

Awareness on Institutional Repositories-related Issues by Faculty of University of Calcutta

Goutam Dutta and Dibyendu Paul

*Department of Library and Information Science, University of Calcutta, Calcutta-700 073
E-mail: duttagoutamcu@gmail.com; dibyendu.kly@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Academic institutes build the institutional repository (IR) where all the scholarly contents and intellectual output of the host institute are captured, stored, indexed, preserved, and redistributed. Flow of content is the preliminary requirement for development and sustenance and the faculty members are the main source of the flow of content. But low rate of participation of faculty members in IR phenomenon is a major issue for the success of IR. Lack of awareness and confusion about copyright issues are the known barriers in faculty participation in it. This paper reports the results of a survey among selected science and technology faculty members of University of Calcutta covering different aspects of IR. The aspects are mainly the awareness about IR and the willingness to participate in it. This paper also highlighted the perceptions of faculty members regarding current copyright issues especially the issue of dual copyright. The paper concludes that the faculty members' attitudes regarding IR is more or less positive. The IR helps to increase professional visibility. According to the opinion of the faculty members, the copyright issues should be handled by the authority of the institution concerned.

Keywords: IR-awareness, dual copyright, institutional repositories

1. INTRODUCTION

The means of disseminating scholarly content has been greatly expanded through the internet and its capabilities for immediate and broad access to information. The movement towards open access (OA) journals and repositories are prime examples of the way the academies are trying to take advantage of this technology by wider dissemination of research, making it free of charge, and attempting to reduce copyright restrictions. Institutional repository (IR) is able to address the challenges faced by faculty members in attempting to disseminate their research through the internet, and to utilise various forms of digital media for scholarly communication. To design and develop IR, the preliminary requirement is deposition of the contents. The main source of content for any academic IR is the faculty members. To initiate and to sustain an IR, the flow of content submission is very much important. However, it may not be generalised that the potential value of IR is not yet fully appreciated by faculty members. Although very few institutions have their own IR and only a small proportion of faculty members deposit their scholarly content into it. This low rate of faculty participation is a common phenomenon across the world, and it is a major issue for the success of those repositories. It can be assumed that the lack

of awareness about IR and its potential, and many other related issues are the main reasons for this low participation in it. Kim¹ shows that only 40.1 % faculty members of Ewha Womens University, Korea were aware of their university's IR. He also raised two basic research questions to identify the behavioral factors that motivate or hold up the willingness of faculties to contribute scholarly content in IR: (a) Which are the factors that encourage faculty participations or willingness to participate? and (b) Which are the factors hold back faculty contributions or unwillingness to participate? He identified that academic reward, professional recognition, accessibility and publicity are the factors which encourage faculty participations. Additional time, effort, and copyright issues are the factors which hold back the faculty contributions. Same way Abrizah² has shown that only 35.9 % respondents of his survey were aware that of Malaya University initiative to prepare an IR.

The flow of content of any IR, including the sustainability, is depending on the content providers' awareness and their willingness to participate. Allen³ has traced how crucial the development of understanding and the attitudes of academicians in different disciplines in this regard. He has also found that compared to science, technology and medical disciplines, the awareness among humanities academics is low. By reviewing different papers

Grundmann⁴ established that institutional mandate regarding depositing of content in IR is the best way for flow of content.

Pelizzari's⁵ survey results show that 44 % of the respondents of Economics and Law subjects of the University of Brescia, Italy know about the existence of IR. But of those aware of the existence of IR, only 4 % affirmed they had already used them to deposit papers.

There are also lots of works, reveal the unwillingness to participate, like Hey⁶, Thomas & McDonald⁷, and Burn & Wilson⁸. According to their several surveys there are many reasons behind the unwillingness to participate in IR. One of the most important issues in this regard is the copyright.

Traditionally, authors are required to transfer their copyright to journal publishers in return for publication of their works. This is usually the case with commercial journal publishers. Commercial publishing agreement contained among its terms the assignment of copyright to the publisher. Authors were given minimal usage right to their works. The publishing agreement expressly states that the duration of the assignment would be for the full term of the copyright (usually 70 years) plus any extensions or renewals. The problem with this conventional publishing agreement is requiring the assignment of copyright. An alternative publishing agreement⁹ or dual copyright allows the author of a work to grant to the publisher the rights necessary to enable the publisher to publish the work while at the same time allowing the author to retain the copyright to the work. Alternatively, an author could opt to publish his work in an OA journal that permits the author to archive his published work in an open access repository like IR. In this way, the work will be given the widest possible dissemination.

A survey was done recently among the Science and Technology faculty members of the University of Calcutta to understand the attitude and perceptions of them towards any IR and also the awareness of current copyright issues. If it is proposed for the said university, what factors are to be considered regarding faculty members awareness about it and whether they will deposit their scholarly contents to it?

2. OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of this study are to know about:

- The awareness of faculty members about IR
- Their willingness to participate in IR
- Their perception about incentives of IR
- Their awareness about dual copyright or alternative publishing agreement.

3. METHODOLOGY

A descriptive survey method that consists of the structured questionnaire has been adopted in this study for collection of data. Selected faculty members of different departments of the University of Calcutta, scattered in different campuses, have been interviewed.

All 27 Science and Technology departments under two Faculty Councils of Post Graduate Studies of the University of Calcutta have been considered for this survey. The Faculty Council for Post-Graduate studies in Engineering & Technology has 7 departments and the Faculty Council for Post-Graduate studies in Science has 20 departments¹⁰.

There were 314 faculty members in all 27 departments as on June 2013. 15 % (47) of them were selected consisting both the professors and others (like Associate Professors and Assistant Professors) for this survey.

4. ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

4.1 Preferred Channel of Publishing (other than print)

Most of the recognised academic disciplines have their own journals and other outlets for publication, although many academic journals are somewhat interdisciplinary, and publish work under several distinct fields or subfields. There is the evolution from the print to the electronic format and now, academic publishing is undergoing major changes. In this segment, the respondents were asked about their preferred channel of publication of their scholarly contents in other than print mode (Table 1).

Table 1. Preferred channel of publication

Preferred channel	Respondents (%)		
	Professors	Others	Total
Personal website/Blogs	1 (4.16)	2 (8.70)	3 (6.4)
Departmental website	10 (41.67)	4 (17.39)	14 (929.8)
Open access journals	13 (54.17)	17 (73.91)	30 (63.8)
Total	24 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)

It was observed that:

- (a) Most of the respondents don't have personal website, so there are little scopes to prefer it in this regards. Only 3 faculty members had their personal website.
- (b) 10 (41.67 %) professors expressed their preference to publish their research materials in the departmental websites, although most of the departments have no departmental websites.
- (c) Most of the respondent other than the professors (73.91 %, i.e., 17), have mentioned OA journals as their preference to publish their research materials compared to the professors in this

regard (54.17 %, i.e., 13). One reason may be that the other than professors are much more comfortable in handling the electronic mode and networking system as their average age (44 years) is lower than the professors' average age (56 years) (Table 2).

Table 2. Awareness about IR

Response	Respondents (%)		
	Professors	Others	Total
Aware	12 (50)	12 (52.17)	24 (51.06)
Not aware	12 (50)	11 (47.83)	23 (48.94)
Total	24 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)

4.2 Respondents' Awareness about IR

Faculty members' view regarding IR is one of the important factors for establishing it in that organisation. In this prospect the awareness of faculty members regarding IR is also important. It is revealed from Table 2 that the scenario about their awareness is not satisfactory. Just more than 50 % of them are aware about it.

It is further revealed that most of the aware respondents came to aware about it through the internet. Table 3 shows the detail about how the faculty members became aware about IR.

It is revealed from Table 3 that most of the respondents, who are aware are not dependent on librarian or library staffs in this regard. 19 (80 %) faculty members came to know about it through the internet. The percentage of other than professors is much higher than the percentages of professors in the same respect. So the library professionals should take a proactive role in awareness development on it.

Table 3. Medium of awareness about IR

Medium of awareness	Respondents (%)		
	Professors	Others	Total
Internet	66.67	91.67	79.16
Librarian	16.67	8.33	12.5
Journals	8.33	-	4.17
Other	8.33	-	4.17
Total	100	100	100

4.3 Willingness to Participate in IR System

In most of the cases the respondents were found to be confused to contribute their content to the IR of different institutes. There are several reasons for unwillingness to participate in it. One of them is the copyright issue. In this study two types of content were considered, one is post-published or previously-published articles, and another is pre-published or work-in-progress articles and have asked the respondents, which one they preferred most to contribute to IR. The results are displaying in Table 4 and Table 5.

51.06 % faculty members are ready to contribute their post-published articles in the IR, in case their university mandates them to do this. But the same percentage is dropping down (19.15 %) hugely when the question arises for contributing pre-published or work-in-progress articles. They want to publish new contents in any reputed journal first. The percentage of agreed professors (54.17 %) in this regard, is much more, than the other than professors (47.83 %).

Table 4. Willingness to submit post-published articles in the proposed IR

Willing	Respondents (%)		
	Professors	Others	Total
Yes	13 (54.17)	11 (47.83)	24 (51.06)
Not sure	8 (33.33)	8 (34.78)	16 (34.05)
No	3 (12.5)	4 (17.39)	7 (14.89)
Total	24 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)

Table 5. Willingness to submit pre-published articles in the proposed IR

Willing	Respondents (%)		
	Professors	Others	Total
Yes	4 (16.67)	5 (21.74)	9 (19.15)
Not sure	15 (62.5)	5 (21.74)	20 (42.55)
No	5 (20.83)	13 (56.52)	18 (38.30)
Total	24 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)

4.4 Incentives of IR

There are many benefits that IR holds for academic institutions and their faculty members. It provides institutions with the opportunity to collect, store and disseminate institutional intellectual output, bring visibility to the university as well as individual faculty. In this survey option of eight different incentives of IR were given to the respondents. These are:

- It increases professional visibility
- It measures of faculty performance
- It improves scholarly communication
- It is easy to use
- It is a permanent place for scholarly content
- It support class room teaching
- It display intellectual achievement of the institute
- It provide easy access of gray literature

However, the respondents opted for only five such incentives, as mentioned in Table 6.

54.17 % professors and 65.22 % other than professors think the professional visibility as the most important benefit of an IR then came the intellectual achievement of the institute.

Table 6. Incentives of IR according to the respondents

Incentives through IR	Respondents (%)		
	Professors	Others	Total
Increase professional visibility	13 (54.17)	15 (65.22)	28 (59.57)
Display Intellectual achievement of the instt.	5 (20.83)	3 (13.04)	8 (17.02)
Improve scholarly communication	3 (12.50)	3 (13.04)	6 (12.77)
Measure faculty performance	2 (8.33)	2 (8.70)	4 (8.51)
Support class room teaching	1 (4.17)	-	1 (2.13)
Total	24 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)

So it may be concluded that faculty members are very much interested in their professional visibility. The professors and the other than professors are more or less in the same view in these regards.

4.5 Awareness about Dual Copyright or Alternative publishing Agreement

The issues of copyright and dual copyright have already been emphasised. Copyright is the authors control over the content but this right is generally transferred to the publisher with the consent for publication through any publishing channel. Dual copyright at the same time allows the author to retain the copyright to the work. In this survey the awareness about dual copyright issue among the faculty members under study was examined.

According to Table 7 it is revealed that one fourth of respondents were aware about the dual copyright issues. Both the professors and other than professors are more or less on the same level in this regard. Faculties who don't want (or not sure) to contribute their content in IR have fear about copyright issue.

Table 7. Awareness about dual copyright among the faculty members

Dual copyright	Respondents (%)		
	Professors	Others	Total
Aware	5 (20.83)	4 (17.39)	9 (19.15)
Not aware	19 (79.17)	19 (82.61)	38 (80.85)
Total	24 (100)	23 (100)	47 (100)

5. CONCLUSIONS

Faculty's attitude towards IR is generally positive. Regarding the awareness of IR, it was found that half of the respondents are positive. Overall, the findings showed that incentive factors are more influential for participation in IR. Any form of awareness programme in this regard would be beneficial in increasing the interest to participate. Faculty members who are

willing to contribute to the IR in future realised potential benefits they could get in contributing their contents in this regard. The copyright issue is the most influential factors in regard to the unwillingness of the contribution. Most of the faculty respondents are unaware about dual copyright or dual licensing policies of the publishers. According to the faculty members all the copyright issues, including the dual copyright or multi licensing policy should be handled by the University authorities. That is why they are in favour of 'Mediated deposit service model', i.e., the agencies interested in establishment or maintain an IR must prepare an appropriate licensing policy in this regard. There are many IR in action but the licensing policy is in a void situation as far as Indian conditions are concerned.

REFERENCES

1. Kim, J. Motivations of faculty self-archiving in institutional repositories. *J. Acad. Lib.*, 2011, **37**(3). <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0099133311000310/> (accessed on 12 September 2012).
2. Abrizah, A. The cautious faculty: Their awareness and attitudes towards institutional repositories. *Malaysian J. Lib. & Inf. Sci.*, 2009, **14**(2). http://umrefjournal.um.edu.my/filebank/published_article/2392/746.pdf/ (accessed on 15 September 2012).
3. Allen, J. Interdisciplinary differences in attitudes towards deposit in institutional repositories. Manchester Metropolitan University, 2005, UK, Master's Thesis. http://nomgobob2032757.pbworks.com/f/institutional_repository.pdf/ (accessed on 23 November 2012).
4. Grundmann, A. Increasing self-archiving of faculty publications in institutional repositories. *Open Lib. Class J.*, 2009, **1**(2). <http://www.infosherpas.com/ojs/index.php/openandlibraries/article/view/35/51/> (accessed on 12 March 2012).
5. Pelizzari, E. Academic authors and open archives: A survey in the social science field. *Libri*, 2004, **54**, 113-22. www.librijournal.org/pdf/2004-2pp113-122.pdf/ (accessed on 15 December 2012).
6. Hey, J. Targeting academic research with Southampton's institutional repository: E-prints soton' as the university of southampton research repository, 2004, publication: ariadne issue 40. <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue40/hey/intro.html/> (accessed on 12 October 2012).
7. Thomas, C. & McDonald, R.H. Measuring and comparing participation patterns in digital repositories. *D-lib Magazine*, 2007, **13**(9/10). <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september07/mcdonald/09mcdonald.html/> (accessed on 13 March 2012).
8. Burn, K.L. & Wilson, K. Build it and they will come?: Assessing the impact of 'academic-friendly' practices on institutional repository growth at

- southern cross university. Paper presented at Information Online 2009 Conference.
9. Christian, G.E. Issues and challenges to the development of open access institutional repositories in academic and research institutions in nigeria. International Development Research Centre (IDRC), 2008. <http://idl-bnc.idrc.ca/dspace/bitstream/10625/36986/1/127792.pdf/> (accessed on 15 October 2012).
 10. Dutta, G. Study of faculty awareness about institutional digital repository and its related issues in University of Calcutta. Department of Library & Information Science, University of Calcutta, Kolkata, 2012. MPhil Dissertation.

About the Authors

Mr Goutam Dutta is working as a University Research Fellow (URF) in the Department of Library and Information Science, University of Calcutta. He

obtained his MLIS and MPhil (LIS) from University of Calcutta, and MCom from University of Burdwan. Prior to this, he was Assistant Librarian at Pailan College of Management and Technology, Kolkata. He has published many papers in different journals and seminar proceedings.

Dr Dibyendu Paul is working as an Associate Professor (LIS) in the Department of Library and Information Science, University of Calcutta. He has been awarded his PhD on Bibliographic Control. Prior to this, he was Assistant Librarian at Maharaja Sris Chandra College, Kolkata and Assistant Professor (LIS) at University of Kalyani. Besides many articles been published in different journals, he has written two books; one on Bibliographic Control and another on Community Information and E-governance. He has also edited two books on academic library management. His area of interest include: Computer application and database management, bibliographic control, research methodology, user study, user education, etc.