu. The online questionnaires were used to collect the university data among the faculty members, and 200 questionnaires were distributed; 189 questionnaires were filled and returned for usable by the participant, and the remaining were not replied to. The response rate is 95.94.50%. The 'Female' faculty members', 3(1.59%) of the 'Fully Unaware', 6(3.17%) of them 'Slightly Aware', 18(9.52%) of them 'Somewhat Aware', 32(16.93%) of them 'Moderately Aware' and 12(6.35%) of the 'Fully Aware'. And also, the faculty members have given priority to the 'APA. 'MLA and 'Chicago' are the familiar referencing styles and the second and third preference, respectively.**
Keywords: **Reference Management, Database, Publications, Citation, Bibliographic, Observation**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Reference management tools for recording and utilising bibliographic citations (references) and managing project references either as a company or as an individual. Once a citation has been recorded, it can be used time and again in generating bibliographies, such as lists of references in scholarly books, articles and essays. The rapid expansion of scientific literature has driven the development of reference management packages. These software packages usually consist of a database in which full bibliographic references can be entered, plus a system for generating selective lists of articles in the different formats required by publishers and scholarly journals. Modern reference management packages can usually be integrated with word processors. A reference list in the appropriate form is produced automatically as an article is written, reducing the risk that a cited source is not included in the reference list. They will also have a facility for importing the details of publications from bibliographic databases. Reference management software does not do the same job as a bibliographic database, which tries to list all articles published in a particular discipline or group of disciplines. Such bibliographic databases are significant and must be housed on central server installations. Reference management software collects a much smaller database of the publications that have been used or are likely to be used by a particular author or group. Such a database can easily be housed on an individual's personal computer.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Berengueres, J., & Nesterov, P. (2020) described the findings of a survey that covered the topics of stress, citation tool use habits, subjective happiness, h-index, research topic and tenure among a sample of 2286 authors of arxiv.org. Among all faculty roles, Ph.D. students report the lowest subjective happiness score, while tenured faculty report the highest. No association between citation management tool usage and h-index was found. The average age at tenure start is 34.9 years. In addition, no significant association between stress levels and the research topic was found. Wahyuningsih, S. (2020) conducted the study about students' perceptions in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education, particularly Bidikmisi students in the English Program conducted by State Islamic Institute of Kudus regarding the role of reference management in academic writing. It belongs to qualitative research. The result reveals that most of the students agreed that reference management software such as Mendeley and Zotero has given some benefits to academic writing.

Avidiansyah, Z., & Kurniajaya, J. F. (2020) states the management of bibliographic lists with various writing styles can be helped by using software assistance. Observations made by the authors at the Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) Graduate School Library, many of the theses from students are still not appropriate for writing the bibliography. So, it becomes a question of how students' final level of self-awareness is in the use of citation/reference software. The results of the survey that has been carried out, the last level students of the Master of Culture and Media Study Program, the Graduate School of UGM have self-awareness in the use of citation/reference software.

Francese, E. (2013) presented research, originally a master thesis, aims to investigate the popularity and usage of Reference Management software among researchers and scholars of the University of Torino, Italy, and university libraries' role in the subject. Based upon a qualitative approach, this study is a descriptive survey composed of an online questionnaire, and direct interviews addressed to the population of professors and researchers of the STM areas at the University of Torino. A qualitative analysis was made

across the 187 responses from the questionnaire and the 13 interviews performed. Lorenzetti, D. L., & Ghali, W. A. (2013) found Of the 78 researchers who responded to our survey, 79.5% reported that they had used a reference management software package to prepare their review. Of these, 4.8% reported this usage in their published studies. EndNote, Reference Manager, and RefWorks were the programs of choice for more than 98% of authors who used this software. Comments concerning ease-of-use issues focused on integrating this software with other programs and computer interfaces and the sharing of reference databases among researchers. Gilmour, R., & Cobus-Kuo, L. (2011) tested importing and data management features, fourteen references from seven bibliographic databases were imported into each RM, using automated features whenever possible. To test citation accuracy, bibliographies of these references were generated in five different styles. The authors found that RefWorks generated the most accurate citations. The other RMs offered contrasting strengths: CiteULike in simplicity and social networking, Zotero in ease of automated importing, and Mendeley in PDF management. Ultimately, the choice of an RM should reflect the user's needs and work habits.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To identify awareness about Reference Management Tools.
2. To assess the level of awareness of Referencing styles.
3. To identify usage of Reference Management Tools.
4. To know the purpose of online Reference Management Tools.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The online survey method was used to investigate the awareness of influencing feature factors of reference management software among the faculty members in Universities in South Tamil Nadu. The online questionnaires in the Google form were used to collect the data in the universities among the faculty members, which consist of Alagappa University, Madurai Kamaraj University (MKU), Manonmaniam Sundaranar University (MSU) and Gandhigram Rural Institute. The 200 questionnaires were distributed, 189 questionnaires were filled and returned for usable by the participant, and the remaining were not replied to. The response rate is 94.50%. Some statistical tools like simple percentages, WAM, and Chi-square tests were used based on the collected data.

V. LIMITATION

This study covers only the faculty members from the four universities in South Tamil Nadu only, i.e., Alagappa University, Madurai Kamaraj University, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, and The Gandhi gram Rural Institute in Tamil Nadu. And other universities, Engineering Colleges, Arts & Science colleges and other institutions were not considered for this study.

VI. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

A. Distribution of Questionnaires

This attempt is to discover the awareness and usage of reference management tools and referencing styles among faculty members of the University of Tamil Nadu, India. It is shown in table I.

TABLE I JUSTIFICATION OF SAMPLE SIZE

Sl. No.	Universities	Distributed		Received	
		No.	%	No.	%
1	Alagappa University	50	25.00	47	23.50
2	MKU	50	25.00	48	24.00
3	MSU	50	25.00	48	24.00
4	GRI	50	25.00	46	23.00
Total		200	100.00	189	94.50

Table I shows the distribution of the questionnaires among faculty members. 200 questionnaires were distributed. The stratified random sampling was used and equally distributed the questionnaires to all the four universities such as Alagappa University, Madurai Kamaraj University (MKU), Manonmaniam Sundaranar University(MSU) and Gandhigram Rural Institute (GRI). Among the 200, 189(94.50%) questionnaires were received with duly filled, consisting of 47(23.50%) from Alagappa University, 48(24%) from Madurai Kamaraj University & Manonmaniam Sundaranar University and 46(23%) from Gandhigram Rural Institute. The response rate is 94.50%.

B. Gender Wise Distribution of the Respondents

The Gender Wise Distribution of the faculty members in universities in South Tamil Nadu is shown in Table II.

TABLE II DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	University	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
1	Alagappa University	31(16.4)	16(8.47)	47(24.87)
2	MKU	34(17.99)	14(7.41)	48(25.4)
3	MSU	22(11.64)	26(13.76)	48(25.4)
4	GRI	31(16.4)	15(7.94)	46(24.34)
Total		118(62.43)	71(37.57)	189(100)

The gender-wise distribution of the faculty members is shown in Table II. Out of 189, 118(62.43%) were from 'Male', which consists of 31(16.4%) from Alagappa University, 34(17.99%) from Madurai Kamaraj University, 22(11.64%) from Manonmaniam Sundaranar University and 31(16.4%) from Gandhigram Rural Institute. Followed by 71(37.57%) were from 'Female', which consists of 16(8.47%) from Alagappa University, 14(7.41%) from

Madurai Kamaraj University, 26(13.76%) from Manonmaniam Sundaranar University and 15(7.94%) from Gandhigram Rural Institute. It is observed from the table that two universities occupied for maximum responses.

C. Wise Designation Distribution of the Respondents

The Wise Designation Distribution of the faculty members in universities in South Tamil Nadu is shown in Table III.

TABLE III DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	University	Designation			Total
		Asst. Professor	Asso. Professor	Professor	
1	Alagappa University	37(19.58)	1(0.53)	9(4.76)	47(24.87)
2	MKU	38(20.11)	2(1.06)	8(4.23)	48(25.4)
3	MSU	28(14.81)	9(4.76)	11(5.82)	48(25.4)
4	GRI	25(13.23)	6(3.17)	15(7.94)	46(24.34)
Total		128(67.72)	18(9.52)	43(22.75)	189(100)

The designation wise distribution of the faculty members is shown in Table III. Out of 189, 128(67.72%) of them are 'Assistant Professor', 18(9.52%) are 'Associate Professor', and 43(22.75%) of them are 'Professor'. In the case 'Assistant Professors' 37(19.58%) from Alagappa University, 38(20.11%) from Madurai Kamaraj University, 28(14.81%) from Manonmaniam Sundaranar University and 25(13.23%) from Gandhigram Rural Institute. Followed by 71(37.57%) in the 'Professor' category, 9(4.76%) from Alagappa University, 8(4.23%) from Madurai Kamaraj University, 11(5.82%) from Manonmaniam Sundaranar University and 15(7.94%) from Gandhigram Rural Institute. It is observed from the table that the minimum number of responses is in the 'Associate Professor' category.

D. Level of Awareness about Reference Management Tools Vs Designation

The Level of Awareness about Reference Management tools was analysed with the designation based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV LEVEL OF AWARENESS ABOUT REFERENCE MANAGEMENT TOOLS VS DESIGNATION

Sl. No.	Description	Designation			Total
		Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
1	Fully Unaware	12(6.35)	0(0)	3(1.59)	15(7.94)
2	Slightly aware	10(5.29)	3(1.59)	5(2.65)	18(9.52)
3	Somewhat aware	29(15.34)	4(2.12)	10(5.29)	43(22.75)
4	Moderately aware	47(24.87)	7(3.7)	21(11.11)	75(39.68)
5	Fully aware	30(15.87)	4(2.12)	4(2.12)	38(20.11)
Total		128(67.72)	18(9.52)	43(22.75)	189(100)

Chi-Square Tests			
Particulars	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.815[a]	8	.452
Likelihood Ratio	9.598	8	.294
Linear-by-Linear Association	.428	1	.513
N of Valid Cases	189		

Table IV shows the level of Awareness about Reference Management Software Among the faculty members from the Universities in Tamil Nadu with their designations. Among the 128(67.72%) 'Assistant Professor', 12(6.35%) of the 'Fully Unaware', 10(5.29%) of them 'Slightly Aware', 29(15.34%) of them 'Somewhat Aware' and 47(24.87%) of them 'Moderately Aware'. It is highlighted that 30(15.87%) of them are 'Fully Aware' of the Reference Management Tools. Followed by 43(22.75%) 'Professor', 3(1.59%) of the 'Fully Unaware', 5(2.65%) of them 'Slightly Aware', 10(5.29%) of them 'Somewhat Aware' and 21(11.11%) of them 'Moderately Aware' and 4(2.12%) of the 'Fully Aware'.

The Chi-square test was administered to identify the significance of the designation wise analysis. The table value is 15.507 at a 5% level of significance. The calculated value was less than the table value, which indicated the variables are insignificant in their opinion about the reference management tools.

E. Level of Awareness about Reference Management Tools Vs Gender

The Level of Awareness about Reference Management tools was analysed by gender based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, shown in Table V.

TABLE V LEVEL OF AWARENESS ABOUT REFERENCE MANAGEMENT TOOLS VS GENDER

Sl. No.	Description	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
1	Fully Unaware	12(6.35)	3(1.59)	15(7.94)
2	Slightly aware	12(6.35)	6(3.17)	18(9.52)
3	Somewhat aware	25(13.23)	18(9.52)	43(22.75)
4	Moderately aware	43(22.75)	32(16.93)	75(39.68)
5	Fully aware	26(13.76)	12(6.35)	38(20.11)
	Total	118(62.43)	71(37.57)	189(100)

Chi-Square Tests			
Particulars	**Value**	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	3.862[a]	4	.425
Likelihood Ratio	4.055	4	.399
Linear-by-Linear Association	.480	1	.488
N of Valid Cases	189		

Table V shows the gender-wise analyses of the level of Awareness about Reference Management Software among the faculty members from the Universities in South Tamil Nadu. Among the 118(62.43%) 'Male' faculty members, 12(6.35%) of the 'Fully Unaware', 12(6.35%) of them 'Slightly Aware', 25(13.23%) of them 'Somewhat Aware', 43(22.75%) of them 'Moderately Aware' and 26(13.76%) of the 'Fully Aware'.

Followed by 71(37.57%) 'Female' faculty members', 3(1.59%) of the 'Fully Unaware', 6(3.17%) of them 'Slightly Aware', 18(9.52%) of them 'Somewhat Aware', 32(16.93%) of them 'Moderately Aware' and 12(6.35%) of the 'Fully Aware'. It clearly shows that most faculty members are aware of the reference management tools.

The Chi-square test has been administered to identify the significance of the designation wise analysis, and the table value is 9.488 at a 5% level of significance. The calculated value was less than the table value, which indicated the variables are insignificant in their opinion about the reference management tools.

F. Acquaintance of Reference Management Tools

The Acquaintance of Reference Management tools was analysed based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, shown in Table III. The five-point scales of No idea, Aware, Learning, Fair, and Expert were used for the study. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for the Acquaintance of Reference Management Tools have been calculated, and the same is shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI ACQUAINTANCE OF REFERENCE MANAGEMENT TOOLS

Sl. No.	Terms	No Idea	Aware	Learning	Fair	Expert	WAM	Rank
1	Mendeley	13(6.88)	2(1.06)	5(2.65)	70(37.04)	99(52.38)	4.2698	1
2	Zotero	5(2.65)	10(5.29)	21(11.11)	57(30.16)	96(50.79)	4.2116	2
3	EndNote	21(11.11)	3(1.59)	10(5.29)	89(47.09)	66(34.92)	3.9312	4
4	RefWork	5(2.65)	22(11.64)	52(27.51)	82(43.39)	28(14.81)	3.5608	5
5	CiteULike	6(3.17)	37(19.58)	43(22.75)	58(30.69)	45(23.81)	3.5238	6
6	EasyBib	14(7.41)	4(2.12)	3(1.59)	93(49.21)	75(39.68)	4.1164	3

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

Table VI shows the Acquaintance of Reference Management Tools among the faculty members in Universities in South Tamil Nadu, and the faculty members have given priority to the familiarity of 'Mendeley'. 'Zotero' and 'EasyBib' are the familiar reference management tools and the second and third preferences. The least preference was given to 'CiteULike'. The mean value of all the variables ranges between 3.5238 and 4.2698. It can be inferred that all the six variables lie between 'Fair and 'Expert. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.003 and 1.369.

G. Usage of Reference Management Tools

The usage of Reference Management tools was analysed based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, shown in Table III. The five-point scales of Rarely Useful, Slightly Useful, Somewhat Useful, Very Useful, and Extremely Useful were used for the study. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for the Usage of Reference Management Tools have been calculated, and the same is shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII USAGE OF REFERENCE MANAGEMENT TOOLS

Sl. No.	Terms	Rarely Useful	Slightly Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful	Extremely Useful	WAM	Ra
1	Mendeley	8(4.23)	3(1.59)	3(1.59)	67(35.45)	108(57.14)	4.3968	1
2	Zotero	10(5.29)	8(4.23)	17(8.99)	50(26.46)	104(55.03)	4.2169	2
3	EndNote	10(5.29)	15(7.94)	55(29.1)	78(41.27)	31(16.4)	3.5556	4
4	RefWork	11(5.82)	40(21.16)	41(21.69)	52(27.51)	45(23.81)	3.4233	6
5	CiteULike	23(12.17)	27(14.29)	33(17.46)	39(20.63)	67(35.45)	3.5291	5
6	EasyBib	16(8.47)	13(6.88)	42(22.22)	49(25.93)	69(36.51)	3.7513	3

Table VII shows the usage of Reference Management Tools among the faculty members in Universities in South Tamil Nadu, and the faculty members have given priority to the 'Mendeley'. 'Zotero' and 'EasyBib' are the familiar reference management tools and the second and third preferences, respectively. The least preference was given 'RefWork'. The mean value of all the variables ranges between 3.4233 and 4.3968. It can be inferred that the majority of the faculty members are using reference management tools. The deviation of opinion ranges between 0.93751 and 1.40873.

H. Awareness of Referencing Styles

The Awareness of Referencing Styles was analysed based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, shown in Table III. The five-point scales of Fully Unaware, Slightly Aware, Somewhat Aware, Moderately Aware, and Fully Aware were used for the study. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for the Awareness of Referencing Styles have been calculated, and the same is shown in table VIII.

TABLE VIII AWARENESS OF REFERENCING STYLES

Sl. No.	Terms	Fully Unaware	Slightly Aware	Somewhat Aware	Moderately Aware	Fully Aware	WAM	Ra
1	MLA	3(1.59)	18(9.52)	16(8.47)	19(10.05)	133(70.37)	4.38	2
2	Harvard	31(16.4)	14(7.41)	11(5.82)	31(16.4)	102(53.97)	3.84	6
3	Chicago	19(10.05)	16(8.47)	14(7.41)	27(14.29)	113(59.79)	4.05	3
4	APA	7(3.7)	6(3.17)	15(7.94)	26(13.76)	135(71.43)	4.46	1
5	MHRA	20(10.58)	19(10.05)	15(7.94)	21(11.11)	114(60.32)	4.01	5
6	IEEE	21(11.11)	11(5.82)	28(14.81)	6(3.17)	123(65.08)	4.05	4

Table VIII analyses the level of Awareness about Referencing Styles among the faculty members from the Universities in South Tamil Nadu. The faculty members have given priority to the 'APA. 'MLA and 'Chicago' are the familiar referencing styles and the second and third preferences, respectively. The least preference was given 'Harvard'. The mean value of all the variables ranges between 3.84 and 4.46. It can be inferred that the majority of the faculty members are using the referencing styles with more awareness. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.024 and 1.535.

I. Use of Referencing Styles

The Awareness of Referencing Styles was analysed based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, shown in Table III. The five-point scales of Rarely Useful, Slightly Useful, Somewhat Useful, Very Useful, and Extremely Useful were used for the study. The Mean, Standard Deviation and their Rank for the Awareness of Referencing Styles have been calculated, and the same is shown in Table IX.

TABLE IX USE OF REFERENCING STYLES

Sl. No.	Styles	Rarely Useful	Slightly Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very Useful	Extremely Useful	WAM	Ra
1	APA	13(6.88)	15(7.94)	17(8.99)	31(16.4)	113(59.79)	4.14	1
2	MLA	15(7.94)	12(6.35)	27(14.29)	25(13.23)	110(58.2)	4.07	2
3	Chicago	21(11.11)	13(6.88)	25(13.23)	17(8.99)	113(59.79)	3.99	3
4	Harvard	21(11.11)	18(9.52)	14(7.41)	27(14.29)	109(57.67)	3.98	4
5	MHRA	31(16.4)	12(6.35)	18(9.52)	12(6.35)	116(61.38)	3.90	5
6	IEEE	48(25.4)	11(5.82)	7(3.7)	23(12.17)	100(52.91)	3.61	6

Table IX analyses the usage level of referencing styles among the faculty members from the Universities in South Tamil Nadu. The faculty members have given priority to the 'APA. 'MLA and 'Chicago' are the familiar referencing styles and the second and third preferences, respectively. The least preference was given 'IEEE. The mean value of all the variables ranges between 3.61 and 4.14. It can be inferred that the majority of the faculty members are using the referencing styles between 'Very Useful' to 'Extremely Useful'. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.270 and 1.563.

TABLE X PURPOSE OF ONLINE REFERENCE MANAGEMENT TOOLS VS DESIGNATION

Sl. No.	Description	Designation			Total
		Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
1	Easy to use	16(8.47)	3(1.59)	12(6.35)	31(16.4)
2	Reference Styles	8(4.23)	1(0.53)	2(1.06)	11(5.82)
3	Downloading / Storing citation	7(3.7)	1(0.53)	2(1.06)	10(5.29)
4	Reference list	15(7.94)	1(0.53)	5(2.65)	21(11.11)
5	In-text citation	18(9.52)	1(0.53)	7(3.7)	26(13.76)
6	Easy change of citation style	11(5.82)	2(1.06)	5(2.65)	18(9.52)
7	Storing PDFs	23(12.17)	3(1.59)	5(2.65)	31(16.4)
8	Easy to Organization	14(7.41)	3(1.59)	4(2.12)	21(11.11)
9	Searching fields	16(8.47)	3(1.59)	1(0.53)	20(10.58)
	Total	128(67.72)	18(9.52)	43(22.75)	189(100)

Chi-Square Tests			
Particulars	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.115[a]	16	.736
Likelihood Ratio	13.154	16	.662
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.840	1	.028
N of Valid Cases	189		

J. Purpose of Online Reference Management Tools Vs Designation

The Purpose of Online Reference Management Tools was analysed with the designation based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, shown in Table X. Table X shows the Purpose of Online Reference Management Tools Among the faculty members from the Universities in Tamil Nadu with their designations. Among the 128(67.72%) 'Assistant Professor', 16(8.47%) of them mentioned 'Easy to Use', 23(12.17%) of them replied 'Storing PDFs', and 11(5.82%) of them stated 'Easy change of citation style'. Similarly, Followed 43(22.75%) 'Professor', 1(0.53%) of them mentioned 'Searching Fields', 4(2.12%) of them replied 'Easy to an organisation', and 7(3.7%) of them said 'Intext Citation is Possible'.

The Chi-square test has been administered to identify the significance of the designation wise analysis, and the table value is 21.026 at a 5% level of significance. The calculated value was less than the table value, which indicated the variables are insignificant in their opinion about the reference management tools.

K. Purpose of Online Reference Management Tools Vs Gender

The Purpose of Online Reference Management Tools was to analyse the gender based on the opinion and responses among the faculty members, as shown in Table XI.

Table XI shows the purpose of Online Reference Management Tools Among the faculty members from the Universities in Tamil Nadu with their designations. Among the 118(62.43%) 'Male' faculty members, 16(8.47%) of them mentioned 'Easy to Use', 14(7.41%) of them replied 'Reference List', 16(8.47%) of them stated 'In text Citations', and 11(5.82%) of them said 'Easy change of citation style'. Similarly, Followed by 71(37.57%) 'Female' faculty members, 15(7.94%) of them mentioned 'Easy to Use', 14(7.41%) of them replied 'Storing PDFs' and 10(5.29%) of them replied as 'In text Citation' is Possible'.

TABLE XI PURPOSE OF ONLINE REFERENCE MANAGEMENT TOOLS VS GENDER

Sl. No.	Description	Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
1	Easy to use	16(8.47)	15(7.94)	31(16.4)
2	Reference Styles	6(3.17)	5(2.65)	11(5.82)
3	Downloading / Storing citation	9(4.76)	1(0.53)	10(5.29)
4	Reference list	14(7.41)	7(3.7)	21(11.11)
5	In-text citation	16(8.47)	10(5.29)	26(13.76)
6	Easy change of citation style	11(5.82)	7(3.7)	18(9.52)
7	Storing PDFs	17(8.99)	14(7.41)	31(16.4)
8	Easy to Organization	12(6.35)	9(4.76)	21(11.11)
9	Searching fields	17(8.99)	3(1.59)	20(10.58)
Total		118(62.43)	71(37.57)	189(100)

Chi-Square Tests			
Particulars	**Value**	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	10.618[a]	8	.224
Likelihood Ratio	11.884	8	.156
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.223	1	.269
N of Valid Cases	189		

The Chi-square test has been administered to identify the significance of the designation wise analysis, and the table value is 21.026 at a 5% level of significance. The calculated value was less than the table value, which indicated the variables are insignificant in their opinion about the reference management tools.

VII. CONCLUSION

Nowadays, reference management tools are the most popular and well utilised by faculty members for their academic publications for citing their work. The faculty members have great awareness and expertise in using all the reference management tools, including Mendeley and EndNotes. Also, they are very practised people by using the referencing styles. The study concludes a significant positive relationship among faculty members regarding awareness and usage of reference management software. The findings also identified the features and influencing factors that perceived reference management software and their desired referencing style.

REFERENCES

[1] Berengueres, J., & Nesterov, P. (2020). A Survey of H-index, Stress, Tenure & Reference Management software used in Academia. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00358*.

[2] Wahyuningsih, S. (2020). The Importance of Reference Management Software in Academic Writing: The Case of EFL Learners. In *Conference Proceeding*.

[3] Avidiansyah, Z., & Kurniajaya, J. F. (2020). Analysis of Final-year Students Self-Awareness Using Reference Management Software. *Record and Library Journal*, *6*(1), 99-109.

[4] Francese, E. (2013). Usage of reference management software at the University of Torino. *Use of Reference Management Software at the University of Torino*, 145-174.

[5] Lorenzetti, D. L., & Ghali, 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.

[6] Gilmour, R., & Cobus-Kuo, L. (2011). Reference management software: A comparative analysis of four products. *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, *66*(66), 63-75.