Open Access Institutional Repositories in Malaysia as Registered in Opendoar: A Study

Library Science

Padma, P	Assistant Professor, Dept. of Library and Information Science, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai.
Ramasamy, K	Ph.D Research Scholar, Dept. of Lib. & Information Science, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai & Librarian, Kendriya Vidyalaya, Narimedu, Madurai-2.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The study reports the functioning of institutional repositories in Malaysia. Various aspects like nature of Institutional repositories (IR), type of open access IR, content types, content language, repository software used, subjects covered, availability of content , preservation and full text re-use policies and their growth rate were analysed. Methodology: OpenDOAR website and the websites of individual institutional repositories were browsed to collect the required data. Findings: 20 Malaysian IRs are registered in openDOAR as on 23/12/2013. All are functional and belong to institutional category. 17 of them have journal articles and 16 of them contain theses and dissertations. 40 % of them have contents in Malay language. 15 of them use Eprints as repository software. 81 % of them have not defined their preservation policies. 19 of them are multidisciplinary in nature. They are born after 2006.
Future implications: The study can be further extended to research the individual IRs of Malaysia or a comparison of related IRs of Malaysia.

Institutional Repository

In the simplest sense of the term, an institutional digital repository is an electronic archive of the scholarly output of an institution, stored in a digital format, where search and recovery are allowed for its national or international use. The general idea is to store, manage, and preserve a university's born-digital and digitized assets, making them freely available via the internet. Crow (2002a) and Ware (2004) characterized an institutional repository as open, interoperable, cumulative, perpetual, contributes to the process of scholarly communication in collecting, storing and disseminating the scholarly content.

Objectives of an IR

Yeates (2003) listed the benefits of IRs, such as: extending the range of knowledge sharing, existing investment in information and content management systems can be leveraged; and more flexible ways of scholarly communication are available. Academic institutions would also reap these benefits. IR proponents argue that they form the infrastructure for a new scholarly publishing paradigm that wrests control away from publishers and puts it back in the hands of the academy, increase visibility, prestige, and public value of contributors, maximize access to the results of publicly funded research, and increase the number and diversity of scholarly materials that are collected and preserved by academic institutions (Crow 2002a, 2002b; Chan 2004).

Literature Review

A more comprehensive study by Chen and Hsiang (2008) found that the number of institutional repositories in Japan, India, Australia, Korea, Russia and Taiwan are more than in other Asian countries. Kiran and Chia (2009) reported that the adoption of institutional repositories in Malaysia is rather low, even in the country's top four research-intensive universities. Zhong (2009) used data from the Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR) and found only 27 Chinese institutional repositories, listed separately under China mainland (15), Hong Kong (3), and Taiwan (16).

In October 2008, Wani, Gul and Rah (2009) conducted a study on the growth of institutional repositories in Asia using the data from the OpenDOAR. Their findings indicate that the total number of institutional repositories in Asia is 138, with Japan as the biggest contributor (69) followed by India (30), while other countries in Asia contributed between 1 to 6 institutional repositories each.

Matsuura's (2008) study reported that Japan has been placed as the fourth biggest contributor by counts of institutional repositories in OpenDOAR and ROAR. Another recent study (Prab-

hat and Gautam 2010) placed India as the second in the Asian region as a contributor to the world institutional repositories. The authors explored the Indian institutional repositories registered in ROAR as at February 2010.

Padma and Ramasamy (2013) did a comparative study of IRs of six Indian universities in terms of IR software used, operational status, no. of items, presentation style, subjects, language of the contents, content types, no. of authors, options available in home page etc. Padma and Ramasamy (2013) undertook another comparative study of IRs of five selected institutes/universities of Bangladesh in the above line.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the present study are to study the IRs of Malaysia in terms of Operational status, Type of open access repositories, Repository software used, Content types, Subjects , Most frequently used languages , Availability of content, preservation and full-text re-use policy and Growth rate

Methodology

The modus operandi of our study underwent the following phases.
1. First of all, the OpenDOAR directory was browsed to find out the institutes which were registered therein.
2. Institutional repository statistics was done to get required data to answer the objectives of the study.
3. Then, the URLs of the selected universities were browsed for cross checking and verification
4. Diagrams were used to show the output of the study.

Findings

1.Operational Status of IRs in Malaysia
It is happy to note that all the 20 IRs in Malaysia are operational. All IRs are fully functional. They are neither trial repositories nor technically malfunctioning.

2. Type of Institutional repositories
The IR may of different types : institutional (run by a institution or department), disciplinary (a cross-institutional subject repository), aggregating (an archive aggregating data from several subsidiary repositories) or a governmental (repository for government data) . All the 20 open access IRs in Malaysia belong to institutional repository type. They are run by various institutes, universities or departments of Malaysia.

3. Content Types in IRs
The IRs in Malaysia possess different kinds of materials namely journal articles, conference and workshop papers, theses and dissertations, book, chapters and section, multi-media and au-

dio-visual materials and some learning objects. 17 (85%) IRs in Malaysia have journal articles, 80 % of them have conference and workshop papers and only 4 IRs (20 %) have unpublished report and working papers. Only 3 IRs don't have journal articles in their repositories but 13 of them don't have multi-media and audio-visual materials.

4. Language content
Out of twenty, 19 (95 %) institutional repositories have contents in English language. Only 8 IRs have contents in Malay language.

5. Repository Software
Eprints software has emerged as the most used IR software in Malaysia. 15 IRs (75 %) use Eprints software. While only 3 IRs (15%) use Dspace, only one IR uses Greenstone software.

6 Recorded Preservation policies
Only two institutional repositories have defined their preservation policies and made it available in their IR portal. 13 (81 %) of them have not defined their preservation policies.

7. Subjects of IRs

16 IRs (80 %) are multi-disciplinary in nature viz they have contents on many subjects. Only one IR each has contents on health and medicine, computers and IT, fine and performing arts, social sciences, management and psychology. Two IRs each have contents in agriculture, biology, ecology, arts, history, language, education and law. 3 IRs each have contents in the subject earth and planetary sciences, Business and economics and library science.

8. Data re-use policies
A majority of 12 IRs (75 %) have not explicitly defined their full data item re-use policies. One IR has varies policy rights for re-use of full data items and two IRs have permitted the re-use of full data items for not-for-profit purposes.

9. Growth of IRs in Malaysia
The birth of IRs took place in the middle of 2007 in Malaysia. There is no much growth in 2010. When 10 IRs got established in first 3 years, it took another 4 years to build next 10 IRs.

Conclusion
IR system in universities and institutes of higher education/research in Malaysia is in its initial stage of development. Only 20 IRs are registered in OpenDOAR enabling the users an open access usage. Other institutes including various universities also may let their local intellectual output flow in the mainstream of open access platform. A kind of standardisation, uniformity and consistency may be insisted upon in the creation and maintenance of these IRs. More web 2.0 tools may be added to enable the easy sharing of contents among the users community. A national level policy on IR development may be drafted aiming at standardisation of publication of intellectual output of one's own institution.

REFERENCE

1. Murakami, Y., and Adachi, J. 2006. Institutional repositories in Japan. In S. Sugimoto, & et al (Eds.), Digital libraries: Achievements, challenges and opportunities: 9th International Conference on Asian Digital Libraries, ICADL 2006, Kyoto, Japan, November 27-30, 2006: Proceedings. Berlin; New York: Springer | 2. Wani, Zahid Ashraf; Gul, Sumeer; and Rah, Javeed Ahmad. 2009. Open Access Repositories: A Global Perspective with an Emphasis on Asia. Chinese Librarianship: an International Electronic Journal, Vol. 27. Available at: http://www.iclc.us/cliej/cl27WGR.htm | 3. Zhong, C. 2009. Development of institutional repositories in Chinese Universities and the open access movement in China. In Mornati, S. and Hedlund, T. (Eds). Rethinking Electronic Publishing: Innovation in Communication Paradigms and Technologies - Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Electronic Publishing, Milano, Italy 10-12 June 2009. Available at: http://elpub.scix.net/cgi-bin/works/Show? 97_elpub2009. |