Chapter IV

Awareness, Access and Use of E-Journals among Faculty of LIS
**Awareness, Access and Use of e-journals among Faculty of LIS**

While examining the patterns of awareness, access and use of e-journals in the subject of LIS, it is necessarily to study the extent of these patterns among faculty of the subjects also. Thus the study, after examining the awareness, access and use of e-journals among researchers, the consideration has also been done to examine the same among the faculty of LIS. In the present chapter, the awareness, access and use of e-journals among faculty of LIS have been ascertained. The total 60 faculty are taken into consideration. As the queries for the faculty were same as for the researchers, similar questions were repeated to the faculty. The faculty, quite perceptibly, exposed out variety of responses, that are mentioned below.

**Preferences to Particular format of Journals**

The faculty were firstly asked that what type of research journals they liked. The faculty had diverse views. There were 20 per cent who liked the print journals and other 21.67 who preferred e-journals over print journals. Interestingly, 58.33 per cent faculty admitted that they liked both formats of journals, i.e. print journals and e-journals.

![Pie Chart: Preferences to Particular format of Journals](image)

**Fig 4.1: Preferences to Particular format of Journals**
The data reveals that the likeliness of faculty has been slightly slanted towards e-journals as e-journals have received 1.67 per cent more acceptance among faculty. But noticeable feature here is that majority of the faculty use both types of journals indiscriminately, as per their research aspirations.

**Table 4.1: Preferences to Particular format of Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 50</th>
<th>Above 50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2: Binominal Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n1</th>
<th>n2</th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To verify the variation of likeliness of both types of journals among faculty on the basis of age variables, (w.r.t age group) since np < 5, binomial test has been taken into consideration. In the table, p value is equal to 0.000001, which is less than 0.001. Thus the null hypothesis may be rejected. H₀: P₁ ≠ P₂ against the alternative H₁: P₁ ≠ P₂ at 1 % level of significance. i. e. there is significance difference between the preference of electronic journals in regard to young and elder faculty. The result shows that generally, young faculty are more interested in electronic journals in comparison to elder faculty.
Fig 4.2: Preferences to Particular format of Journals (as per age variable)

Awareness of e-journals
To begin with, the faculty were asked that whether they were aware of e-journals. Positively, 100 per cent faculty divulged that they were aware of e-journals.

Fig. 4.3: Awareness of e-journals
Noticeable attribute highlights here is that the entire faculty is fully aware of e-journals. Reasonably, e-journals are part of the subject-matter of LIS. Thus the awareness of e-journals among faculty of LIS is quite expectant.

**Major Purposes of using e-journals**

Further, it was asked from the faculty that for what prominent purposes they used e-journals. Interestingly, 42.06 per cent faculty have expressed that they used e-journals for teaching purpose. Other 23.36 per cent admitted that they used e-journals to supplement their research work. Further, 18.69 per cent asserted that they used e-journals for writing papers, while the remaining 15.89 per cent disclosed that they used e-journals for updating knowledge.

![Fig. 4.4: Major Purposes of using e-journals](image)

**Frequency of using or accessing e-journals**

To be acquainted with the extant of the use of e-journals among faculty, they were asked that how frequently did they use and access
e-journals. Only 5 per cent admitted that they had an access to e-journals everyday. Other 20 per cent accessed e-journals once in week, while 41.67 per cent used e-journals once in a month. Noticeably 33.33 per cent faculty asserted that they used e-journals occasionally.
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**Fig. 4.5: Frequency of using or accessing e-journals**

The data confirms that most of the faculty use e-journals regularly. But noticeably, very less number of faculty access e-journals much frequently. Contrarily, a dominant majority of those who access e-journals regularly, access e-journals once in a month. One third of faculty does not access e-journals regularly, but they use them occasionally.
Fig. 4.6: Frequency of using or accessing e-journals (as per age variable)

Table 4.3: Frequency of using or accessing e-journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 50</th>
<th>Above 50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Z test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>POOLED</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.780488</td>
<td>0.3125</td>
<td>0.649123</td>
<td>0.140678</td>
<td>3.326657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in the use of e-journals as per different age groups was tested. Under null hypothesis it was considered that proportions of regularly using e-journals with regard to two age groups (below 50 years and above 50 years) are same. But against the alternative hypothesis, these proportions are not same. From the above table, the value of Z calculated is 3.327
\[ |z \text{ call} | = 3.327 \]

\[ |z \text{ call} | > 3 \]

So the null hypothesis may be rejected at 1% level of significance. So proportion of young faculty which are regularly using e-journals is larger than the proportion of elder faculty which are regularly using e-journals.

**Extent and amount of using e-journals**

The faculty were asked that approximately, how many articles they usually access in a month. There were 10 per cent respondents who affirmed that they accessed 1 to 3 articles in a month. 45 per cent respondents acclaimed that they accessed 4 to 6 articles, while 40 per cent respondents responded that they accessed 7 to 10 articles. Only 5 per cent claimed that they access more than 10 articles in a month.

![Pie chart showing extent and amount of using e-journals](image)

**Fig. 4.7: Extent and amount of using e-journals**

The data exposes that 85 per cent faculty access 4 to 10 articles in a month. The number of those who access less than 4 articles and more than 10 articles in a month is very minimal.
Fig. 4.8: Extent and amount of using e-journals (as per age variable)

Table 4.5: Extent and amount of using e-journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 50</th>
<th>above 50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Z test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>POOLED</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0.634146</td>
<td>0.4375</td>
<td>0.578947</td>
<td>0.145537</td>
<td>1.351178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To examine the variations in the frequency of the access to e-journals on the basis of two different age groups, relevant test was applied. Under the null hypothesis, the data establishes that proportions of faculty which are accessing 1 to 6 e-journals in a week with regard to two age groups (below 50 years and above 50 years) are same.
Alternative hypothesis, these proportions are not same. From table, the calculated value of Z statistic is 1.351.

\[ |z \text{ call}| = 1.351 \]

\[ |z \text{ call}| < 3.00 \]

The null hypothesis thus may be accepted at 1% level of significance. There is no significance difference for accessing number of e-journals in regard to age group.

**Probable sources of finding e-journals**

To verify the most reliable source of accessing e-journals among faculty, they were asked that which source they mostly used to find e-journals. The faculty divulged variety of responses. Total 63.33 per cent faculty asserted that they used preferably search engines to access e-journals. 15 per cent revealed to use directories, while 10 per cent acclaimed to use the e-mail alerts. The library web sites and the mailing lists found respectively 6.67 per cent and 5 per cent faculty.

![Fig. 4.9: Probable sources of finding e-journals](image)
The data establishes that vast majority of faculty (78.33 per cent) use the general and informal sources such as search engines, mailing lists and the e-mail alerts. Noticeably, only 21.67 per cent rely on the directories and the library web sites, the formal sources to find e-journals.

**Probable locations to access e-journals**
Further, it was asked from the faculty that at which place they mostly accessed e-journals. Total 76.67 per cent faculty admitted that they accessed e-journals mostly in the departments. Other 20 per cent revealed that they accessed e-journals at home, while 3.33 per cent faculty asserted that they accessed e-journals at home.

![Fig. 4.10: Probable locations to access e-journals](image)

The data confirms that more than 80 per cent of the faculty access e-journals in the university campus. Reasonably, due to the availability of furnished infrastructure, unfluctuating connectivity and other related facilities available in the departments and the libraries is the cause for more frequent access at these places. One fifth of the faculty access e-journals at their homes. Perceptibly, these include those who
have less time for the same at the university campus and secondly they are having adequate related facilities at their homes.

![Bar chart showing probable locations to access e-journals (as per age variable)](image)

**Fig. 4.11: Probable locations to access e-journals (as per age variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 50</th>
<th>above 50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.7: Probable locations to access e-journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>POOLED</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0.756098</td>
<td>0.9375</td>
<td>0.807018</td>
<td>0.116328</td>
<td>-1.5594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.8: Z Test**

The significance difference for places of the access of e-journals (Inside University and Outside University) with regard to two age groups was also accessed. Under the null hypothesis it has been assumed that proportions of faculty, which are accessing e-journals
inside the university with regard to age groups (below 50 years and above 50 years), are same. So as per alternative hypothesis these proportions are not same.

From the table, the calculated value of Z statistics is -1.559

\[ i.e. \ |z| \text{ call} = 1.559 \]

\[ |z| \text{ call} < 3.00 \]

We may accept the null hypothesis at 1% level of significances. So there is no difference in the proportions of accessing e-journals inside the university with regard to two age groups.

**Methods of reading e-journals**

The faculty was asked that what method they preferably used to read e-journals i.e. on screen or print on paper. As many as 80 per cent faculty responded that they preferred print on paper to read e-journals. But there were 20 per cent faculty who admitted that they read e-journals on screen.

![Pie chart showing methods of reading e-journals](image)

**Fig. 4.12: Methods of reading e-journals**
Noticeably, there are only one fifth part of faculty who read e-journals on screen, other gigantic majority of faculty gets a print on papers for the same. Reasonably, most of the faculty use e-journals at their departments or libraries, where they have unrestricted availability of printers and paper free of cost or at minimal charges.

**Table 4.9: Methods of reading e-journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 50</th>
<th>Above 50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Screen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print on paper</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.10: Binominal Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n1</th>
<th>n2</th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test that whether there is any significance difference of proportions of faculty who are reading e-journals on the basis of two age groups, appropriate statistical test was applied. So under alternative hypothesis, these proportions are not same. Since np < 5, so the binomial test was used. From the above table, p value is 0.039. Since p value is greater than 0.01. We may accept the null hypothesis at 1% level of significance. So the proportions are same.
Preference to particular format of information display
It was further enquired from the faculty that what format of information display they preferred to access e-journals. Noticeably, 58.33 per cent faculty asserted that they preferred PDF format, while other 35 per cent revealed that they preferred HTML format. There were 6.67 per cent faculty who divulged to prefer the DOC format.
Certainly, the prior preference expressed to the PDF format by the faculty is due to its ready to print standardised format and its inalterability. Noticeable Preference to the HTML verifies its multimedia applications, dynamic colours and graphics and hypermedia features. Very minimal and least preference to the DOC as this is highly vulnerable to be altered and corrupted.

**Relevance, Usefulness and Value of e-journals**

To evaluate the significance and relevance of the information received through e-journals, the faculty was asked to divulge the use and value of the information received through e-journals. Total 30 per cent of them considered the information as most helpful; while other 56.67 per cent found it helpful. There were 13.33 per cent for whom the information obtained from e-journals was little helpful.

![Pie Chart: Relevance, Usefulness and Value of e-journals](chart.png)

**Fig.: 4.15: Relevance, Usefulness and Value of e-journals**

For 86.67 per cent faculty, the information obtained through e-journals is positively helpful or even most helpful. The significance of e-journals to impart information has been thus manifestly confirmed. However there is minimal numbers of faculty who believe that e-journals are only a little helpful source of relevant information.
Subscription of the ToC of relevant e-journals

The faculty was further asked that whether they had subscribed the Table of Contents (ToC) Service of e-journals on their e-mails. It is noteworthy here that only 46.67 per cent faculty had subscribed the service, the rest of 53.33 per cent had not subscribed that service yet.

![Bar chart showing subscription status]

**Fig. 4.16: Subscription of the ToC of relevant e-journals**

The data shows that majority of faculty have not subscribed ToC of e-journals. Perceptibly, the entire faculty is not aware about that ToC. Secondly, the entire faculty does not find the ToC relevant enough to subscribe.

Usefulness of subscription of ToC service

It was further verified from those who have subscribed the ToC, that whether it is helpful for them. Interestingly, all 100 per cent have responded that they found it helpful.
The members of faculty who have subscribed the ToC find it totally helpful because this facility enables them to access the articles relevant to them. It further escapes them from time-consuming process of finding the relevant articles from various sources.

**Recommendation of e-journals to other information seekers**

It was asked from the faculty that whether they recommended e-journals to the students or other information seekers. All 100 per cent of them accepted that they usually recommend e-journals to the students and the others.
The entire faculty recommends e-journals to the students and other information seekers. It further establishes the acceptance and reliability of e-journals as the sources of information.

**Publication or submission of articles in e-journals**
To further confirm the acceptance of e-journals among faculty, they were asked that whether they published or submitted their articles in e-journals. Positively, 91.67 per cent of them admitted that they had published or submitted their articles in e-journals. There were only 8.33 per cent faculty who accepted that that they had not done the same yet.

![Publication or submission of articles in e-journals](image)

**Fig. 4.19: Publication or submission of articles in e-journals**

The acceptance of e-journals among faculty can be verified from the fact that nearly 92 per cent members of faculty have published or submitted for publication their articles.

**Recommending and supporting others for publication**
To confirm the extent of acknowledgement of e-journals among faculty was further asked that whether they suggest other scholars and their
colleagues to publish their articles in e-journals. Interestingly, 100 per cent of the faculty accepted that they recommended the other scholars and colleagues for the same.

![Bar chart showing 100% for Yes and 0% for No]

**Fig. 4.20: Recommending and supporting others for publication**

The acceptance and acknowledgement of e-journals as a major source of imparting information, particularly for teaching faculty of LIS, is further confirmed from the verification that the faculty recommend others to publish in e-journals.

**Extent of effect of use of e-journals**

Further, it was asked from the faculty whether the access to e-journals had increased their ability (of teaching and research etc.) The 86.67 per cent faculty admitted to that while 13.33 per cent had denied that.
The belief of the 86.67 per cent of the faculty that the access to e-journals had increased their ability (of teaching and research) confirms that the use and access of e-journals undoubtedly plays constructive and positive role in enhancing the skill and aptitude of the faculty of LIS.

**Problems while accessing e-journals/if any**

To examine the problems, if any, faced by the faculty, the query was asked from them. Only 20 per cent of the faculty admitted that they faced problems while accessing e-journals, while other 80 per cent were of the strong belief that they did not face any problems while accessing e-journals.
Four-fifth of the majority of the faculty do not face any problems while using and accessing e-journals. Reasonably, e-journal is part of information science. Thus the faculty of LIS is perceptibly aware about the know-how of using e-journals. Only one fifth of the researchers face various problems certainly due to fluctuating connectivity, slow internet server or any other causes.

**Types of problems faces while accessing e-journals**

The 20 per cent of the faculty who revealed that they faced problems while accessing e-journals were further asked to assert out their most prominent and frequently faced problems. 66.67 per cent of them blamed it to the fluctuating internet connectivity while the remaining 33.33 per cent revealed that the slow speed of the internet server was responsible for the same.

![Pie chart showing the percentage of problems faced by faculty while accessing e-journals](image)

**Fig. 4.23: Types of problems faces while accessing e-journals**

Positively, none of the faculty had censured to e-journals for any type of problems they faced while accessing e-journals. For all of them, the setbacks and shortcoming associated to the slow speed and fluctuating connectivity of the internet are the major problems.
Requirement of any technical training to use e-journals
For the proper use of e-journals, it was asked from the faculty that did they believe that any training or technical know-how is required for accessing e-journals. Interestingly, 83.33 per cent of them admitted that they did not need any formal training or technical know-how, while there were other 16.67 per cent who believe that certainly formal training or know-how is required to access e-journals.

![Bar Graph]

Fig. 4.24: Requirement of any technical training to use e-journals

The faculty of LIS certainly has expertise over information science which does not require them any formal training or technical know-how to access e-journals. Only one fifth of the faculty, who feel the need of training, are perceptibly those who are less familiar with the internet techniques and devices.

Types of technical training
The 16.67 per cent faculty, who advocated the formal training and technical know-how for accessing e-journals, were asked that whether they preferred short term training or a long term training programme. Interestingly, 80 per cent of them were in favour of a short term
training programme, while the remaining 20 per cent suggested long term training programme.

![Fig. 4.25: Types of technical training](image)

**Amount of satisfaction from e-journals**

To examine the level of acceptance of e-journals, the faculty was asked that whether they were satisfied with e-journals. Positively, 63.33 per cent of them accepted that they were fully aware with e-journals. Noticeably, the remaining 36.67 per cent revealed that they were partially satisfied from e-journals.

![Fig. 4.26: Amount of satisfaction from e-journals](image)
Positively, none of the faculty asserted their dissatisfaction with e-journals, but contrarily, two third of them express their full satisfaction in regard to the use of e-journals. The 36.67 per cent of them, who are partially dissatisfied from e-journals, are due to the problems of fluctuating internet facility or slow internet speed.

**Whether e-journals are replacing print journals**

It was further asked from the faculty to give their views that whether e-journals were replacing the print journals. The 40 per cent of them have believed that e-journals were indeed replacing the print journals. But there were 60 per cent who believed that acceptance of e-journals was growing but these were not replacing the print journals.

![Bar chart showing the percentage of faculty views on e-journals replacing print journals.](chart.png)

**Fig. 4.27: Whether e-journals replacing print journals**

Those who believe that e-journals are replacing the print journals assume the same views because of the constantly increasing popularity of e-journals. But majority of them acknowledge that increasing eminence of e-journals but they are of the view that popularity of e-journals has not been diminishing the significance of the print journals.
**Causes of less acceptance of e-journals, if any**

Further it was asked from the faculty that if they access e-journals quite less frequently, then they should mention the reasons for the same. Noticeably, 58.33 per cent of them revealed that it was due to lack of time, total 36.67 per cent admitted that they were uncomfortable while using e-journals and the remaining 5 per cent asserted that the quality of e-journals was not equal to print journals.

![Cause of less acceptance of e-journals](image)

**Fig. 4.28: Causes of less acceptance of e-journals, if any**

Positively, majority of the faculty who asserted to use less frequently e-journals have revealed the cause for same as lack of time for the same. But the noteworthy concern here is that 41.67 per cent faculty have blamed the less use of e-journals to less acceptance and substandard quality of e-journals.

**Obstacles in using e-journals**

It was asked from the faculty to mention if they observe any obstacles in using/accessing e-journals. The respondents revealed variety of obstacles. Total 58.33 per cent of them believed that e-journals were difficult to read; other 20 per cent censured it to the lack of
infrastructure; for other 13.33 per cent, it was the complicated format of e-journals; the remaining 8.33 per cent admitted that the preference and more acceptance to the print journals hamper the broader use of e-journals.

![Pie chart showing percentages]

**Fig. 4.29: Obstacles in using e-journals**

Noticeably, 71.66 per cent of the faculty believe that the format of e-journals is complicated and thus difficult to read. Lack of infrastructure revealed as an obstacle includes fluctuating internet connectivity and slow internet server speed. The noticeable concern arising here is the acceptance and acknowledgement of print journals hinder the broader acknowledgement of e-journals.

**Proposed steps to make e-journals more efficient**

The faculty was further asked that what according to them was required to make e-journals facility more efficient. The faculty has given various constructive suggestions for the same. There are 46.67 per cent who believe that Bandwidth should be improved; while other 35 per cent feel that sufficient infrastructure should be established for the same; Other 13.33 per cent revealed that affordable internet
access is needed; the remaining 5 per cent think that e-journals should be more promoted.

![Pie chart showing percentages of responses]

**Fig. 4.30: Proposed steps to make e-journals more efficient**

The noticeable concern highlighted by the data is that 95 per cent of the faculty believes that sufficient infrastructure, improved and inexpensive internet facility is required to make the facility of e-journals more user-friendly. However, there are nominal number of faculty who feel that e-journals should be promoted more enthusiastically for their better acknowledgement.

To measure the variation of suggestions by faculty on the difference of age groups, the faculty was again separated into two age groups, i.e. below 50 and above 50. Total 63.64 per cent faculty below 50 think that the bandwidth should be improved; but on the other side there is none of the faculty above 50 who feel in similar manner. Additionally, 27.27 per cent faculty of below 50 realise that sufficient infrastructure should be established; noticeably, there are 56.25 per cent above 50 faculty who feel the same. Only 2.27 per cent below 50 think that affordable internet access should be applicable; while there are 43.75 per cent above 50 members who assert the same aspiration. In regard to the need of the promotion of e-journals, 6.82 per cent faculty below 50 and none among above 50 acknowledge the need for same.
Fig. 4.31: Proposed steps to make e-journals more efficient (as per age variable)

The data shows a number of variations in regard to age variations.

The empirical analysis confirms that the level of the use of e-journals is very frequent, awareness highly appropriate and acceptance undoubtedly overwhelming among the faculty of LIS. The faculty has been found giving priority to use e-journals in comparison to print journals. The faculty is reasonably adequately aware about appropriate use and access of e-journals. The level of acceptance of e-journals among faculty can be witnessed from the fact that all of them enthusiastically recommend e-journals to others and vast majority of them frequently get their articles published in e-journals. The faculty finds marginal problems while accessing e-journals. These problems are more the obstacles concerning information technology and less related to the worth and value of e-journals. The study concludes that more improvement of technological advancement in the area can obviously enlarge the scale of use and acceptance of e-journals among faculty of the subject of LIS.