

2-2018

A STUDY ON POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS CONTRIBUTION IN INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY SYSTEM AMONG THE FACULTY MEMBERS

Sankar P Mr

Sree Narayana Guru College, amulsankar@gmail.com

Kavitha E S Dr

Department of Library and Information Science, Periyar University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

P, Sankar Mr and E S, Kavitha Dr, "A STUDY ON POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS CONTRIBUTION IN INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY SYSTEM AMONG THE FACULTY MEMBERS" (2018). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1681.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1681>

A STUDY ON POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS CONTRIBUTION IN INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY SYSTEM AMONG THE FACULTY MEMBERS

P. SANKAR

Research Scholar, Department of Library and Information Science, Periyar University, Salem and Librarian, Sree Narayana Guru College, KG Chavai, Coimbatore

Dr. E. S. KAVITHA

Assistant Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, Periyar University, Salem

Abstract:

Each educational institution will define which their potential authors are, depending on the documents that it decides to include in the repository. The study aimed to study the perception on various factors of academic parameters to deposit in the Institutional Repositories System. Majorities of the institutions had institutional repositories and three fourth of the respondents were depositing their works in their institutional repositories. The study noticed that there is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of advocacy, accessibility, altruistic intention and positive impact of self-archiving. It is inferred that among the professional recognition factors, Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing in IR which help to establish priority or prove their ownership of their ideas. Majorities (46%) of the respondents were depositing in IR for retaining their IPR for their works. More number of faculty members were willingness to deposit their works in IR for professional recognition, pre-print culture, university or department action and grant awarding body. It is also noticed that faculty members were depositing their work for their support (Additional time & effort) and monetary incentive.

Keywords: Institutional Repository, IRS

1. Introduction

The institutions of higher education all over the world are experiencing the necessity of managing their education, research and resources in a more effective and open way. By making the research and scientific output easily available, they will support the development of new relationships between the academicians and both national and international research centres. Institutional Repository is an electronic archive of the scientific and scholarly output of an institution, stored in digital format, where search and recovery are allowed for its subsequent national or international use. 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.

1.1 Definition of IR

Crow define IR as (Crow, 2002)“*Provide a critical component in reforming the system of scholarly communication-a component that expands access to research, reasserts control over scholarship by the academy, increases competition and reduces the monopoly power of journals, and brings economic relief and heightened relevance to the institutions and libraries that support them*”. According to Johnson while traditional publishing model limits readership, obscures institutional origin, costs much, the new model implies no monopoly, increase of output, awareness (Johnson, 2002).

2. Review of Literature

Abdelrahman, Omer Hassan (2017) indicated that, in order to enhance the usage of the repository by graduate students, there is a need for more awareness raising and advocacy programmes to be carried out by the library about the repository and its benefits to the academic community of the university. **Bates, Melanie (2016)** explored the rights and rewards associated with the deposit of materials into such repositories. The findings suggested what could be considered to be an ‘ideal’ repository from the contributors’ perspective and also outline many of the concerns expressed by respondents in the survey. **Sandy, H M (2016)** conducted study among U.S.-based repository administrators from the OpenDOAR initiative were surveyed to understand aspects of the quality and creation of their metadata, and how their metadata could improve. The discussion argues that increased strategic staffing will alleviate many perceived issues with metadata quality. **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. **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 and to establish IRs since the lecturers have positive attitudes towards the establishment. **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. **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. **Safdar, Muhammad (2015)** revealed that one third of the respondents came to know about PRR through library staff. The current study is first one in Pakistan of its type in terms of topic as no study has been conducted yet on this national program i.e. PRR. The study focuses on the importance of PRR from the users’ point of view. Problems and users’ satisfaction level with PRR are also discussed in the study.

3. Aim and 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.

3.1 Methodology

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 the Arts & Science and Engineering College faculty members working in Coimbatore of South India. Questions were designed to analysis perception on willing towards depositing the works in Institutional repository system in the areas of advocacy, accessibility, Altruistic intention Positive impact of self-archiving, Professional recognition, Pre-print culture, University or department action, Grant awarding body, Influence of other actors, Preservation, Publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving, Support (Additional time & effort) and Monetary incentive. 90 samples were collected from faculty members.

4. Analysis and Interpretation

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 Designation

Sl. No	Designation	No of Respondents	Percentage
1	Assistant Professor	60	66.7
2	Associate Professor	23	25.6
3	Professor	7	7.8
	Total	90	100

The table no 3 shows the distribution of the respondents by their designation. It is clear from the table that majorities (67%) of the respondents were Assistant Professors. Around 26% of the respondents were Associate Professor and 8% of the respondents were Professors.

Table No: 4
Distribution of the respondents by Type of Institution

Sl. No	Type of Institution	No of Respondents	Percentage
1	Arts and Science	48	53.3
2	Engineering	42	46.7
	Total	90	100

The table no 4 shows the type of institution where the respondents working. It is clear from the table that majorities (53%) of the respondents were working in Arts and Science colleges and 47% of the respondents were working in the Engineering Colleges.

Table No: 5
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 5 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: 6
Distribution of the respondents by educational Qualification

Sl. No	Educational Qualification	No of Respondents	Percentage
1	PG	10	11.1
2	PG with MPhil	21	23.3
3	Phd	42	46.7
4	Pursing Phd	17	18.9
	Total	90	100

The table no 6 shows the educational qualification of the respondents. It is clear that majorities of the respondents had PhD and 23% of the respondents had PG with MPhil. Around 19% of the respondents were pursuing PhD and 11% of the respondents had PG degree.

Table No: 7
Availability of institutional repositories

Sl. No	Availability of Institutional Repositories	No of Respondents	Percentage
1	Yes	71	78.9
2	No	19	21.1
	Total	90	100

The table no 7 shows the Availability of institutional repositories in their respective institutions. It is noticed that majorities (79%) of the respondents' institutions had institutional repositories and remaining 21% of the respondents' institutions not having institutional repositories.

Table No: 8
Depositing 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 8 shows the depositing 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: 9
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 9 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: 10
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 10 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: 11
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 11 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: 12
Advocacy factor to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Supporting the principle of open access	N	23	31	15	12	9	90	2.48	1.28
		%	25.56	34.44	16.67	13.33	10.00	100		
2	Involvement with innovative technology	N	22	18	22	16	12	90	2.76	1.36
		%	24.44	20.00	24.44	17.78	13.33	100		

The table no. 12 shows the advocacy factors of willingness to deposit the works in IR. It is inferred that majorities (60%) of the respondents were depositing in the IR for supporting the principles of open access and majorities (44%) of the respondents was depositing in the IR for involvement with innovative technology.

Table no: 13
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of advocacy

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.615	68.691 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.615

Wilks' Lambda	.385	68.691 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.615
Hotelling's Trace	1.597	68.691 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.615
Roy's Largest Root	1.597	68.691 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.615

The table no 13 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to advocacy. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.615$ indicates that approximately 61% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.615 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of advocacy”**

Table No: 14
Accessibility factor to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Making the work available to anyone from anywhere	N	25	17	27	15	6	90	2.56	1.25
		%	27.78	18.89	30.00	16.67	6.67	100		
2	Making the work available to other students	N	26	24	22	12	6	90	2.42	1.23
		%	28.89	26.67	24.44	13.33	6.67	100		
3	Making the work available to others in the institution	N	13	25	32	13	7	90	2.73	1.12
		%	14.44	27.78	35.56	14.44	7.78	100		

The table no 14 shows the factors of willingness factor of accessibility to deposit their work in IR. It is inferred that among the accessibility factors, majorities (47%) of the respondents were depositing in the IR for making their work available to anyone from anywhere. majorities (56%) of the respondents were willing to deposit in the IR for making their work available to other students and majorities (42%) of the respondents were depositing their working IR for making their work available to others institution.

Table no: 15
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of accessibility

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis is df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.602	64.258 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.602
Wilks' Lambda	.398	64.258 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.602
Hotelling's Trace	1.512	64.258 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.602
Roy's Largest Root	1.512	64.258 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.602

The table no 15 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to accessibility. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.602$ indicates that approximately 60% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.602 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of accessibility.”**

Table No: 16
Altruistic intention factor to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Good way of disseminating the work to the research community and beyond	N	13	41	18	12	6	90	2.52	1.10
		%	14.44	45.56	20.00	13.33	6.67	100		
2	Sharing material with research collaborators	N	10	19	36	19	6	90	2.91	1.07
		%	11.11	21.11	40.00	21.11	6.67	100		

The table no 16 shows altruistic intention factors to deposit the works in IR. It is inferred that among the altruistic intention factors, majorities (60%) of the respondents were willing to deposit in IR, due to giving good way of disseminating the work to the research community and beyond. majorities (32%) of the respondents were depositing their work for sharing materials with other research collaborators.

Table no: 17
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of altruistic intention

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.548	52.204 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.548
Wilks' Lambda	.452	52.204 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.548
Hotelling's Trace	1.214	52.204 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.548
Roy's Largest Root	1.214	52.204 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.548

The table no 17 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to altruistic intention. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.548$ indicates that approximately 55% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.548 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative

hypothesis is being “There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of altruistic intention”

Table No: 18
Positive impact of self-archiving factor to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Helpful for gathering information about the work for career purposes	N	17	28	27	12	6	90	2.58	1.14
		%	18.89	31.11	30.00	13.33	6.67	100		
2	Advantage of added services such as download counts and cross-searching	N	19	35	24	8	4	90	2.37	1.05
		%	21.11	38.89	26.67	8.89	4.44	100		
3	Able to publish supplementary material such as data sets, video clips or sound files	N	12	23	36	15	4	90	2.73	1.04
		%	13.33	25.56	40.00	16.67	4.44	100		
4	Information about the benefits of doing so	N	14	17	47	8	4	90	2.68	0.99
		%	15.56	18.89	52.22	8.89	4.44	100		
5	Helpful for collecting and organizing my work	N	19	39	20	8	4	90	2.32	1.05
		%	21.11	43.33	22.22	8.89	4.44	100		

The table no 18 shows the positive impact of self-archiving factor of willingness to deposit the works in IR. It is inferred that among the positive impact of self-archiving factor, majorities (50%) of the respondents were willing to submit IR which helpful for gathering information about the work for career purpose. Majorities (60%) of respondents were depositing for getting advantages of added services such as download counts, helpful for collecting and organising their work through IR and cross-searching. Majorities (39%) of the respondents were depositing in IR which able to publish supplementary material such as data sets, video clips or sound files. Majorities (35%) of the respondents were depositing for information about the benefits of doing so more. Majorities (65%) of the respondents were depositing in IR which helpful for collecting and organising their work.

Table no: 19
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of positive impact of self-archiving

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.496	40.922 ^a	2.000	83.000	.000	.496
Wilks' Lambda	.504	40.922 ^a	2.000	83.000	.000	.496
Hotelling's Trace	.986	40.922 ^a	2.000	83.000	.000	.496
Roy's Largest Root	.986	40.922 ^a	2.000	83.000	.000	.496

The table no 19 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to positive impact of self-archiving. The multivariate $n^2 = 0.496$ indicates that approximately 50% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The resulted interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.496 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of positive impact of self-archiving”**

Table No: 20
Professional recognition factor to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Help to establish priority or prove ownership of ideas	N		32	38		20	90	3.09	1.12
		%	0.00	35.56	42.22	0.00	22.22	100		
2	Retain the IPR for their work	N	25	16	21	19	9	90	2.68	1.35
		%	27.78	17.78	23.33	21.11	10.00	100		

The table no 20 shows the professional recognition factor of depositing the works in IR. It is inferred that among the professional recognition factors, Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing in IR which help to establish priority or prove their ownership of their ideas. Majorities (46%) of the respondents were depositing in IR for retaining their IPR for their works.

Table no: 21
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of professional recognition

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.562	55.185 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.562
Wilks' Lambda	.438	55.185 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.562
Hotelling's Trace	1.283	55.185 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.562
Roy's Largest Root	1.283	55.185 ^a	2.000	86.000	.000	.562

The table no 21 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to professional recognition. The multivariate $n^2 = 0.562$ indicates that approximately 56% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The resulted interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.562 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of professional recognition”**

Table No: 22
Pre-print culture factor to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Get feedback or commentary from others	N		41		40	9	90	3.19	1.13
		%	0.00	45.56	0.00	44.44	10.00	100		
2	Enable to publish the work very quickly	N	25	7	19	19	20	90	3.02	1.52
		%	27.78	7.78	21.11	21.11	22.22	100		
3	Practice for getting published elsewhere	N	22		19	38	11	90	3.18	1.37
		%	24.44	0.00	21.11	42.22	12.22	100		

The table no 22 shows the pre-print culture factors of depositing in IR. It is inferred that among pre-print culture factors, Majorities (46%) of the respondents were depositing their work for getting feedback or commentary from others. Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing their work in IR for enable to publish their work very quickly. It is noticed that Majorities (24%) of the respondents were submitting their works in IR for practice for getting published elsewhere.

Table no: 23
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of pre-print culture

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.522	46.419 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.522
Wilks' Lambda	.478	46.419 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.522
Hotelling's Trace	1.092	46.419 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.522
Roy's Largest Root	1.092	46.419 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.522

The table no 23 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to pre-print culture. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.522$ indicates that approximately 52% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.522 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of pre-print culture”**

Table No: 24
University or department action factor to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Encouragement of the library	N	9	26	36	19		90	2.72	0.91
		%	10.00	28.89	40.00	21.11		100		
2	Encouragement of department	N	10	22	9	29	20	90	3.30	1.35
		%	11.11	24.44	10.00	32.22	22.22	100		
3	Encouragement of research supervisor and others	N		28	32	30		90	3.02	0.81
		%		31.11	35.56	33.33		100		

The table no 24 shows University or department action of depositing their works in the IR. It is inferred that among the university or department factors, Majorities (39%) of the respondents were willing to deposit their works in IR for the encouragement of the library professionals. Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing their work for encouragement from their department and 31% of the respondents were depositing in the IR for the encouragement of their research supervisor and other faculty members.

Table no: 25
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of university or department action

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.411	29.600 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.411
Wilks' Lambda	.589	29.600 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.411
Hotelling's Trace	.696	29.600 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.411
Roy's Largest Root	.696	29.600 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.411

The table no 25 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to university or department action. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.411$ indicates that approximately 41% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.411 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of university or department action”**

Table No: 26
Grant awarding body and Influence of other factors to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Encouragement to do so by research funders	N	9	81				90	1.90	0.30
		%	10.00	90.00				100		
2	Encouragement to do so by co-authors	N		55	26	9		90	2.49	0.67
		%		61.11	28.89	10.00		100		
3	Following the example of many others	N	6	26	38	20		90	2.80	0.86
		%	6.67	28.89	42.22	22.22		100		
4	Encouragement to do so by fellow students	N	6	45	39			90	2.37	0.61
		%	6.67	50.00	43.33	0.00		100		

The table no 26 shows the grant awarding body and Influence of other factors to deposit the work in IR. It is inferred that among the grant awarding body and Influence of other factors to deposit, it is wondered that all the respondents were depositing their work in the IR for the encouragement to do so more works by the research funders. Majorities (61%) of the respondents were depositing their work for the encouragement from their co-authors to do more works. Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing their works for the following the examples of many others. Majorities (57%) of the respondents were depositing their works in the IR for the encouragement from the fellow students to do more works.

Table no: 27
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of grant awarding body

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.255	14.869 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.255
Wilks' Lambda	.745	14.869 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.255
Hotelling's Trace	.342	14.869 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.255
Roy's Largest Root	.342	14.869 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.255

The table no 27 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to grant awarding body. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.255$ indicates that approximately 25% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.255 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of grant awarding body”**

Table No: 28
Preservation and Publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving factors to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Idea of work being permanently available	N	6	45	29	10		90	2.48	0.78
		%	6.67	50.00	32.22	11.11		100		
2	Like to maintain multiple versions of the work	N	13	37	19	21		90	2.53	1.01
		%	14.44	41.11	21.11	23.33		100		
3	Like someone else to take responsibility for preserving the work	N		34	27	29		90	2.94	0.84
		%	0.00	37.78	30.00	32.22		100		
4	Publishers would not have exclusive rights over the work	N	17	28	16	29		90	2.63	1.13
		%	18.89	31.11	17.78	32.22		100		

The table no 28 shows the preservation and publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving factors to deposit the work in IR. It is inferred that among the preservation and publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving factors, Majorities (57%) of the respondents were depositing their works in IR for getting an idea of work being permanently available and like to maintain the multiple versions of the works. Majorities (38%) of the respondents were depositing their work in IR for like someone else to take responsibility for preserving the work. Majorities (50%) of the respondents were depositing in IR for the publishers would not have exclusive rights over their works.

Table no: 29
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.658	83.656 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.658
Wilks' Lambda	.342	83.656 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.658
Hotelling's Trace	1.923	83.656 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.658
Roy's Largest Root	1.923	83.656 ^a	2.000	87.000	.000	.658

The table no 29 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.658$ indicates that approximately 66% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.658 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between**

experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving

Table No: 30
Support (Additional time & effort) and monetary incentive factors to deposit the work in IR

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	SD
1	Given training on how to do so	N		43	7	29	11	90	3.09	1.14
		%	0.00	47.78	7.78	32.22	12.22	100		
2	Provided with step by step instructions online	N	7	34	19	19	11	90	2.92	1.18
		%	7.78	37.78	21.11	21.11	12.22	100		
3	Nominated as Repository representative in their department which could go for advice	N	22	38	30			90	2.09	0.76
		%	24.44	42.22	33.33	0.00	0.00	100		
4	Paid to do so in IR	N		41	29	9	11	90	2.89	1.02
		%	0.00	45.56	32.22	10.00	12.22	100		

The table no 30 shows the support (Additional time & effort) and monetary incentive factors to deposit the work in IR. It is inferred that among the support (Additional time & effort) and monetary incentive factors, Majorities (48%) of the respondents were depositing their work for the benefit of given training on how to do so and 46% of the respondents were depositing for paid to do so in IR. Majorities (46%) of the respondents were depositing for providing with step by step instructions online. Majorities (67%) of the respondents were depositing for the nominated as repository representative in their department which could go for advice.

Table no: 31
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of Support (Additional time & effort)

Multivariate Tests^b

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.509	43.986 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.509
Wilks' Lambda	.491	43.986 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.509
Hotelling's Trace	1.035	43.986 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.509
Roy's Largest Root	1.035	43.986 ^a	2.000	85.000	.000	.509

The table no 31 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of Support (Additional time & effort). The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.509$ indicates that approximately 51% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.509 and the significant value was 0.000. The *P value* is lesser than 0.05. The results

indicated that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of Support (Additional time & effort)”**

Table no: 32
Multivariate Tests between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of monetary incentive

Multivariate Tests ^b						
Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pillai's Trace	.013	.556 ^a	2.000	87.000	.576	.013
Wilks' Lambda	.987	.556 ^a	2.000	87.000	.576	.013
Hotelling's Trace	.013	.556 ^a	2.000	87.000	.576	.013
Roy's Largest Root	.013	.556 ^a	2.000	87.000	.576	.013

The table no 32 shows the multivariate test results between the experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor to monetary incentive. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.013$ indicates that approximately 1% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables is associated with the group factor. The result is interpreted that the Pillai's Trace value was 0.013 and the significant value was 0.576. The *P value* is higher than 0.05. The results indicated that the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. The alternative hypothesis is being **“There is a no significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of monetary incentive”**

5. Findings

- ❖ The study indicated that majorities (74%) of the respondents were male and 26% of the respondents were female.
- ❖ The study pointed 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.
- ❖ It is found that that majority (67%) of the respondents were working as Assistant Professors Around 26% of the respondents were working as Associate Professors and 8% of the respondents were Professors.
- ❖ It is clear that majorities (53%) of the respondents were working in Arts and Science colleges and 47% of the respondents were working in the Engineering Colleges.
- ❖ The study indicates that majorities (24%) of the respondents had experience of 2-4 years and around 21% of the respondents had 5-6 years of experience.
- ❖ The study stated that majorities (47%) of the respondents had PhD and 23% of the respondents had MLIS with MPhil. Around 19% of the respondents were pursuing PhD and 11% of the respondents had MLIS degree.
- ❖ It is noticed that majorities (79%) of the respondents' institutions had institutional repositories and remaining 21% of the respondents' institutions not having institutional repositories.
- ❖ The study indicated 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.

- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ It is clear that majorities (36%) of the respondents were extremely aware about the institutional repositories and 34% of the respondents were moderately aware on institutional repositories.
- ❖ It is clear that majorities (34%) of the respondents agreed and 26% of the respondents were strongly agreed to support the principles of open access.
- ❖ It is noticed that majorities (24%) of the respondents were strongly agreed and 20% of the respondents were agreed about involvement of innovative technology of IR.
- ❖ It is inferred that majorities (60%) of the respondents were depositing in the IR for supporting the principles of open access and majorities (44%) of the respondents was depositing in the IR for involvement with innovative technology.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of advocacy”
- ❖ It is inferred that among the accessibility factors, majorities (47%) of the respondents were depositing in the IR for making their work available to anyone from anywhere. majorities (56%) of the respondents were willing to deposit in the IR for making their work available to other students and majorities (42%) of the respondents were depositing their working IR for making their work available to others institution.
- ❖ “There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of accessibility.”
- ❖ It is inferred that among the altruistic intention factors, majorities (60%) of the respondents were willing to deposit in IR, due to giving good way of disseminating the work to the research community and beyond. majorities (32%) of the respondents were depositing their work for sharing materials with other research collaborators.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of altruistic intention”
- ❖ It is inferred that among the positive impact of self-archiving factor, majorities (50%) of the respondents were willing to submit IR which helpful for gathering information about the work for career purpose. Majorities (60%) of respondents were depositing for getting advantages of added services such as download counts, helpful for collecting and organising their work through IR and cross-searching. Majorities (39%) of the respondents were depositing in IR which able to publish supplementary material such as data sets, video clips or sound files. Majorities (35%) of the respondents were depositing for information about the benefits of doing so more. Majorities (65%) of the respondents were depositing in IR which helpful for collecting and organising their work.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of positive impact of self-archiving”
- ❖ It is inferred that among the professional recognition factors, Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing in IR which help to establish priority or prove their ownership of their ideas. Majorities (46%) of the respondents were depositing in IR for retaining their IPR for their works.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of professional recognition”

- ❖ It is inferred that among pre-print culture factors, Majorities (46%) of the respondents were depositing their work for getting feedback or commentary from others. Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing their work in IR for enable to publish their work very quickly. It is noticed that Majorities (24%) of the respondents were submitting their works in IR for practice for getting published elsewhere.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of pre-print culture”
- ❖ It is inferred that among the university or department factors, Majorities (39%) of the respondents were willing to deposit their works in IR for the encouragement of the library professionals. Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing their work for encouragement from their department and 31% of the respondents were depositing in the IR for the encouragement of their research supervisor and other faculty members.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of university or department action”
- ❖ It is inferred that among the grant awarding body and Influence of other factors to deposit, it is wondered that all the respondents were depositing their work in the IR for the encouragement to do so more works by the research funders. Majorities (61%) of the respondents were depositing their work for the encouragement from their co-authors to do more works. Majorities (36%) of the respondents were depositing their works for the following the examples of many others. Majorities (57%) of the respondents were depositing their works in the IR for the encouragement from the fellow students to do more works.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of grant awarding body
- ❖ It is inferred that among the preservation and publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving factors, Majorities (57%) of the respondents were depositing their works in IR for getting an idea of work being permanently available and like to maintain the multiple versions of the works. Majorities (38%) of the respondents were depositing their work in IR for like someone else to take responsibility for preserving the work. Majorities (50%) of the respondents were depositing in IR for the publishers would not have exclusive rights over their works.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of publishers' policies prohibiting self-archiving
- ❖ It is inferred that among the support (Additional time & effort) and monetary incentive factors, Majorities (48%) of the respondents were depositing their work for the benefit of given training on how to do so and 46% of the respondents were depositing for paid to do so in IR. Majorities (46%) of the respondents were depositing for providing with step by step instructions online. Majorities (67%) of the respondents were depositing for the nominated as repository representative in their department which could go for advice.
- ❖ There is a significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of Support (Additional time & effort)”
- ❖ There is a no significant difference between experienced in depositing in IR and their willingness factor of monetary incentive”

6. Conclusion:

The scientific contribution of the faculty members of education institutions produce need a new type of management to describe and analyse them, organise and present them. These environments could strengthen research and learning development and increase the effective work time, visibility of science which lead to motivate the students in an intrinsic and extrinsic way. Institutional repositories help to explore the knowledge of the faculty members. On the other hand it processes their positive attitude for depositing their working in the institutional repositories for various purposes.

References

- Abdelrahman, Omer Hassan (2017) Use of the University of Khartoum Institutional Repository by Graduate Students, *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 37(2), 104-108
- Bates, Melanie., Loddington, Steve., Manuel, Sue & Oppenheim, Charles (2016) Attitudes to the rights and rewards for author contributions to repositories for teaching and learning, *ALT-J Research in Learning Technology*, 15(1).
- 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
- 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.
- 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>
- 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.
- Safdar, M., & Rehman, S. U. (2015). Users' Perception and Satisfaction with Higher Education Commission Pakistan Research Repository (PRR): problems and opportunities. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1.
- Sandy, H. M., & Dykas, F. (2016). High-Quality Metadata and Repository Staffing: Perceptions of United States–Based OpenDOAR Participants. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 54(2), 101-116.
- 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.