

INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY IN ACADEMIC COMMUNITY: A CASE STUDY

Dr. Shipra Awasthi

Assistant Librarian
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi

ABSTRACT

This article describes the significant factors important for the authors to contribute in the institutional repository. The academic community will be greatly benefitted with the development of an institutional repository. But the development depends upon the faculty and research scholars, so it becomes a necessity to explore the nature and behavior of faculty and research scholars towards institutional repository.

Key words: Open Access Repositories, Self-Archiving, Institutional Repository, Open Access Initiatives

Cite this Article: Dr. Shipra Awasthi. Institutional Repository in Academic Community: A Case Study. *International Journal of Library & Information Science*, 4(3), 2015, pp. 01-07.

<http://www.iaeme.com/IJLIS/issues.asp?JTypeIJLIS&VType=4&IType=3>

1. INTRODUCTION

In today's era Institutional repositories are becoming an essential component of academic organizations. An institutional repository increases the visibility of scholarly output to the wider community. Planning and strong efforts are required to set up an effective and successful institutional repository. Library is an important element to build up successful IR. Authors are still not involved in the process of self-archiving. Library professionals have to archive the research output produced by them. This is the time when the Govt. has to frame policy for the organizations to include institutional repository in the list of priority. An institutional repository is an important source of information that can communicate the user about the latest developments taking place in their areas of interest.

2. OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of this study are:

- To investigate the knowledge about Open Access Initiatives and use or non-use of Open Access Archives in the academic community.

- To explore under which conditions would, the authors agree to participate in the Institutional Open access Archive Project.
- To analyze authors expectations from the Institutional Open Access Archive.
- To find out different sources that assisted the community in developing the awareness about open access.
- To examine different factors important for the publication.

3. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire method has been used to collect the information from faculty and research scholars. This is the method most frequently used in surveys and case studies to gather the information from the large sample.

4. SCOPE

The scope of this study is confined to the Academic organizations running instructional repositories in India.

Table 1

S.No	Research Organizations	URL
1	Cochin University of Science & Technology	http://www.cusat.ac.in/
2	Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi	http://www.iitd.ac.in/
3	National Institute of Technology, Rourkela	http://www.nitrkl.ac.in/
4	University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad	http://www.uohyd.ac.in/
5	Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi	http://www.ipu.ac.in/

5. LIMITATIONS

Very few respondents from IPU, IITD and UOH, returned the filled in questionnaire. Therefore, the sample is low from the abovementioned organizations.

6. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

6.1. Familiarity with Open Access Initiatives

Table 2

Institutes	Yes		No		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	20	95.2	1	4.7	0	0	21
IITD	4	100	0	0	0	0	4
NITR	51	94.4	3	5.5	0	0	54
IPU	1	100	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	7	100	0	0	0	0	7
Total	138	86.7	20	12.5	1	0.6	87

Table 2 shows that 86.7% respondents agreed that they are well familiar about the concept of open access initiatives and 12.5% respondents are not aware of the same. 0.6% didn't comment about it. The majority of respondents are well acquainted with the open access initiatives. The dearth of awareness regarding the open access

initiatives is not there in the society. Information producers are updated about the wider publicity of the product across the globe.

6.2. Sources of Information

Table 3

Institutes	Literature		Colleagues		Both(a&b)		Don't know		Other		No ans		Not applicable		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	10	42.1	6	31.5	3	15.7	0	0	2	10.5	0	0	0	0	21
IITD	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
NITR	13	24	28	51.8	4	7.4	0	0	6	11.1	0	0	3	5.5	54
IPU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	4	57.1	2	28.5	0	0	0	0	1	14.2	0	0	0	0	7
Total	55	34.5	52	32.7	15	9.4	0	0	17	10.6	2	1.2	19	11.9	87

Table 3 revealed that the sources of information through which the respondents are aware of OAI. 34.5% replied that they received the information through the printed literature. 32.7% responded that they came to know from their peers. 9.4% agreed that both printed material and colleagues played a significant role in informing about the same. 10.6% responded that there are other sources that assisted them. Sources of information are very significant for simplifying any new concept for the welfare of society. There are formal channels and informal channels through which the communities can be benefitted.

6.3 Use of Institutional Repository

Table 4

Institutes	Everyday		Once a week		Approximately every 2 weeks		Once in a month		Only a few times throughout the year		Never		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	1	4.7	3	14.2	4	19	1	4.7	5	23.8	6	29	1	4.7	21
IITD	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	50	1	25	1	25	0	0	4
NITR	7	12.9	10	18.5	9	16.6	10	18.5	14	25.9	1	1.8	3	5.5	54
IPU	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	0	0	1	14.2	1	14.2	2	28.5	1	14.2	2	29	0	0	7
Total	13	8.1	20	12.5	16	10	23	14.4	51	32	25	16	11	6.9	87

Table 4 highlighted 8.1 respondents from various organizations everyday use their institutional repository. 12.5% respondents use only once in a week and 10% respondents use approximately in every two weeks. 51% responded that they use their IR only a few times throughout the year. 25% responded that they never make use of their IR. Institutional repositories are rich sources of information comprising of research output, projects, images, and historic events. But the status is it is under utilized by the users.

6.4. Advantages from the use of IR

Table 5

Institutes	Yes		No		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	7	33.3	9	68	5	23.8	21
IITD	2	50	2	50	0	0	4
NITR	24	44.4	28	52	2	3.7	54
IPU	1	100	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	2	28.5	4	57	1	14.2	7
Total	51	32	89	56	19	11.9	87

Table 5 showed 32% respondents agreed that they have derived the benefits from the use of IR. At the same time, 56% responded that they have never derived any benefit from its use. 11.9% didn't comment anything. A Largege number of respondents didn't agree that use of IR can be beneficial in building research work. Archival of scholarly output in the institutional repository can bring success to the users in different ways.

6.5. Material to be hosted in an Institutional Archive

Table 6

Institutes	Refereed material		Educational		Preprints		Works accepted by a body		Other		All		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	11	31.4	9	25.7	6	17.1	5	14.2	0	0	2	5.7	2	5.7	35
IITD	3	30	3	30	3	30	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
NITR	35	30.7	34	29.8	10	8.7	30	26.3	3	2.6	0	0	2	1.7	114
IPU	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	6	37.5	6	37.5	1	6.2	3	18.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Total	103	31.7	96	29.6	46	14.1	65	20	6	1.8	2	0.6	6	1.8	176

Table 6 showed that 31.7% respondents from different organizations prefer to archive their refereed material in the IR. 29.6% respondents favor to deposit the educational material, and 14.1% chose to deposit the preprints of the published paper. 65% respondents prefer to archive their works accepted by a body and 1.8% respondents chose to archive other material in the institutional repository.

6.6. Nature of preferred repository

Table 7

Institutes	Institutional		Disciplinary		Interdisciplinary		All		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	9	42.8	2	9.5	7	33.3	3	14.2	0	0	21
IITD	0	0	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0	4
NITR	20	37	10	18.5	21	38.8	2	3.7	1	1.8	54
IPU	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	2	22.2	2	22.2	5	55.5	0	0	0	0	9
Total	55	33.5	38	23.1	56	34.1	10	6	5	0	89

Table 7 highlighted that 34.1% respondents preferred to have an interdisciplinary repository. 33.5% respondents favored institutional repository and 23.1% respondents prefer to have a disciplinary or subject repository.

6.7. Administrator of the repository

Table 8

Institutes	Computer Center		Central Library		Other		Both		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	3	14.2	15	71.4	1	4.7	2	9.5	0	0	21
IITD	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
NITR	1	1.8	52	96.2	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	54
IPU	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	4	57.1	2	28.5	1	14.2	0	0	0	0	7
Total	15	9.4	129	81.1	4	2.5	7	4.4	4	2.5	87

Table 8 showed 81.1% respondents consented that central library need to administer the repository. 9.4% responded that the management of the repository should be done by Computer Center. 4.4% agreed that both play an important role for the sustainability of IR.

6.8. Conditions for participating in an Open Access Initiatives

Table 9

Institutes	Unconditional		No alterations		can also be published in journal		Protection from plagiarism		Permanent storage		Inclusion in indexes		Assurance of interoperability		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	6	13	6	13	10	21.7	10	21.7	6	13	6	13	2	4.3	0	0	46
IITD	1	10	0	0	2	20	2	20	1	10	2	20	1	10	1	10	10
NITR	15	12	15	12	24	19.3	21	16.9	14	11.2	16	13	19	15.3	0	0	124
IPU	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	3	15	2	10	4	20	6	30	1	5	4	20	0	0	0	0	20
Total	37	9.1	59	14.5	76	18.7	84	20.7	41	10.1	63	16	42	10.3	3	0.7	201

Table 9 showed that 20.7% responded that they believe that protection of their work from plagiarism is an important condition.18.7% believed that they are keen to participate in open access initiatives but their research output can also be published in journals.16% believed that their scholarly output also be included in the indexing process. 14.5% agreed that their output need not be altered. 10.3% assured their participation provided that model should be interoperable in nature. 9.1% deserves an appreciation as they are eager to contribute unconditionally.

6.9. Willingness to undertake self-archiving

Table 10

Institutes	Yes, willingly		Yes, if supported by the organizers		Need further information		No, prefer someone else to archive		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	8	38	8	38	3	14.2	2	9.5	0	0	21
IITD	2	50	1	25	1	25	0	0	0	0	4
NITR	36	66.6	13	24	0	0	5	9.2	0	0	54
IPU	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	4	57.1	3	42.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Total	77	48.4	49	30.8	10	6.2	19	11.9	4	2.5	87

Respondents from all the organizations agreed that if the conditions they requested have been fulfilled, then they will willingly self-archive their work in an organizations repository. Table 10 showed 48.4% respondents are willing to self-archive their work in the IR. 30.8% respondents also agreed for the same provided they are supported by the administrators. 11.9% responded that they would prefer someone else to archive their work.

6.10. Factors for publication

Table 11

Institutes	Impact Factor		Target audience		Speed of publication		Open access status		All		No ans		Total
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	
CUSAT	9	28.1	9	28.1	9	28.1	2	6.2	2	6.2	1	3.1	32
IITD	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
NITR	41	59.4	12	17.3	12	17.3	4	5.7	0	0	0	0	69
IPU	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UOH	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total	103	45.5	62	27.4	45	19.9	6	2.6	6	2.6	4	1.7	115

Table 11 showed that 45.5% responded that Impact Factor is a chief component while publishing an article. 45% responded that speed of publication is more important for them. 27.4% believed that they publish keeping in view the target audience and 2.6% responded that they ensure to publish in open access venue.

7. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

86.7% respondents are well aware of the concept of open access initiatives. So there is no lack of awareness among the faculty

- Large numbers of respondents conversed that literature is the main source of information.
- 32% respondents communicated that they use the institutional repository only a few times throughout the year.
- 56% respondents agreed that they had never derived any benefit from the use of the institutional repository.

- Large numbers of respondents believed that the refereed material should be deposited in the institutional archive. This picture shows that the respondents are more inclined towards the material that has the authenticity.
- Large numbers of respondents favored the interdisciplinary repository followed by the institutional type of archive. The reason behind this order of preference may be that in interdisciplinary archive users can get the output of their subject and also the inter-related subjects. In institutional archive users can get all the scholarly output of an institution at one place but in disciplinary repository only the research output of a particular subject will be available.
- Majority of the respondents in all the organizations feel that their works can also be published in journals and protected from the plagiarism in order to deposit their works in the an obsolete mode of communication in the scholarly publishing era. Though respondents are using the scholarly mode of communication but the traditional method has not lost its significance
- 48.4% respondents conversed that they are willing to self archive their own work. Few respondents also feel that if the organizers of the repository support them then they agreed to self-archive. The culture of archiving the material on the behalf of the author is very common today.
- The impact factor is a chief component for publishing an article as responded by a majority of respondents. Average numbers of respondents felt that target audience and speed should not be overlooked, as they also play an important role.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kanu A. Nagra' (2012). Building Institutional Repositories in the Academic Libraries. *Community & Junior College Libraries*. Volume 18, Issue 3-4. DOI: 10.1080/02763915.2012.799028
- [2] B. K., Vishala and Bhandi, M. K. (2007). Building Institutional Repository (IR): Role of the <http://ir.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/1944/1438/1/631-640.pdf> (Retrieved on 15.09.2015)
- [3] J. Juliet Gladies and Dr. Vijila Kennedy. Impact of Institutional Environment on Career Success of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal Management*, 6(1), 2015, pp. 129-138.
- [4] S.L.Faisal. Effectiveness of Library Blogs and Social Networks of Kendriya Vidyalaya Pattom: A Case Study. *International Journal of Library & Information Science*, 2(1), 2015, pp. 71-88.
- [5] Dr. P. Muthumari, Dr. N. Tamilselvan. Global Information Literacy in Academic Library. *International Journal of Library & Information Science*, 3(1), 2015, pp. 18-23.
- [6] S.L.Mohammed Sajeer. Technology and Services for Library Automation. *International Journal of Library & Information Science*, 1(1), 2012, pp. 69-89.