

Reference Management Software in Scholarly Communication: A comparative study of faculty members and research scholars in higher education institutions

DOI: 10.63880/jli.v2i1.94

M Panduranga Swamy¹, Kutty Kumar²

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The study examines the Reference Management Software (RMS) awareness, purpose of usage and problems faced by the faculty members and research scholars of selected higher educational institutions in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. The study's main goals are to determine the degree of awareness of RMS tools like Mendeley, Zotero, and EndNote; assess the extent to which these tools are used in academic and research writing activities; identify the goals and advantages of using RMS; analyse the challenges encountered when using these tools; and recommend ways to improve their efficient use.

Methodology: In February and March of 2026, a structured online survey created using Google Forms was used to gather data. It was distributed via email and WhatsApp groups. Faculty members and research scholars of Yogi Vemana University (YVU), Sri Venkateswara University (SVU), Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education (KARE), and Sri Sathya Sai Institute of

Received: 01.06.2026
Accepted: 20.06.2026
Published: 30.06.2026

Copyright (c) 2026, M
Panduranga Swamy,
Kutty Kumar



This work is licensed
under a Creative
Commons
Attribution 4.0
International License

¹ Assistant Librarian, Central Library, Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning, Prasanthi Nilayam, Puttatharhi Andhra Pradesh. India. Email: reachpandurangaswamy@gmail.com; ORCID: [0000-0002-0737-588X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0737-588X)

² Assistant Professor, Library and Information Science, Sri Venkateswara Veterinary University Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh. India.; Email: kumarkkutty@gmail.com; ORCID: [0000-0002-3510-5924](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3510-5924)

Higher Learning (SSSIHL), were included in the study. Out of the 210 replies that were received, 174 were deemed eligible for further examination. Data analysis was done using statistical methods such Cramer's V, Chi-square test, and percentage analysis.

Findings: *The results show that most respondents are aware of RMS tools and mostly utilize them for increasing citation accuracy, managing citations, and creating bibliographies. However, obstacles including inadequate institutional support, technological problems, and a lack of training were also noted. The study finds out that for RMS to be used well in research, we need good training programs and support from institutions and libraries to spread awareness. We need training programs to help researchers use RMS effectively. Institutions must also provide support for RMS to be successful. Additionally, libraries can play a role by leading awareness campaigns about RMS. This way, more researchers can learn about. Use RMS in their academic and research work.*

Implementation: *Effective implementation of RMS requires regular training, workshops, and technical support from academic libraries. Universities should introduce RMS to postgraduate students through research methodology courses and encourage its use in thesis and research work. Faculty members and librarians can guide researchers in using these tools effectively*

Keywords: Reference management tools, Reference management software, Citation management software, Referencing styles, Academic writing, Bibliographic management, Bibliography

1. INTRODUCTION

Reference management software helps academics organize citations, improve research and save time. It is a tool for researchers to keep track of what they read and use it to revise their articles. These software tools have been helpful for academics and researchers since the 1980s. They make it easy to organize, manage and format references. The goal of this study is to see how well reference management software works for managing citations and boosting research productivity. We want to find out what stops people from using these tools and suggest ways to make them more accepted and used efficiently in schools. Reference management software is important for academics to manage their references. It helps them to be more productive in their research. Researchers use reference management software to improve their work. The software makes it easy to manage citations. Academics use reference management software to save time. According to Jisc & Open University, (2010) Software is a tool that helps people who write things. Reference Management Software allows people to make a list of the things

they have read by putting the details of each thing into a format. These tools often help people make groups of the things they have read. They can make lists of the things they have read in different formats. Reference Management Software is very useful. Wikipedia says that Reference Management Software is a kind of software that stores information about the things people have read and it helps people make lists of the things they have read in the format. Reference Management Software (Lonergan, 2017). is a tool that helps people who do research. It helps them keep track of the things they have read. This can be done on a persons computer or on a website. Reference Management Software is a tool that assists researchers in organising and structuring their sources, like the things they have read on the internet. RMS helps scholars get their research in order and make bibliographies and citations in the text. Some people, like Borah et al., (2022) that the main job of reference management software is to collect organize and structure references inside a document. Nowadays you can use reference management software with word processing tools. It will make a bibliography for you in the right format, so you do not have to worry about a reference being removed from the list. People have been using reference management software for a time and it is very common. This study found that using reference management services is very important, for research work, so we decided to ask people about how they use RMS services.

Objectives

1. To determine how well-informed research scholars and faculty members are about reference management software like Mendeley and Zotero.
2. To assess how frequently and in what ways these technologies are used in scholarly and research endeavors.
3. To determine user preferences and proficiency levels with reference management software.
4. To examine the challenges encountered in obtaining and utilizing these tools, including obstacles relating to technology and expertise.
5. To make recommendations on how to increase knowledge, accessibility, and efficient use of reference management solutions.

2. REVIEWS OF LITERATURE

Istiana & Singh, (2025) wanted to see how graduate students at Gadjah Mada University use reference management software. They found out that Mendeley and Zotero are the reference

management systems. This is because Mendeley and Zotero are available for free and work on platforms. The people who did the study think that graduate students should use reference management tools when they do research. This will help graduate students to really use what they know about reference management software in their schoolwork. They believe that using reference management tools, like Mendeley and Zotero will help graduate students do better in school. Kishore et al., (2026) conducted study looked on the level of awareness and frequency of usage of reference management systems among social science PhD academics at selected Bihar universities. The most well recognized and utilized tools were Mendeley and Zotero, mostly for citation generating. (Jegan & Balasubramanian, 2024) investigated the attitudes and usage patterns of reference management software among 250 faculty members and research researchers from institutions across Tamil Nadu. It was shown that 90% of respondents knew about reference management software with 70% using it. Researchers in science mostly used Mendeley and APA style while those in humanities preferred Zotero and MLA style. Kavitha & Sathya, (2024) looked into how aware and how much Periyar University research academics used Reference Management Software (RMS). They considered 95 research scientists for their study. The survey found that these research scientists were very aware of using RMS. Williams & Woods, (2024) studied how students, researchers and academic staff at the University of Huddersfield handled reference management. They used a mix of methods to see how these groups cited and used reference management software in their work. Panda, (2023) compared five reference management tools: EndNote, Mendeley and Zotero. The study found that all tools were good at automating citations and references. People used them differently based on what they could do. Borah et al., (2022) looked at how aware and how much research scholars at institutions, in Assam used Reference Management Software (RMS). These tools are also helpful for rearranging, restyling and reformatting references in publications. Mendeley and Zotero are popular among researchers because they are free and easy to use. A survey by Singh et al. (2022) found that researchers in North India mostly use Mendeley and Zotero to organize their references and track citations when working on research projects. Researchers use RMS tools to keep track of their sources and format their references correctly. The study by Saxena & Kaushik, (2022) showed that RMS tools like Mendeley and Zotero are useful for researchers. Mendeley and Zotero help researchers to manage their references and citations. Universities must provide training on RMS tools to help researchers use them effectively. Researchers need to learn how to use RMS tools, like Mendeley, Zotero and EndNote.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study looked at what faculty members and research scholars know about Reference Management Software. How they use it at some universities in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. The universities that took part in the study are Yogi Vemana University, Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning Sri Venkateswara University and Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education. The people in the study were faculty members and research scholars from different subjects like social sciences and humanities and pure sciences and engineering and technology, at these universities. Reference Management Software is what the study focused on to see how faculty members and research scholars use Reference Management Software.

A questionnaire was created using Google Forms (<https://forms.gle/iQpZFWjKbN6Dt5iF7>) to collect data. The questionnaire had sections on demographics, knowledge of RMS tools, how often RMS tools are used, goals of using RMS, challenges faced, views on RMS. The questionnaire link was shared in February and March 2026 via email and WhatsApp groups. It was shared with people who do research and write scholarly papers. The goal was to get responses from these people. The online questionnaire got 210 responses. After checking for mistakes, duplicates and incomplete answers 174 responses were used for analysis. To understand the data statistical methods were used, such as percentage analysis, Chi-square test, Cramer's V. These methods helped find relationships, between variables and types of responders. RMS tools were looked at in the study. The study analysed RMS. The study investigated RMS tools.

4. DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Gender-wise distribution of respondents

Gender	Faculty members	Research Scholars	Total
Male	43 (24.71)	57 (32.75)	100 (57.47)
Female	32 (18.39)	42 (24.13)	74 (42.52)
Total	75 (43.10)	99 (56.89)	174 (100.00)
$\chi^2 = .001^a$, DF = 1 Significance = 0.974 Cramer's V = 0.002			

(parenthesis indicates the value)

The distribution of responders by gender is displayed in Table 1. Of the 174 responders, 74 (42.52%) are female and 100 (57.47%) are male. There is no statistically significant correlation

between respondent category and gender, according to the chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 0.001$, $p = 0.974$). Additionally, the Cramer's V value of 0.002 indicates a very weak degree of correlation. This demonstrates that the distribution of research researchers and faculty members in the study is unaffected by gender.

Table 2: Discipline-wise responder

Discipline	Faculty members	Research Scholars	Total
Engineering & Technology	6 (3.44)	8 (4.59)	14 (8.04)
Pure Science	10 (5.74)	11 (6.32)	21 (12.06)
Social Science	44 (25.28)	54 (31.03)	98 (56.32)
Humanities	12 (6.89)	21 (12.06)	33 (18.96)
Others	3 (1.72)	5 (2.87)	8 (4.59)
Total	75 (43.10)	99 (56.89)	174 (100.00)
$\chi^2 = 1.017^a$, DF = 4, Significance = 0.907, Cramer's V = 0.076			

(parenthesis indicates the value)

The majority of responders (56.32%) are in the social sciences, followed by the humanities (18.96%) and pure sciences (12.06%), according to Table 2. Others (4.59%) and Engineering & Technology (8.04%) make up a lower percentage. There is no significant correlation between discipline and responder category, according to the chi-square test ($\chi^2 = 1.017$, $p = 0.907$). A weak relationship is further supported by the low Cramer's V value (0.076). This implies that research scientists and faculty members are reasonably evenly represented across fields.

Table 3: Research & Teaching Experience

No. of Years	Faculty members	Research Scholars	Total
Below 5 Years	16 (9.19)	83 (47.70)	99 (56.89)
5 - 10 Years	12 (6.89)	11 (6.32)	23 (13.21)
10 – 15 Years	27 (15.51)	4 (2.29)	31 (17.81)
> 15 Years	20 (11.49)	1 (0.6)	21 (12.06)
Total	75 (43.10)	99 (56.89)	174 (100.00)
$\chi^2 = 77.812^a$, DF = 3, Significance = 0.000, Cramer's V = 0.669			

(parenthesis indicates the value)

Table 3 depicts the number of years' experience in teaching and research of the respondents. The data reveals that the majority of respondents (56.89%) have less than 5 years of experience, mostly research scholars. Faculty members are more represented in higher experience in the 10–15 years' category (17.81%). The chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 77.812$, $p = 0.000$) indicates a highly significant association between experience and category. The strong Cramer's V value (0.669) suggests a substantial relationship, confirming that experience levels differ significantly between faculty members and research scholars.

Table 4: Category-wise familiarity with Reference Management Software / Tools

Category	Yes	No	Not Sure	Total
Faculty members	58 (33.33)	10 (5.74)	7 (4.02)	75 (43.10)
Research Scholars	53 (30.45)	23 (13.21)	23 (13.21)	99 (56.89)
Total	111 (63.79)	33 (18.96)	30 (17.24)	174 (100.00)
$\chi^2 = 10.774^a$, DF = 2, Significance = 0.005, Cramer's V = 0.249				
(parenthesis indicates the value)				

Table 4 indicates that 63.79% of respondents are familiar with Reference Management Software (RMS) tools, while 18.96% are not familiar and 17.24% are uncertain. Faculty members show higher familiarity (33.33%) compared to research scholars (30.45%). The chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 10.774$, $p = 0.005$) demonstrates a statistically significant association between category and familiarity. The Cramer's V (0.249) indicates a moderate association, suggesting that faculty members are relatively more aware of RMS tools than research scholars.

Table 5: Awareness of Reference Management Software (RMS)

Awareness of RMS	Faculty Members N = 75					Research Scholars N=99					Total N=174				
	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA
I am aware of RMS tools	3 (1.72)	1 (0.57)	5 (2.87)	27 (15.51)	39 (22.41)	11 (6.32)	5 (2.87)	18 (10.34)	29 (16.66)	36 (20.68)	14 (8.04)	6 (3.44)	23 (13.21)	56 (32.18)	75 (43.10)
	$\chi^2 = 11.689^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.020				
											Cramer's V = 0.259				
I know the different features available in RMS	5 (2.87)	3 (1.72)	8 (4.59)	28 (16.09)	31 (17.81)	12 (6.89)	12 (6.89)	25 (14.369)	23 (13.21)	27 (15.51)	17 (9.77)	15 (8.62)	33 (18.96)	51 (29.31)	58 (33.33)
	$\chi^2 = 14.777^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.005				
											Cramer's V = 0.291				
I learned about RMS through workshops or training programs	8 (4.59)	4 (2.29)	11 (6.32)	27 (15.51)	25 (14.36)	18 (10.34)	15 (8.62)	17 (9.77)	23 (13.21)	26 (14.94)	26 (14.94)	19 (10.91)	28 (16.09)	50 (28.73)	51 (29.31)
	$\chi^2 = 8.695^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.069				
											Cramer's V = 0.224				
MY institute / University promotes the use of RMS	2 (1.14)	2 (1.14)	23 (13.21)	32 (18.39)	16 (9.19)	8 (4.59)	5 (2.87)	27 (15.51)	30 (17.24)	29 (16.66)	10 (5.74)	7 (4.02)	50 (28.73)	62 (35.63)	45 (25.86)
	$\chi^2 = 5.826^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.213				
											Cramer's V = 0.183				

SD (Strongly Disagree) D (Disagree) N (Neutral) A (Agree) SA (Strongly agree)

Table 5 reveals the information on the awareness of Reference Management Software (RMS), majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that they are aware of RMS tools. Significant associations are observed in variables such as awareness of RMS ($p = 0.020$) and knowledge of features ($p = 0.005$), indicating that awareness levels differ between faculty and research scholars. However, learning through workshops ($p = 0.069$) and institutional promotion ($p = 0.213$) are not statistically significant. The results suggest that while general awareness is high, institutional efforts may not be uniformly effective.

Table 6: Usage of Reference Management Software (RMS)

Usage of RMS	Faculty Members N = 75					Research Scholars N=99					Total N=174				
	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA
I regularly use RMS for my research work	4 (2.29)	4 (2.29)	18 (10.34)	34 (19.54)	15 (8.62)	14 (8.04)	6 (2.87)	34 (19.54)	26 (14.94)	19 (10.91)	18 (10.34)	10 (5.74)	52 (29.88)	60 (34.48)	34 (19.54)
	$\chi^2 = 9.282^a$					DF = 4	Significance = 0.054				Cramer's V = 0.231				
I use RMS to organise research articles & documents	4 (2.29)	6 (3.44)	9 (5.17)	33 (18.96)	23 (13.21)	14 (8.04)	7 (4.02)	24 (13.79)	32 (18.39)	22 (12.64)	18 (10.34)	13 (7.47)	33 (18.96)	65 (37.35)	45 (25.86)
	$\chi^2 = 9.356^a$					DF = 4	Significance = 0.053				Cramer's V = 0.232				
I use RMS while writing research papers, thesis etc	3 (1.72)	5 (2.87)	8 (4.59)	31 (17.81)	28 (16.09)	13 (7.47)	7 (4.02)	25 (14.36)	32 (18.39)	22 (12.64)	16 (9.19)	12 (6.89)	33 (18.96)	63 (36.20)	50 (28.73)
	$\chi^2 = 13.014^a$					DF = 4	Significance = 0.011				Cramer's V = 0.274				
I find RMS easy to use	3 (1.72)	4 (2.29)	12 (6.89)	30 (17.24)	26 (14.94)	10 (5.74)	8 (4.59)	31 (17.81)	19 (10.91)	31 (17.81)	13 (7.47)	12 (6.89)	43 (24.71)	49 (28.16)	57 (32.75)
	$\chi^2 = 13.350^a$					DF = 4	Significance = 0.010				Cramer's V = 0.277				
I prefer using RMS over manual referencing	3 (1.72)	5 (2.87)	15 (8.62)	26 (14.94)	26 (14.94)	11 (6.32)	8 (4.59)	23 (13.21)	34 (19.54)	23 (13.21)	14 (8.04)	13 (7.47)	38 (21.83)	60 (34.48)	49 (28.16)
	$\chi^2 = 4.983^a$					DF = 4	Significance = 0.289				Cramer's V = 0.169				
SD (Strongly Disagree) D (Disagree) N (Neutral) A (Agree) SA (Strongly agree)															

According to Table 6, there is a moderate level of agreement among respondents about the use of Reference Management Software (RMS) for research, document organization, and paper authoring. RMS usage for research paper writing ($p = 0.011$) and simplicity of use ($p = 0.010$) show significant relationships, suggesting variations between scholars and instructors. Regular usage ($p = 0.054$) and preference for manual referencing ($p = 0.289$), however, do not reach statistical significance. This implies that while RMS is used, not everyone uses it consistently and preferentially.

Table 7: Purpose of using Reference Management Software (RMS)

Purpose	Faculty Members N = 75					Research Scholars N=99					Total N=174				
	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA
I use RMS to save and manage references efficiently	3 (1.7 2)	7 (4.02)	20 (11.49)	25 (14.36)	20 (11.49)	10 (5.74)	10 (5.74)	37 (21.26)	21 (12.06)	21 (12.06)	13 (7.47)	17 (9.77)	57 (32.75)	46 (26.43)	41 (21.56)
	$\chi^2 = 6.555^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.161				
It helps me generate citations and bibliographies automatically	2 (1.1 4)	5 (2.87)	15 (8.62)	26 (14.94)	27 (15.51)	9 (5.17)	7 (4.02)	33 (18.96)	27 (15.51)	23 (13.21)	11 (6.32)	12 (6.89)	48 (27.58)	53 (30.45)	50 (28.73)
	$\chi^2 = 8.733^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.068				
It improves the accuracy of citations in my research work	2 (1.1 4)	2 (1.14)	15 (8.62)	28 (16.09)	28 (16.09)	9 (5.17)	6 (3.44)	30 (17.24)	33 (18.96)	21 (12.06)	11 (6.32)	8 (4.59)	45 (25.86)	61 (35.05)	49 (28.16)
	$\chi^2 = 9.739^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.045				
It saves time during manuscript preparation	2 (1.1 4)	2 (1.14)	16 (9.19)	28 (16.09)	27 (15.51)	9 (5.17)	5 (2.87)	27 (15.51)	28 (16.09)	30 (17.24)	11 (6.32)	7 (4.02)	43 (24.71)	56 (32.18)	57 (32.75)
	$\chi^2 = 5.507^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.239				
It supports collaboration with other researchers	4 (2.2 9)	5 (2.87)	18 (10.34)	27 (15.51)	21 (12.06)	9 (5.17)	8 (4.59)	40 (22.98)	24 (13.79)	18 (10.34)	13 (7.47)	13 (7.47)	58 (33.33)	51 (29.31)	39 (22.41)
	$\chi^2 = 8.213^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.084				

SD (Strongly Disagree) D (Disagree) N (Neutral) A (Agree) SA (Strongly agree)

Table 7 shows a purpose-wise analysis shows that respondents generally agree that RMS helps in managing references, generating citations, and improving accuracy. A statistically significant association is found only for improving citation accuracy ($p = 0.045$). Other factors such as time-

saving and collaboration do not show significant differences. This indicates that RMS is primarily valued for enhancing citation precision rather than collaborative or efficiency aspects.

Table 8: Difficulties in accessing and using Reference Management Software (RMS)

Difficulties	Faculty Members N = 75					Research Scholars N=99					Total N=174				
	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA
I find it difficult to learn how to use RMS	7 (4.02)	21 (12.06)	30 (17.24)	13 (7.47)	4 (2.29)	10 (5.74)	23 (13.21)	47 (27.01)	16 (9.19)	3 (1.72)	17 (9.77)	44 (25.28)	77 (44.25)	29 (16.66)	7 (4.02)
	$\chi^2 = 1.546^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.818				
Lack of training is a major barrier to using RMS	5 (2.87)	10 (5.74)	23 (13.21)	26 (14.94)	11 (6.32)	7 (4.02)	17 (9.77)	42 (24.13)	22 (12.64)	11 (6.32)	12 (6.89)	27 (15.51)	65 (37.35)	48 (27.58)	22 (12.64)
	$\chi^2 = 4.814^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.307				
Technical usage (Software errors, syncing problems, etc.) discourage me using RMS	4 (2.29)	13 (7.47)	27 (15.51)	27 (15.51)	4 (2.29)	7 (4.02)	15 (8.62)	47 (27.01)	20 (11.49)	10 (5.74)	11 (6.32)	28 (16.09)	74 (42.52)	47 (27.01)	14 (8.04)
	$\chi^2 = 6.799^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.147				
Compatibility usage with word processors create difficulties	4 (2.29)	13 (7.47)	22 (12.64)	29 (16.66)	7 (4.02)	6 (3.44)	14 (8.04)	48 (27.58)	20 (11.49)	11 (6.32)	10 (5.74)	27 (15.51)	70 (40.22)	49 (28.16)	18 (10.34)
	$\chi^2 = 9.507^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.050				
Limited institutional support effect my use of RMS	4 (2.29)	11 (6.32)	34 (19.54)	14 (8.04)	12 (6.89)	11 (6.32)	15 (8.62)	44 (25.28)	20 (11.49)	9 (5.17)	15 (8.62)	26 (14.94)	78 (44.82)	34 (19.54)	21 (12.06)
	$\chi^2 = 3.406^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.492				
Paid versions are subscription costs that limit my use of RMS	2 (1.14)	10 (5.74)	23 (13.21)	30 (17.24)	10 (5.74)	7 (4.02)	8 (4.59)	43 (24.71)	23 (13.21)	18 (10.34)	9 (5.17)	18 (10.34)	66 (37.93)	53 (30.45)	28 (16.09)
	$\chi^2 = 9.134^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.058				
											Cramer's V = 0.229				

SD (Strongly Disagree) D (Disagree) N (Neutral) A (Agree) SA (Strongly agree)

The results of Table 8 show that respondents deal with moderate difficulties such inadequate training, technical difficulties, and compatibility issues. With the exception of word processor compatibility problems ($p = 0.050$), which is marginally significant, the majority of factors do not exhibit statistical significance. The generally low Cramer's V values point to weak correlations, suggesting that challenges are typically encountered in both groups with little variation.

Table: 9 Overall perception of Reference Management Software (RMS)

Over all perception	Faculty Members N = 75					Research Scholars N=99					Total N=174								
	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA	SD	D	N	D	SA				
RMS is essential for academic research	2 (1.14)	0 (0.00)	7 (4.02)	24 (13.79)	42 (24.13)	3 (1.72)	2 (1.14)	20 (11.49)	26 (14.94)	48 (27.58)	5 (2.87)	2 (1.14)	27 (15.51)	50 (28.73)	90 (51.72)				
	$\chi^2 = 5.738^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.220					Cramer's V = 0.182			
I would recommended RMS to others scholars and faculty members	2 (1.14)	0 (0.00)	6 (3.44)	27 (15.51)	40 (22.98)	4 (2.29)	2 (1.14)	18 (10.34)	25 (14.36)	50 (28.73)	6 (3.44)	2 (1.14)	24 (13.79)	52 (29.88)	90 (51.72)				
	$\chi^2 = 6.671^a$					DF = 4					Significance = 0.154					Cramer's V = 0.196			
SD (Strongly Disagree) D (Disagree) N (Neutral) A (Agree) SA (Strongly agree)																			

SD (Strongly Disagree) D (Disagree) N (Neutral) A (Agree) SA (Strongly agree)

The majority of respondents agreed that RMS is crucial for academic research and recommended it to others, as seen in Table 9, which illustrates the generally positive opinion. However, there is no discernible difference between research scholars and faculty members, according to the chi-square data ($p > 0.05$). This suggests that both groups have a consistent favourable opinion of RMS's significance and use.

5. DISCUSSION

The current study looked at faculty members and research scholars from a few Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu institutions' knowledge, use, and difficulties with reference management software (RMS). The results show that RMS technologies are being used more frequently in academic and research settings. Research scholars made up a larger percentage of the overall respondents (56.89) than faculty members (43.10), suggesting that younger scholars and researchers rely more and more on digital technologies for academic writing and citation management. Similar findings were documented by Borah et al. (2022), who discovered that research academics at particular Assamese institutions were growing more conscious of RMS methods for organizing references and preventing plagiarism. The study found that 63.79 percent of the people in the study knew how to use RMS programs like Mendeley and Zotero and EndNote. Faculty members knew more about these RMS programs than the research people did. The type of person being. How much they knew about RMS programs were connected in a big way. This is what other people found out too. For example Kavitha and Sathya (2024) that the academics who do research at Periyar University know a lot, about RMS applications. Jegan & Balasubramanian, (2024) that a lot of academics and faculty members know about RMS tools because they are easy to use and people can get to them easily Mendeley and Zotero. The results also show that Reference Management System (RMS) tools help to save time when preparing papers make citations more accurate keep references organized and automatically create citations. RMS tools are used a lot in research articles and theses. It seems this usage is really growing in academic writing. These findings match what Saxena and Kaushik (2022). They said RMS tools make it easier to format citations and reduce mistakes when citing references in papers. RMS tools are useful for managing references and getting more done in research. As, (Panda, 2023) these tools are really good for handling bibliographies and improving how productive researchers are. The usage of RMS tools, in research is becoming more common. Individuals think well of RMS. There are some problems with it. For example people do not get formal training they have technical difficulties and they have trouble with the software working together. They also have problems with the word processor. The study found out that having training programs and the university promoting RMS does not make a big difference in how much people use RMS. This is similar to what Williams and Woods (2024). They said that universities and libraries are important, in helping people use RMS. To get more people to use RMS, universities and libraries should have workshops and training sessions to teach people how to use RMS for research and writing papers.

6. CONCLUSION

According to a poll many research academics do not use Reference Management Software (RMS) effectively even though they know about it. This shows that organizations need to provide training on RMS. Academic libraries can help by organizing seminars creating learning materials and offering technical support. They can also encourage researchers to use RMS by including it in research method courses and requiring its use when preparing theses. Faculty members can guide researchers on how to use RMS. Universities should have rules that promote RMS as a standard tool for academic work. Special support systems are needed to solve problems with RMS. Introducing RMS to postgraduate students can improve their research efficiency in the long run. The statistics also show that RMS helps improve the quality of research and the accuracy of citations. In short universities need to work with libraries and administrators to provide policy support, training and help to make the most of RMS. The goal is to help academics, library staff and university administrators work together to teach students how to use reference management tools. This way students can properly credit authors work in their writing. As a result, they will not be accused of plagiarism and academic fraud. Researchers, academics and library staff must collaborate to increase awareness of reference management tools. Effective use of RMS requires effort from all parties involved. Universities should make RMS a priority to improve research quality. By doing they can ensure that researchers use RMS to its full potential. Reference Management Software is a tool for researchers to manage their sources. Academic libraries play a role in promoting RMS. They can provide the support to help researchers use RMS effectively. In conclusion RMS is essential, for high-quality research. Its effective use can be achieved through cooperation and proper support.

REFERENCE

- Borah, J., Hussain, I., Saikia, D., & Nath, H. (2022). *Use and Awareness of Reference Management Software among the research scholars of the Selected University of Assam*. 13(7), 7385–7392. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S07.889>
- Inbox (83)—Reachpandurangaswamy@gmail.com—Gmail. (n.d.). Retrieved May 16, 2026, from <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/2/#inbox>
- Istiana, P., & Singh, S. (2025). Use of Reference Management Software by Graduate Students: A Case Study at Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Librarianship*, 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.33701/ijolib.v6i2.5313>
- Jegan, M. S., & Balasubramanian, P. (2024). *Reference Management Tools And Referencing Styles A Study On Perception And Usage Among Faculty Members And Research*

- Scholars Of University In Tamilnadu.* 30(11), 87-93.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i11.8360>
- Jisc, & Open University. (2010). *Telstar (Technology enhanced learning supporting Students to achieve Academic Rigour).* Open University.
<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/institutionalinnovation/telstar.aspx>
<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/institutionalinnovation/telstar.aspx> (2010)
- KARE. (2026, May 16). *Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education.*
<https://www.kalasalingam.ac.in/>
- Kavitha, E. S., & Sathya, K. (2024). Awareness About the Use of Reference Management Tools among the Research Scholars in Periyar University: A Survey. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(6), 30004.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i06.30004>
- Kishore, A., Kumari, S., & Singh, A. K. (2026). Awareness and utilisation of Reference Management Tools among the Social Science Research Scholars in selected Universities of Bihar, India. *IASLIC Bulletin.*, 70(1), 25–34.
<https://www.iaslic1955.org.in/fckeditor/userfiles/file/IASLIC%20Bulletin%20March%202025%20abstract%20Book.pdf>
- Lonergan, N. (2017). Reference management software preferences among liberal arts faculty. *Reference Services Review*, 45(4), 584–595. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-06-2017-0024>
- Panda, S. (2023). *Reference Management Software for Assisting Researchers: A Comparative Analysis of Usage and Usability.* Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7898059>
- RMS. (2026, May 16). *Reference Management software.*
- Saxena, R., & Kaushik, J. S. (2022). Referencing Made Easy: Reference Management Softwares. *Indian Pediatrics*, 59(3), 245–249. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-022-2478-5>
- Singh, A. K., Mahawar, K. L., & Singh, V. (2022). *Use and awariness of Reference Management Softwares as among the research scholars and awareness of reference management software among the research scholars of Central Universities in North India: A survey.* 58(2), 112-121.
<https://journal.ilaindia.net/index.php/lib/article/view/412>
- SSSIHL. (2026, May 15). Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning. *Sri Sathya Sai Institute of Higher Learning (SSSIHL).* <https://www.sssihl.edu.in/>
- SVU. (2026, May 16). *Sri Venkateswara University* [<https://svuniversity.edu.in/>].
<https://svuniversity.edu.in/>
- Williams, L., & Woods, L. (2024). Reference management practices of students, researchers, and academic staff. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 50(3), 102879.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2024.102879>
- YVU. (2026, May 16). *Yogi Vemana University (YVU), Kadapa | Official Website.*
<https://yvu.edu.in/>