

**FACTORS AFFECTING PERCEIVED EASE OF USE OF  
THE DIGITAL LIBRARY AMONG STUDENTS OF  
PRINCE OF SONGKHLA UNIVERSITY, THAILAND**

**NANNAPHAT SANGUANKHAM**

**UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA**

**2011**



**FACTORS AFFECTING PERCEIVED EASE OF USE OF  
THE DIGITAL LIBRARY AMONG STUDENTS OF  
PRINCE OF SONGKHLA UNIVERSITY, THAILAND**

**A research project submitted to the College of Business  
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree  
Master of Science (Management)  
Universiti Utara Malaysia**

**By  
NANNAPHAT SANGUNAKHAM  
2011**

## **PERMISSION TO USE**

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission of copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may be granted by my supervisor or, in her absence, by the Dean of Research and Innovation. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to:

**DEAN OF RESEARCH AND INNOVATION,  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (COB)  
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA  
06010 UUM SINTOK  
KEDAH DARUL AMAN**

## ABSTRACT

This study was implementing Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to study factors affecting perceived ease of use of digital library among students of Prince of Songkhla University (PSU). The main objective of this study was the impact of system characteristics (screen design, relevance and accessibility) and individual difference (domain knowledge) on perceived ease of use of digital library. A total of 393 questionnaires were distributed to students from various faculties with three (3) education levels which are Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree and Doctoral Degree. In addition, 393 questionnaires were returned and usable for analysis. Multiple regression analysis was performed to tests the hypotheses of the study. The results indicated that of the four (4) characteristics, all screen design, relevance and accessibility and domain knowledge were positively related to perceived ease of use.

This study shows that perception of students about relevance, accessibility and domain knowledge are almost equally significant to intend to use the digital library. The findings were discussed and recommendations for the future research were also addressed.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In completing this study, I owe a debt of gratitude and thanks to many persons that have supported me. First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Mr. Shahmir Abdullah for his continuous intellectual guidance, wise counselling, kindness, thoughtfulness throughout this study. Special thank goes to my examiner, Mr. Rajoo Ramanchandram for his helpfulness and very good suggestions. I would also like to convey my great thanks to Mr. Faizul Mamat, without his benevolence, I probably could not have been done my master program. For khun Oraphan and khun Rattiya, without their supports and constant guidance, I could not have completed this study, I absolutely appreciate that. Moreover, I am also greatly indebted many lecturers in the College of Business.

My highest and most sincere appreciation goes to my beloved grandma my parents, my family and brothers and sisters for their love, encouragement, patience, support, finance support and sacrifice they have given me during the implementation of study, always concern about my education and giving me various supports in the success of my study. What I have done, I have done to make you proud.

Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all my friends, bang Rafale, p'kah, Sisi, n'Kuk, Ama, Sandy and Sacha for their understanding, help and support on me. Thanks again to everyone including those who has helped either directly or indirectly to the completion of this study.

I am blessed and thankful of what I conquered. To all those people, thank you so much.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PERMISSION TO USE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix

## CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Research Questions	6
1.4 Research Objectives	7
1.5 Significance of the Study	7
1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study	8
1.7 Definition of key terms	9

## CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction	10
2.1 Library development in Thailand	10
2.2 Technology Acceptance Model and Perceived Ease of Use	14
2.2.1 Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)	14
2.2.2 Perceived Ease of Use (PEU)	16

2.3	Digital library experience and PEU	17
2.4	Digital library usability	18
2.5	System Characteristics	21
2.5.1	Interface Characteristics	21
2.5.1.1	Screen design	22
2.5.2	Organizational Context	23
2.5.2.1	Relevance	23
2.5.2.1.1	Accessibility	25
2.6	Individual Differences	25
2.6.1	Domain knowledge	26
2.7	Theoretical Framework	27
2.8	Hypothesis	28
2.9	Conclusion	28

### **CHAPTER 3 : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

3.0	Introduction	30
3.1	Research Design	30
3.2	Sampling Design	33
3.3	Data Collection Method	34
3.3.1	Questionnaire Survey	35
3.4	Research Instrument	36
3.4.1	Questionnaire Design (Instruments)	36
3.4.2	Measurement scales	39
3.5	Data Analysis Technique	39
3.6	Pilot Study	40
3.7	Conclusion	41

## **CHAPTER 4 : FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS**

4.0	Introduction	42
4.1	Reliability Analysis	42
4.2	Descriptive Analysis	44
4.2.1	Demographic Data	44
4.2.2	Descriptive Statistics of Variables	48
4.3	Correlation Analysis	49
4.4	Hypothesis Testing	50
4.4.1	Hypothesis One	51
4.4.2	Hypothesis Two	52
4.4.3	Hypothesis Three	53
4.4.4	Hypothesis Four	54
4.5	Conclusion	55

## **CHAPTER 5 : DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

5.0	Introduction	56
5.1	Discussions	56
5.2	Recommendations for increasing perceived ease of use	58
5.3	Limitations of the study	61
5.4	Suggestions for Future Research	62
5.5	Conclusion	62

<b>REFERENCES</b>	64
-------------------	----

<b>APPENDIX</b>	77
-----------------	----

<b>APPENDIX A : Questionnaire</b>	77
<b>APPENDIX B : Results from SPSS Tests</b>	87
• Reliability Analysis	88
• Correlation Analysis	94
• Regression Analysis	95

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page</b>
Table 3.1: Population of students in PSU	34
Table 3.2: Number of blocks and questions	38
Table 4.1: Reliability analysis	43
Table 4.2: Respondent's demographic Profile	44
Table 4.3: Descriptive statistics of variables	48
Table 4.4: Correlation of Variables	49
Table 4.5: Linear Regression between Screen Design and Perceived Ease of Use	51
Table 4.6: Linear Regression between Relevance and Perceived Ease of Use	52
Table 4.7: Linear Regression between Domain Knowledge	53
Table 4.8: Linear Regression between Accessibility and Perceived Ease of Use	54
Table 5.1: Recommendations to enhance perceived ease of use	61

## LIST OF FIGURES

	<b>Page</b>
Figure 2.1: Technology Acceptance Model	15
Figure 2.2: Theoretical framework	27

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.0 Introduction

This chapter introduces the chapter agenda of this study. It outlines the background of the study, problem statement, research questions, research objectives, significance of the study, scope and limitations of the study, and definition of key terms.

#### 1.1 Background of the study

Information and Communications Technologies (ICTs) shape every aspect of life including the educational sector of the country. ICT has come into practice within a very short time and has become one of the basic building blocks of modern society (Arif & Kanwal, 2009). The advent of technology has changed the way business is conducted today. The educational sector is also not spared. The advent of the Internet has revolutionized the way learning is done and how knowledge is disseminated. The higher education sector is experiencing an unprecedented growth rate. This trend is largely a result of new enabling technologies that have facilitated the virtual delivery of academic programs (Ramayah, 2006a).

From ancient times libraries have served as repositories of human knowledge. As in ancient times, one of the most precious elements of an institution of higher learning is its library. The library is the key to an institution's academic strengths. It is the heart and soul of the learning process (Koohang, 2004). Similarly, Haider (2004), states that libraries are central organs in a university and play significant roles in achieving the due

The contents of  
the thesis is for  
internal user  
only

## REFERENCES

Agarwal, R., & Prasad, J. (1999). Are individual differences germane to the acceptance of new information technologies? *Decision Sciences*, 30(2), 361-391.

Ahmad, F. (2003). Tacit Knowledge Dissemination among UUM Lecturers. Unpublished Master degree dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Akla, W.I. (2002). Perpustakaan Digital@Maya@Elektronik. *Jendela: Buletin Perpustakaan USM, Buletin Bil*, (1).

Alaxei, V. M. (2002). *The Advantages of Employing Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Intercultural Research: Practical Implications from the study of the Perceptions of Intercultural Communication Competence by American and Russian managers*, Available: [http://www.russcomm.ru/eng/rca\\_biblio/m/matveev01\\_eng.shtml](http://www.russcomm.ru/eng/rca_biblio/m/matveev01_eng.shtml), retrieved on 8 September 2009.

Allen, M. (2002). A case study of the usability testing of the University of South Florida's virtual library interface design. *Online Information Review*, 26(1), 40-53.

Arif, M., & Kanwal, S. (2009). Acceptance of digital library among female students and effects of limited access of digital library on their performance in research work: A case of International Islamic University. *The International Information & Library Review*, 41, 122-128.

Arms, W.Y. (2000). *Digital Libraries*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Association of Research Libraries. (1995). Definition and purposes of a digital library. Retrieved July 17, 2002, from  
<http://www.arl.org/sunsite/definition.html>

Borghuis, C.L., Brinckman, H., Fischer, A., Hunter, K., Loo van der, E., Mors ter., R., Mostert, P. & Zijlstra, J. (1996). *TULIP Final Report*, Elsevier Science N.Y. available at: [www.elsevier.nl/inca/homepage/about/resproj/trmenu.htm](http://www.elsevier.nl/inca/homepage/about/resproj/trmenu.htm).

Borgman, C. L. (1987). *Toward a definition of user friendly: a psychological perspective*. In F. W. Lancaster, Ed. *What Is User Friendly?* Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

Borgman, C.L. (1999). What Are Digital Libraries? Competing Visions. *Information Processing and Management*, 35, 227–243.

Barnett, M. (1998). Testing a digital library of technical manuals. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 41, 116-122.

Blandford, A., Stelmaszewska, H. & Bryan-Kinns, N. (2001). Use of multiple digital libraries: a case study. *Proceedings of the First ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* ,179-188.

Booth, P. A. (1989). *An Introduction to Human-Computer Interaction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

Cahoy, E.S., & Moyo, L.M. (2003). Meeting the Needs of Remote Library Users. *Library Management*, 24(6/7), 281-290.

Cavana, R. Y., Delahaye, B. L., & Sekaran, U. (2000). *Applied Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. Sydney: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Chapanis, A. (1991). *Evaluating usability*. In B. Shackel & S. Richardson, Eds. *Human Factors for Informatics Usability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chau, P.Y.K., & Hu, P.J.H. (2001). Information technology acceptance by individual professionals: A model comparison approach. *Decision Science*, 32(4), 699-719.

Chen, C., Czerwinski, M. & Macredie, R. (2000). Individual differences in virtual environments – introduction and overview. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51, 499-507.

Chen, L.D., Gillenson, M.L., & Sherrel, D.L. (2002). Enticing online consumers: An extended technology acceptance perspective. *Information and Management*, 39, 705-719.

Cockrell, B. J., & Jayne, E. A. (2002). How do I find an article? Insights from a web usability study. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 28(3), 122-132.

Colley, A. M., & Gale, T. M. (1994). Effects of gender role identity and experience on computer attitudes. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 10(2), 129-137.

Conger, S., & Loch, D. K. (1995). Ethics and information technology use – a factor-analysis of attitudes to computer use. *Information Systems Journal*, 5(3), 161-183.

Covi, L. & Kling, R. (1997). Organisational dimensions of effective digital library use: closed rational and open natural systems model. In S. Kiesler (Ed.), *Culture of the Internet*, 343-360. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Culnan, M. J. (1983). Environmental scanning: the effects of task complexity and source accessibility on information gathering behavior. *Decision Sciences*, 14, 194-206.

Davies, C. (1997). Organizational influences on the university electronic library. *Information Processing and Management*, 33, 377-392.

Davis, D. F. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13, 319-340.

Davis, D. F., Bagozzi., P, R., & Warsaw, R. P. (1989). User Acceptance of computer technology a comparison of two theoretical models. *Management Science*, 35, 982-1003.

Davis, F. D. (1993). User acceptance of information technology: system characteristics, user perceptions and behavior impacts. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 38, 475-487.

Davis, F. D. & Venkatesh, V. (1996). A critical assessment of potential measurement biases in the technology acceptance model: three experiments. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 45, 19-45.

Dickstein, R. & Mills, R. (2000). Usability testing at the University of Arizona library: how to let the users in on the design. *Information Technology & Libraries*, 19, 144-151.

Dijkstra, J. (1998). Journal in transition: From paper to electronic access – the DECOMATE project. *Serials Librarian*, 33(3/4), 243-70.

Dugdale, C. (1999). Managing electronic reserves. *Librarian Career Development*, 7(12), 150-163.

Duncker, E., Theng, Y. L. & Mohd-Nasir, N. (2000). Cultural usability in digital libraries. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science*, 26, 21-22.

Ebenezer, C. (2003). Usability evaluation of an NHS library website. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 20(3), 134-142.

Ferreira, S. M., & Pithan, D. N. (2005). Usability of digital libraries: A study based on the areas of information science and human-computer interaction. *OCLC Systems and Services*, 21(4), 311-323.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Fox, E. A., Hix, D., Nowell, L. T., Brueni, D. J., Wake, W. C., Heath, L. S. & Rao, D. (1993). Users, user interfaces, and objects: envision, a digital library. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 44, 480-491.

Fuller, D. M., & Hinegardner, P. G. (2001). Ensuring quality website redesign: The University of Maryland's experience. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 89(4), 339-345.

Gluck, M. (1996). Exploring the relationship between user satisfaction and relevance in information systems. *Information Processing and Management*, 32, 89-104.

Gopi, M. (2006). Factors influencing user acceptance of internet stock trading in Penang. Unpublished final year project paper, School of Management, University Sains Malaysia, Penang.

Graham, P. S. (1995). Requirements for the digital research libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 56, 331-339.

Groud, C. & Rymer, J. (1998), VADS User Needs Survey 1998: Report, Survey Section 3: Problems and Solutions.

Haider, S. J. (2004). Coping with change: issues facing university libraries in Pakistan. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(3), 229-236.

Hair, J., Money, A., Page, M. & Samuouel, P. (2007). *Research Methods for Business*. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Hammond, C. (1994). Nontraditional Students and the Library: Options, Preference, and Behaviors. *College and Research Libraries*, 55, 323-341.

Hardy, A. P. (1982). The selection of channels when seeking information: cost-benefit vs. least-effort. *Information Processing and Management*, 18, 289-294.

Hartson, R. H., Shivakumar, P., & Pe'rez-Quin'ones, M. A. (2004). Usability inspection of digital libraries: A case study. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, 4(2), 108-123.

Harter, S. P. & Kim, H. J. (1996). Accessing electronic journals and other E-publications: an empirical study. *College and Research Libraries*, 57, 440-443.

Hill, L. L., Dolin, R., Frew, J., Kemp, R. B., Larsgaard, M., Montello, D. R., Rae, M. & Simpson, J. (1997). User evaluation: summary of the methodologies and results for the Alexandria digital library, University of California at Santa Barbara. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science Annual Meeting*, 34, 225-243.

Hong, W., Wong, W., Thong, J., & Tam, K. (2002). Determinants of user acceptance of digital libraries: An empirical examination of individual differences and system characteristics. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(3), 97-124.

Hsieh-Yee, I. (1996). Student Use of Online Catalogs and Other Information Channels. *College and Research Libraries*, 57, 161-175.

Hu, P. J ,Ma, P. C. & Chau, P. Y. K. (1999). Evaluations of user interface designs for information retrieval systems: a computer-based experiment. *Decision Support Systems*, 27, 125-143.

Igbaria, M., Guimaraes, T. & Davis, G. B. (1995). Testing the determinants of microcomputer usage via a structural equation model. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 11, 87-114.

Igbaria, M., & Tan, M. (1997). The consequences of information technology acceptance on subsequent individual performance. *Information and Management*, 32(3), 113-121.

Jackson, C. M., Chow, S. & Leitch, R. A. (1997). Toward an understanding of the behavioural intentions to use an information system. *Decision Sciences*, 28, 357-389.

Jackson, M. (2001). A user centered approach to the evaluation of a hybrid library. *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 2(2), 97-107.

Jeng, J. (2005). What is usability in the context of digital library and how it can be measured?. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 24(2), 47-56.

Kim, J.-A. (2006). Toward an understanding of Web-based subscription database acceptance. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57(13), 1715-1728.

Kling, R., & Elliott, M. (1994). Digital library design for organizational usability. *ACM SIGOIS Bulletin*, 15(2), 59-70.

Koohang, A. (2004) Students' perceptions toward the use of the digital library in weekly web based distance learning assignments portion of a hybrid program. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(5), 617-62.

Kranich, N. (1999). Diglibs. Retrieved May 20, 2009, from  
[http://www.txla.org/pubs/tlj75\\_3/diglibs.html](http://www.txla.org/pubs/tlj75_3/diglibs.html).

Krejcie & Morgan (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 607-610.

Kukulska-Hulme, A., Zwan, R. V. D., Dipaolo, T., Evers, V. & Clarke, S. (1999). An evaluation of the information digital video library system at the open university. *Journal of Educational Media*, 24, 131-136.

Lewis, W., Agarwal, R., & Sambamurthy, V. (2003). Sources of influence on beliefs about information technology use: An empirical study of knowledge workers. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(4), 657-678.

Lim, K. H., Benbasat, I. & Todd, P. A. (1996). An experimental investigation of the interactive effects of interface style, instructions, and task familiarity on user performance. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 3, 1-37.

Lim, S.L., Ramaiah, C.K. & Pitt, K.W. (2003). Problems in the preservation of electronic records. *Library Review*, 52(3), 117-125.

Linde, L., & Bergstrom, M. (1988). Impact of prior knowledge of informational content and organization on learning search principles in a database. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 13(2), 90-101.

Lindgaard, G. (1994). *Usability Testing and System Evaluation: A Guide for Designing Useful Computer Systems*. London, New York: Chapman & Hall.

Liu, Y., Dantzig, P., Sachs, M., Corey, J. T., Hinnebusch, M. T., Damashek, M. & Cohen, J. (2000). Visualizing document classification: a search aid for the digital library. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51, 216-227.

Marchionini, G., Dwiggins, S., Katz, A. & Lin, X. (1993). Information seeking in full-text end-user-oriented search systems: the roles of domain and search expertise. *Library and Information Science Research*, 15, 35-69.

Marchionini, G., Lin, X. & Dwiggins, S. (1990). Effects of search and subject expertise on information seeking in a hypertext environment. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science Annual Meeting*, 27, 129-142.

Mathieson, K. (1991). Predicting user intention: Comparing the technology acceptance model with the theory of planned behavior. *Information System Research*, 2(3), 173-191.

Mathieson, K., Peacock, E., & Chin, W.W. (2001). Extending the technology acceptances model: The influence of perceived user resources, *Database for Advances in Information Systems*, 32(3), 86.

McGill, L. & Toms, L. (2001). Usability of the academic library web site: implications for design. *College & Research Libraries*, 62, 355-367.

McIlroy, D., & Bunting, D. (2001). The relation of gender and background experience to self-reported computing anxieties and cognitions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 17, 21-33.

McInerney, V., McInerney, D. M., & Sinclair, K. E. (1994). Student teachers, computer anxiety, and computer experience. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 11(1), 27-50.

McMullen, S. (2001). Usability testing in a library Web site redesign project. *Reference Services Review*, 29(1), 7-22.

Meadow, C. T., Wang, J .& Yuan, W. (1995). A study of user performance and attitudes with information retrieval interfaces. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46, 490-505.

Monopoli, M., Nicholas, D., Georgiou, P. & Korfiati, M. (2002), A user-oriented evaluation of digital libraries: Case study the 'electronic journals' service of the library and information services of the University of Patras, Greece, *Aslib Proceedings*, 54(2), 103-117.

Nawi, S. M. (2009) Knowledge Sharing Behavior among Academic Staff of Universiti Utara Malasia. Unpublished final year project paper, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia.

Nelson, D. L. (1990). Individual adjustment to information-driven technologies: a critical review. *MIS Quarterly*, 14, 79-98.

O'neill, R (2006). *The advantages and disadvantages of qualitative and quantitative research methods*. Available:  
<http://www.learnhigher.ac.uk/analysethis/main/quantitative1.html>, retrieved on 20 July 2009.

O'Reilly, C. A. (1982). Variations in decision makers' use of information sources: the impact of quality and accessibility of information. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 756-771.

Par'e, G. & Elam, J. J. (1995). Discretionary use of personal computers by knowledge workers: testing of a social psychology theoretical model. *Behavior and Information Technology*, 14, 215-228.

Park, S. (2000). Usability, user preferences, effectiveness, and user behaviors when searching individual and integrated full-text databases: implications for digital libraries. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51, 456-468.

Park, T. K. (1994). Toward a theory of user-based relevance: a call for a new paradigm of inquiry. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 45, 135-141.

Pedersen, P., & Nysveen, H. (2003). Usefulness and self-expressiveness: extending TAM to explain the adoption of a mobile parking services. In: The proceeding of 16th Beld eCommerce conference, Bled, Slovenia, June 9–11.

Ramayah, T. (2004). Impact of interface characteristics on digital libraries usage. *Malaysian Online Journal of Instructional Technology*, 2(1).

Ramayah, T. (2006a). Doing e-Research with e-Library. *The International Journal of Technology Knowledge & Society*, (1).

Ramayah, T. (2006b). Interface characteristics, perceived ease of use and intention to use an online library in Malaysia. *Information Development*, 22(2), 123-133.

Ramayah, T., Ignatius, J., & Aafaqi, B.(2005). PC usage among students in a private institution of higher learning: The moderating role of prior experience. *Educators and Education Journal*.

Schamber, L., Eisenberg, M. B. & Nilan, M. S. (1990). A re-examination of relevance: toward a dynamic, situational definition. *Information Processing and Management*, 26, 755-776.

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. 4th edition, John Wiley & Sons. Inc.

Shackel, B. (1991). *Human factors for informatics usability background and overview*. In B. Shackel and S. Richardson, eds. *Human Factors for Informatics Usability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharma, R.K. & Vishwanathan, K.R. (2001). Digital Libraries: Development and Challenges. *Library Review*, 50(1), 10-16.

Smith, B., Caputi, P., Crittenden, N., Jayasuriya, R., & Rawstone, P. (1999). A review of the construct of computer experience. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 15, 227-242.

Spink, A., Greisdorf, H.&Bateman, J. (1998). From highly relevant to not relevant: examining different regions of relevance. *Information Processing and Management*, 34, 599-621.

Sun, H.,& Zhang,P.(2004). The role of moderating factors in user technology acceptance. *International Journal of Human Studies*.

Sutcliffe, G., Ennis, M., & Hu, J. (2000). Evaluating the effectiveness of visual user interfaces for information retrieval. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 53(5), 741-763.

Theng, Y. L., Duncker, E., Mohd-Nasir, N., Buchanan, G., & Thimbleby, H. (1999). Design guidelines and user-centred digital libraries. In Proceedings of the 3rd European conference on Digital Libraries 2001: LNCS. Vol. 1696 (pp. 167–183). Berlin: Springer.

Thong, J.Y.L., Hong W. & Tam K.Y. (2002). Understanding User Acceptance of Digital Libraries: What Are The Roles of Interface Characteristics, Organizational Context, and Individual Differences?. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 57, 215-242.

Todd, P. A. & Benbasat, I. (1992). The use of information in decision making: an experimental investigation of the impact of computer-based decision aids. *MIS Quarterly*, 16, 373-393.

Travica, B. (1997). Organizational aspects of the virtual/digital library: a survey of academic libraries. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science Annual Meeting*, 34, 149-161.

Vaidyanathan, G., Sabbaghi, A., & Bargellini, M. (2005). User acceptance of digital library: An empirical exploration of individual and system components. *Issues in Information Systems*, 6(2), 279-285.

Van House, N. A., Butler, M. H., Ogle, V., & Schiff, L. (1996). User-centered iterative design for digital libraries: The Cypress experience. *D-Lib Magazine*, 2(2), <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/february96/02vanhouse.html> (retrieved 24.01.07).

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (1996). A model of the antecedents of perceived ease of use: development and test. *Decision Sciences*, 27, 451-481.

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F.D. (2000). A theoretical expansion of the technology acceptance model: Four Longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186-204.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425-478.

Walbridge, S. (2000). Usability testing and libraries: the WSU experience. *ALKI*, 16, 23-24.

Wallis, P. & Thom, J. A. (1996). Relevance judgements for assessing recall. *Information Processing and Management*, 32, 273-286.

Wiederhold, G. (1995). Digital libraries, value, and productivity. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(4), 85-96.

Wood, F., Ford N., Miller D., Duffin R. & Sobczky G. (1995). Information skills for student centred learning. In *ELVIRA: Electronic Library and Visual Information Research*, Proceedings of the First ELVIRA Conference, eds M. Collier and K. Arnold. Aslib, The Association for Information Management, London: Milton Keynes, 134-148.

Woodward, H. (1997). *Café Jus: Commercial and Free Electronic Journals User Study*, London: British Library Research & Innovation Centre.

Yao, Y. Y. (1995). Measuring retrieval effectiveness based on user preference of documents. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46, 133-145.

Zhang, Y. & Estabrook, L. (1998). Accessibility to Internet-based electronic resources and its implications for electronic scholarship. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science Annual Meeting*, 35, 463-473.

Zmud, R. W. (1979). Individual differences and MIS success: a review of the empirical literature. *Management Science*, 25, 966-979.

# APPENDIX A

## Questionnaire