

Challenges in Contributing in Institutional Repository System: A Study

P. Sankar¹ ● E. S. Kavitha²

¹Sree Narayana Guru College, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu

²Department of Library and Information Science, Periyar University, Salem, Tamil Nadu

Email Id: amulsankar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Institutional repository is a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members. This study is a descriptive study in which the sample was elected by means of random sampling. A structured questionnaire designed to collect the data from faculty members who working in the engineering College in Coimbatore. A structured questionnaire was designed with the objectives of willingness to depositing their works in the Institutional repository and challenges faced by the faculty members while their depositing their works in Institutional repository system. 90 samples were collected from faculty members. The study pointed the various challenges faced by the contributors while they depositing their works in the Institutional repository systems.

Keywords: IR, IRS, Institutional Repository System, User study

1. Introduction

The Institutional Repository (IR) is understood as an information system that collects, preserves, disseminates and provides access to the intellectual and academic output of the academic community. Nowadays, the IR is a key tool of the scientific and academic policy of the institution. On the other hand, access to the full text of the digital learning objects makes the repository become a fundamental support tool for teaching and research, whilst at the same time multiplying the institution's visibility in the international community. Within this scenario, it is the university libraries that must lead the implementation of the IRs to enhance the university's educational competitiveness, because of their experience in information management in all its forms and contact with knowledge .

According to Clifford Lynch (2003), Institutional Repository is defined as “a university-based institutional repository is a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members. It is most essentially an organizational commitment to the stewardship of these digital materials, including long-term preservation where appropriate, as well as organization and access or distribution.”

2. Review of Literature

Xia, Jingfeng (2016) stated that when people were happy with the success of mandate policies in digital repositories, it was equally important to carry out quality control over repository content by setting up guidelines for self-archiving and understand how scholars perform self-archiving in and what expectations readers have for a repository.

Tiemo, Pereware Aghwotu (2016) revealed that lecturers' awareness of institutional repository was high and most of the lecturers agreed that if the repository was established in the university it will enable them to deposit their work but this will violate the copy right law. It is recommended that librarians should create more awareness of IR and educate lecturers on the dangers of giving out the copy right of their work out to commercial publishers.

Lagzian, Fatemeh (2015) stated that several of the factors are not fully realised by the institutional repositories despite their relative importance. Institutional repositories are still in development; this study may help to guide their implementation and further development

Gross, Julia (2015) argued that OA publishing will continue to transform scholarship within the arts and humanities, especially through the role of institutional repositories. However, the ongoing training of university researchers and personnel is required to bring into balance their understandings of OA publisher and the demands of the broader Australian and international research environment.

Lee, Jongwook (2015) confirmed the contribution of the IR in making papers available and accessible. The results also reveal some impediments to the success of OA: including impediments linked to contractual arrangements between authors and publishers, impediments linked to policies, practices, and technologies governing the IR itself, and the low level of faculty participation in the IR.

Okhaku Sr, David O (2015) found out that Librarians had a negative perception that lecturers were not fully aware of IR and were not willing to support the project by submitting their intellectual property to the university IR. The study concluded by highlighting the need for librarians to have a positive perception of IR development.

Ogbomo, Esoswo Francisca (2015) concluded that universities should encourage promotional activities geared towards creating awareness of IR which will in turn enhance positive attitude towards IR establishment in universities.

3. Objectives of the study

The study attempted to study the positive perception of the engineering college faculty members towards depositing the works in the Institutional Repositories System. The study aimed to study the perception on various factors of academic parameters to deposit in the Institutional Repositories System.

4. Data Analysis

This study is a descriptive study in which the sample was elected by means of random sampling. A survey was used as a method of collecting the data. The data analysis is descriptive in nature. A structured questionnaire designed to collect the data from Engineering College faculty members working in Coimbatore of South India. Questions were designed to analysis challenges faced by the faculty members while contributing their works in their Institutional repository systems.

Table No. 1: Distribution of the respondents by gender

| Sl. No | Gender | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|--------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Male | 67 | 74.4 |
| 2 | Female | 23 | 25.6 |
| | Total | 90 | 100 |

The table no 1 shows the gender wise distribution of the respondents. It is inferred that majorities (74%) of the respondents were male and 26% of the respondents were female.

Table No. 2: Distribution of the respondents by Age

| Sl. No | Age Group | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|-----------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Below 25 | 9 | 10 |
| 2 | 26-30 | 6 | 6.7 |
| 3 | 31-35 | 19 | 21.1 |
| 4 | 36-40 | 23 | 25.6 |
| 5 | 41-45 | 27 | 30 |
| 6 | Above 45 | 6 | 6.7 |
| | Total | 90 | 100 |

The table no 2 shows the distribution of the respondents by their age. It is clear from the table that majorities (30%) of the respondents were in the age group of 41-45. Around 26% of the respondents were in the age group of 36-40 and 21% of the respondents were in the age group of 31-35. 10% of the respondents were below 25 age. A 7% of the respondents were above 45 age and another 7% of the respondents were in the age group of 26-30.

Table No. 3: Distribution of the respondents by experience

| Sl. No | Experience | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Below 2 | 18 | 20 |
| 2 | 2-4 | 22 | 24.4 |
| 3 | 5-6 | 19 | 21.1 |
| 4 | 7-8 | 10 | 11.1 |
| 5 | 9-10 | 9 | 10 |
| 6 | Above 10 | 12 | 13.3 |
| | Total | 90 | 100 |

The table no 3 shows the experience of the respondents. It is clear that majorities (24%) of the respondents had experience of 2-4 years and around 21% of the respondents had 5-6 years of experience. Around 20% of the respondents had below 2 years of experience and 13% of the respondents had above 10 years of experience. 11% of the respondents had 7-8 years of experience and 10% of the respondents had 9-10 years of experience.

Table No. 4: Willingness to deposit the in the institutional repositories

| Sl. No | Opinion | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|---------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Yes | 52 | 73.2 |
| 2 | No | 19 | 26.8 |
| | Total | 71 | 100 |

The table no 4 shows the willingness to deposit the materials in the institutional repositories. It is noticed that majorities (73%) of the respondents were depositing their works in their institutional repositories and 27% of the respondents were not depositing their works in their institutional repositories.

Table no. 5: Sources to know about institutional repositories

| Sl. No | Sources | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Librarian/ Library Staff | 34 | 37.8 |
| 2 | From colleagues /friends | 17 | 18.9 |
| 3 | From faculty | 13 | 14.4 |
| 4 | Through Internet | 26 | 28.9 |
| | Total | 90 | 100 |

The table no 5 shows the various sources to know about institutional repositories. It is noticed that majorities (38%) of the respondents were aware of institutional repositories from other Librarians and Library Staff. 29% of the respondents were aware of institutional repositories through internet. 19% of the respondents were aware of institutional repositories from colleagues and their friends and 14% of the respondents were aware of institutional repositories from their faculty.

Table no. 6: Types of material are currently/willing in college's digital Repository

| Sl. No | Type of Materials | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Thesis (Full Text) | 66 | 73.3 |
| 2 | Thesis (Abstract) | 36 | 40 |
| 3 | Research articles(Abstract) | 31 | 34.4 |
| 4 | Research Articles | 67 | 74.4 |
| 5 | Dissertations (Full text) | 38 | 42.2 |
| 6 | Books/Book Chapters | 51 | 56.7 |
| 7 | Video, Audio, Images | 27 | 30 |
| 8 | Technical Reports | 39 | 43.3 |
| 9 | Software's | 20 | 22.2 |

The table no 6 shows the type of material are currently / willing in college's digital Repository. It is noticed that majorities (74%) of the respondents were depositing the research articles in their repository and 73% of the respondents were depositing the Full text thesis. 57% of the respondents were depositing books/books chapters. 43% of the respondents were depositing technical reports and 42% of the respondents were depositing

Table no. 7: The awareness level about the Institutional Repositories

| Sl. No | Level of Awareness | No of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | Extremely aware | 32 | 35.6 |
| 2 | Moderately aware | 31 | 34.4 |
| 3 | Somewhat aware | 19 | 21.1 |
| 4 | Slightly aware | 4 | 4.4 |
| 5 | Not at all aware | 4 | 4.4 |
| | Total | 90 | 100 |

The table no 7 shows the awareness level about the Institutional Repositories. It is clear from the table that majorities (36%) of the respondents were extremely aware about the institutional repositories and 34% of the respondents were moderately aware on institutional

repositories. Around 21% of the respondents had somewhat aware about institutional repositories. 4% of the respondents had slightly aware and another 4% of the respondents not at all aware about institutional repositories.

Table No. 8: Respondents’ opinion on challenges to deposit in IR

| Sl. No | Factors | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total |
|--------|--|---|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|-------|
| 1 | Funding | N | 23 | 31 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 90 |
| | | % | 25.56 | 34.44 | 16.67 | 13.33 | 10.00 | 100 |
| 2 | Plagiarism | N | 22 | 18 | 22 | 16 | 12 | 90 |
| | | % | 24.44 | 20.00 | 24.44 | 17.78 | 13.33 | 100 |
| 3 | Maintenance | N | 25 | 17 | 27 | 15 | 6 | 90 |
| | | % | 27.78 | 18.89 | 30.00 | 16.67 | 6.67 | 100 |
| 4 | Copyright issue | N | 26 | 24 | 22 | 12 | 6 | 90 |
| | | % | 28.89 | 26.67 | 24.44 | 13.33 | 6.67 | 100 |
| 5 | Lack of incentive | N | 13 | 25 | 32 | 13 | 7 | 90 |
| | | % | 14.44 | 27.78 | 35.56 | 14.44 | 7.78 | 100 |
| 6 | Lack of will to deposit | N | 13 | 41 | 18 | 12 | 6 | 90 |
| | | % | 14.44 | 45.56 | 20.00 | 13.33 | 6.67 | 100 |
| 7 | No appropriate agreement | N | 10 | 19 | 36 | 19 | 6 | 90 |
| | | % | 11.11 | 21.11 | 40.00 | 21.11 | 6.67 | 100 |
| 8 | Poor IT infrastructure development | N | 17 | 28 | 27 | 12 | 6 | 90 |
| | | % | 18.89 | 31.11 | 30.00 | 13.33 | 6.67 | 100 |
| 9 | Long term commitment of contributors | N | 19 | 35 | 24 | 8 | 4 | 90 |
| | | % | 21.11 | 38.89 | 26.67 | 8.89 | 4.44 | 100 |
| 10 | Lack of understanding of the goals of IR | N | 12 | 23 | 36 | 15 | 4 | 90 |
| | | % | 13.33 | 25.56 | 40.00 | 16.67 | 4.44 | 100 |
| 11 | Lack of understanding among stakeholders | N | 14 | 17 | 47 | 8 | 4 | 90 |
| | | % | 15.56 | 18.89 | 52.22 | 8.89 | 4.44 | 100 |
| 12 | Lack of Administrative attention and support | N | 19 | 39 | 20 | 8 | 4 | 90 |
| | | % | 21.11 | 43.33 | 22.22 | 8.89 | 4.44 | 100 |

The table no 8 shows the respondents opinion on challenges to deposit the works on Institutional Repositories. It is clear from the table that majorities (34%) of the respondents agreed the funding was one the challenge to deposit in Institutional Repositories. Around 26% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 17% of the respondents were in neutral stand in funding problems. 13% of the respondents disagreed and 10% of the respondents were strongly

disagreed about the funding problems in depositing on Institutional Repositories. It is understand that majorities (24%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 20% of them agreed about fear on Plagiarism while depositing on Institutional Repositories. A 20% of the respondents were in neutral stand about Plagiarism. 18% of the respondents were disagreed and 13% of the respondents were strongly disagreed and not worried about the Plagiarism.

It is clear that majorities (30%) of the respondents were in neutral stand and 28% of the respondents were strongly agreed that Maintenance was one the problem of depositing on Institutional Repositories. Around 19% of the respondents were agreed, 17% of the respondents were disagreed and 7% of the respondents were strongly disagreed about the maintenance issue in institutional Repositories. It is understand that majorities (29%) of the respondents were strongly agreed and worried about Copyright issue in depositing on Institutional Repositories. Around 27% of the respondents were agreed and 24% of the respondents were in neutral stand in copyright issue. 21% of the respondents disagreed about the copyright issue in IR. It is clear that majorities (36%) of the respondents were in neutral stand and 28% of the respondents agreed and 14% of the respondents were agreed about Lack of incentive in depositing on Institutional Repositories. 22% of the respondents were disagreed about the lack of incentive in IR.

It is noticed from the table that majorities (46%) of the respondents agreed and 14% of the respondents were strongly agreed about Lack of will to deposit in IR. Around 20% of the respondents were in neutral stand and 20% of the respondents disagreed about lack of willingness to deposit. It is clear from the table that majorities (40%) of the respondents were in neutral stand and 32% of the respondents were agreed about the no appropriate agreement on depositing in IR. 28% of the respondents disagreed about the agreement about IR. It is noticed that majorities (31%) of the respondents agreed and 30% of the respondents were neutral stand about the problem of poor IT infrastructure development in depositing Institutional Repositories. A 19% of the respondents were strongly agreed about the poor IT infrastructure development in the IR. 20% of the respondents were disagreed about the application of IT infrastructure in IR. It is noticed that majorities (39%) of the respondents were agreed and 21% of the respondents were strongly agree about lack of long term commitment of contributors. Around 27% of the respondents were in neutral stand and 13% of the respondents were disagreed about the long term commitment of contributors of IR.

It is clear from the table that majorities (40%) of the respondent were in neutral stand and 26% of the respondents were agreed about lack of understanding of the goals of IR. 21% of the respondents were disagreed and 13% of the respondents were strongly agreed about lack of understanding about the goals of IR. It is noticed that majorities (52%) of the respondents were in neutral stand and 19% of the respondents were agreed about Lack of understanding among stakeholders in depositing of works in IR. 16% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 13% of the respondents were disagree about the lack of understanding among the stakeholders of IR. It is clear from the table that majorities of the respondents were 43% of the respondents were agreed and 21% of the respondents were strongly agree about the lack of Administrative attention and support in IR. Around 22% of the respondents were in neutral stand and 13% of the respondents were disagreeing about lack of administrative attention and support.

5. Conclusions

The growth of institutional repositories has been very remarkable in many developed countries. However, academic and research institutions in many developing countries like India are still battling to overcome many challenging issues in an attempt to make their research outputs openly accessible and available by means of internet technologies like institutional repositories. This research used both primary and secondary sources of information and simple percentage was used to analyse the data for presentation. The study experienced in both conducting this exploratory study and reviewing the related literature leads us to emphasize the twin needs for IRs to be made more apparent to challenges towards depositing of their works in the IR systems. Both contributors and users will benefit from increased attention and considered response to IR users.

6. References

- Crow, R. (2002) The case for institutional repositories: a SPARC position paper. URL: <http://www.arl.org/sparc/IR/ir.html> and www.arl.org/sparc/IR/IR_Final_Release_102.pdf
- Johnson, R. K. (2002) Institutional repositories: partnering with faculty to enhance scholarly communication. D-Lib Magazine, 8(11), Available at: <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november02/johnson/11johnson.html>
- Ukwoma, Scholastica C., Dike, V. W. (2017), Academics' Attitudes toward the Utilization of Institutional Repositories in Nigerian Universities, *Libraries and the Academic*, 17(1), 17-32

- Moseti, Irene (2016) Digital preservation and institutional repositories: case study of universities in Kenya, *Journal of the South African Society of Archivists*, 49,137-154.
- Schwartz, N. R. (2016). Creating an Institutional Repository., *The Christian Librarian*, 59(1), 43-47.
- Tiemo, Pereware Aghwotu (2016) Awareness and Attitude of Lecturers toward Establishing Institutional Repository in Niger Delta University, Bayelsa State, Nigeria, *Information and Knowledge Management*, 6(6), 1-6.
- Xia, J. (2008). A comparison of subject and institutional repositories in self-archiving practices. *The Journal of academic librarianship*, 34(6), 489-495.
- Gross, J., & Ryan, J. C. (2015). Landscapes of Research: Perceptions of Open Access (OA) Publishing in the Arts and Humanities. *Publications*, 3(2), 65-88.
- Lagzian, F., Abrizah, A., & Wee, M. C. (2015). Measuring the gap between perceived importance and actual performance of institutional repositories. *Library & Information Science Research*, 37(2), 147-155.
- Lee, J., Burnett, G., Vandegrift, M., Baeg, J. H., & Morris, R. (2015). Availability and accessibility in an open access institutional repository: a case study. *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal*, 20(1), n1.
- Ogbomo, E. F., & Muokebe, B. O. (2015). Institutional Repositories, as Emerging Initiative in Nigerian University Libraries., *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(1), 1-9.
- Okhakhu, D. O. (2015). Librarians' Perception of Lecturers' Awareness as a Factor Influencing the Development of Institutional Repository in Public Universities in South-West Nigeria
<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/br226ir.pdf>