Table 1
Department wise Distribution of the sample population

| Sl. No. | Name of Department | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Bengali | 9 | 11.54 |
| 2 | Botany | 7 | 8.97 |
| 3 | Business Management | 3 | 3.85 |
| 4 | Commerce | 1 | 1.28 |
| 5 | Economics | 3 | 3.85 |
| 6 | Education | 1 | 1.28 |
| 7 | English | 4 | 5.13 |
| 8 | Fine Arts | 3 | 3.85 |
| 9 | Forestry \& Biodiversity | 7 | 8.97 |
| 10 | History | 2 | 2.56 |
| 11 | Information Technology | 2 | 2.56 |
| 12 | Journalism \& Mass Communication | 1 | 1.28 |
| 13 | Kokborok | 2 | 2.56 |
| 14 | Law | 2 | 2.56 |
| 15 | Library \& Information Science | 4 | 5.13 |
| 16 | Linguistics \& Tribal Languages | 1 | 1.28 |
| 17 | Mathematic | 1 | 1.28 |
| 18 | Pharmacy | 4 | 5.13 |
| 19 | Philosophy | 4 | 5.13 |
| 20 | Physical Education | 2 | 2.56 |
| 21 | Political Science | 4 | 5.13 |
| 22 | Psychology | 6 | 7.69 |
| 23 | Rural Studies | 1 | 1.28 |
| 24 | Sociology | 1 | 1.28 |
| 25 | Statistics | 1 | 1.28 |
| 26 | Tribal \& Ethnic Studies | 2 | 2.56 |
|  |  | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |  |



Figure 1 Designation wise distribution of sample population

Table 2: Gender wise data

| Sl. No. | Gender | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Male | 49 | 62.82 |
| 2 | Female | 29 | 37.18 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |

Table 3: Awareness of Open Access publishing wise distribution

| S. No. | Response | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Yes | 69 | 88.46 |
| 2 | No | 9 | 11.54 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |

Table 4: Usage of Open Access journal wise distribution

| Sl. No. | Response | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Yes | 65 | 83.33 |
| 2 | No | 13 | 16.67 |
| Total |  |  | $\mathbf{7 8}$ |



Figure 2 Preference of type of journal articles wise data


Figure 3: Perception regarding reception of more citations by OA articles
Table 5: Reason for Preference of reading open access articles wise data

| S. No. | Response | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Accessible from anywhere | 29 | 38.16 |
| 2 | Freely available | 26 | 34.21 |
| 3 | I support open access publishing | 11 | 14.47 |
| 4 | I am unaware of the resources subscribed by the <br> university library | 5 | 6.58 |
| 5 | Freely available <br> and accessible from anywhere | 3 | 3.95 |
| 6 | Freely available , accessible from anywhere and <br> I support open access publishing | 1 | 1.32 |
| Freely available, the resources subscribed by the <br> university library, accessible from anywhere and <br> I support open access publishing | 1 | 1.32 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |  |

Table 6: Reason for not selecting Open Access journals wise data

| Sl. No. | Reason | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Not always peer reviewed | 15 | 25.00 |
| 2 | Lack of Reliability | 7 | 11.67 |
| 3 | Lack of Awareness | 6 | 10.00 |
| 4 | Lack of Reliability \& Not always peer reviewed | 5 | 8.33 |
| 5 | Other | 5 | 8.33 |
| 6 |  <br> Not always peer reviewed | 4 | 6.67 |
| 7 | Lack of Reliability \& Lack of Quality | 4 | 6.67 |
| 8 | Lack of high Standard | 3 | 5 |
| 9 | Lack of Quality | 2 | 3.33 |
| 10 | Lack of Awareness \& Not always peer reviewed | 1 | 3.33 |
| 11 | Lack of Reliability \& Lack of high Standard | 1.67 |  |
| 12 | Lack of Reliability, Lack of Quality \& Not always peer <br> reviewed | 1 | 1.67 |
| 13 | Lack of Reliability, Lack of Awareness \& Not always peer <br> reviewed | 1 | 1.67 |
| 14 | Lack of high Standard, Lack of Quality \& Not always peer <br> reviewed | 1 | 1.67 |
| 15 | Lack of Quality \& Lack of Awareness | 1 | 1.67 |
| 16 | Lack of Awareness \& Researchers not able to publish <br> elsewhere publish in Open Access journals | 1 | 1.67 |
| 17 | Researchers not able to publish elsewhere publish in Open <br> Access journals | 1 | 1.67 |
| 18 | No reason for not selection | 18 | 23.07 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |



Figure 4: Perception regarding blessing for developing country researchers' wise data

Table 7: Perception regarding ensuring of faster publication of research work wise data

| Sl. No. | Opinion | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Agree | 43 | 55.13 |
| 2 | Neutral | 17 | 21.79 |
| 3 | Strongly agree | 11 | 14.10 |
| 4 | Disagree | 5 | 6.41 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2.56 |
| Total |  |  | $\mathbf{7 8}$ |
| $\mathbf{l}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |  |  |

Table 8: Preference of type of journal for publishing their research wise data

| Sl. No. | Type of journal | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Open Access journal | 43 | 55.84 |
| 2 | Print only Journal | 14 | 18.18 |
| 3 | Subscription based journal | 12 | 15.58 |
| 4 | Open Access journal \& Subscription based <br> journal | 5 | 6.49 |
| 5 | Open Access journal \& Print only Journal | 2 | 2.60 |
| 6 | Open Access journal, Subscription based <br> journal \& Print only Journal | 1 | 1.30 |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |  |

Table 9: Correlation between Gender and awareness of OA

| Sl. No. | Gender | Aware of OA | Total | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | M | 45 | 49 | $91.83 \%$ |
| 2 | F | 24 | 29 | $82.75 \%$ |

