

AN ASSESSMENT OF OPEN ACCESS REPOSITORIES OF INDONESIA

Dr. Ramneek

PGDLAN Student,

Panjab University, Chandigarh

Email: rmnk.chal@gmail.com

Abstract: The present study highlights the assessment of Open Access repositories in Indonesia. The study attempts to focus on current status of open access institutional repositories (IRs) in Indonesia on some key aspects like number of IRs, types of IRs, language used, contents, subjects and software used in IRs of Indonesia. To fulfill the specified objectives, the Open Access institutional repositories in Indonesia were identified by selecting the data base of Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR) and the data was collected and analyzed for necessary information.

Keywords: Open Access, Institutional Repositories, OpenDOAR, Indonesian Open Access Institutional Repositories.

1.0 Introduction

The introduction of ICT in the 1990s has revolutionized the entire scholarly communication environment. Chan (2004) describes the scholarly communication situation as a crisis that encompasses two distinct though interrelated problems. On the one hand, several subscriptions costs, particularly for science and medical journals have been increasing rapidly over the last two decades often at rates for above the cost of inflation. At the same time, research library budgets have been decreasing. So the old model of journal subscription is in competition with the open access environment which includes Open Access journals, open repositories, open source software and open educational resources (Jantz and Wilson, 2008). Open Access movement got a lot of importance and popularity after Budapest Open Access Initiatives (2002) and then by the Bethesda statement on Open Access publishing (June 2003) and the Berlin declaration on Open Access to knowledge in the sciences & humanities (Oct. 2003) Open Access (OA) is achieved through green and gold routes. Crow (2002) states that institutional repositories are “digital collections that capture & preserve the intellectual output of a single or multi-university community.” The principle of Open Access is supported by institutional repositories (IRs) through self archiving copies of already published research articles in the author’s institutional archive which is made freely available. According to Chang (2003) institutional repositories is a new concept for collecting, managing, disseminating and preserving scholarly communications created in digital form by faculty & students in individual universities and colleges.

2.0 Review Of Literature

Some selected studies are highlighted as follows in reverse chronological order.

Das & Singh (2017) reviewed the current status of 39 Chinese open access institutional repositories. The study shows that there is need to create awareness within community for extensive contribution of contents to the IRs.

Kunwar Singh (2017) investigated Open Access institutional repositories in Australia and reported that out of number of 55 Open Access IRs, 47 are institutional IRs, 5 are Disciplinary IRs and only 2 are Governmental IRs.

Mamtora et al. (2015) described the shift from a traditional mode of information dissemination through the development of Open Access institutional repositories. The article described the case study of three Asia-Oceania region institutions, namely Charles Darwin University (Australia), the University of Hong-Kong (China) and the University of Malaya (Malaysia).

Perna Singh (2015) examined Open Access repositories in India have witnessed enormous growth of Open Access repositories worldwide promoting visibility of the research outcomes of institutions.

Kumar & Siwach(2013) conducted analysis of Indian Open Access repositories in “OpenDOAR” highlighted that OpenDOAR service provides a quality – assured listing of Open Access (OA) repositories around the world. OpenDOAR maintains a comprehensive and authoritative list of institutional and subject-based repositories. The finding revealed that out of the 2311 repositories listed in OpenDOAR, India with 58 repositories stands 11th in the list of countries. Among there 58 Indians repositories 51 are institutional, 4 are disciplinary and 3 are aggregating.

Cullen and Chawner (2011) investigated the awareness of open repositories among the academic staff of eight New Zealand Universities. The results show that 75% of academic staff were aware of the concept of institutional repositories.

Abriazah, Noorhidawati & Kiran (2010) examined the current state of Open Access repositories of Asian universities. The study revealed that out of the 191 Asian organizational institutional repositories identified in the study, only 48 are listed in the Top 400 Ranking Web of World Repositories (RWWR).

3.0 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study are:

- To analyses the total number and types of Open Access repositories in Indonesia.
- To identify the subjects and contents covered by Indonesian OA repositories in OpenDOAR.
- To study the language preferred by institutional repositories in Indonesia.
- To find out the main software used in Indonesian OA repositories.

4.0 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of the study is confined to Indonesian Open Access repositories in the OpenDOAR as on March 2018. At present, there are 69 Open Access IRs available in Indonesia. The study is intended to examine the current trends and developments; it is limited to those IRs which are registered under the OpenDOAR.

5.0 Methodology

To justify above given objectives, researchers have selected OpenDOAR (<http://www.open-doar.org>) database for collecting of information to find out current states of Indonesian Open Access Institutional repositories. According to the OpenDOAR, at present, there are 69 IRs registered till March 2018. Further, it analyses the contents of all Open Access IRs in terms of contents types, repository type, number of records, software used and language preferred by IRs.

6.0 Data Analysis

6.1 Types of IRs and No. of Records

Table 1 indicates the type of IRs and no. of records deposited in the archive. Out of 69 IRs all Indonesian Open Access repositories are of institutional type and are having total 1235417 records.

Table 1: Types of IRs and No. of Records

Types of IRs	No. of IRs	%age	No. of Records	%age
Institutional	69	100.00	1235417	100.00
Disciplinary	0	0.00	0	0
Governmental	0	0.00	0	0
Aggregating	0	0.00	0	0
Total	69	100.00	1235417	100.00

6.2 Language Wise Distribution of IRs

Table 2 shows that language-wise distribution of Indonesia IRs. It clearly shows that the main language interface of Indonesian IRs are in Indonesian language 50(53.76%), it is followed by English language 36(38.70%), Arabic 4 (4.30%) and Malay 3 (3.22%).

Table 2: Language-wise Distribution of IRs

Language	No. of IRs	(%)age
Indonesian	50	53.76
English	36	38.70
Arabic	04	4.30
Malay	03	3.22
Total	93	100.00

6.3 Types of Software Used to Develop IRs

Table 3 reveals the software used to develop IRs in Indonesia Open Access institutional repositories. The table shows extensively used software is E prints 53 (76.81%), followed by D space 9 (13.04%), whereas SLIMS

senayan, open Repository, Ispektra, JSP – My SQL Alfresco, GAE, Django and unknown at each one was used by only 5 individual repositories.

Table 3: Distribution of IRs by software

Software	No. of IRs	%age
E Prints	53	76.81
D Space	9	13.04
SLIMS sevanan	1	1.45
Open Repository	1	1.45
Ispektra	1	1.45
ISP – My SQL Alfreesee	1	1.45
GAE	1	1.45
Django	1	1.45
Unknown	1	1.45
Total	69	100.00

6.4 Subject Wise Coverage

Table 4 shows subject wise distribution of IRs of Indonesia. The majority that is 52 (32.09%) of the IRs belong to the subject of multidisciplinary in OpenDOAR, followed by Business & Economics 12 (7.40%), Laws & politics 10 (6.17%), Educations 8 (4.93%), Technology General & computers & IT (6 repositories), Arts & Humanities General & language & literature (5 repositories).

The findings indicate that Economics, Politics, Philosophy & Technology Subjects have majority in the disciplinary coverage of Indonesian Open Access IRs.

Table 4: Subject-wise distribution of IRs

S. No.	Subjects	No. of Repositories	%age
1	Multidisciplinary	52	32.10
2	Business & Economics	12	7.41
3	Law & Politics	10	6.17
4	Philosophy & Religion	9	5.56
5	Education	8	4.94
6	Technology General	6	3.70
7	Computers & IT	6	3.70
8	Arts & Humanities General	5	3.09
9	Language Literature	5	3.09
10	Science General	4	2.47
11	Mathematics & Statistics	4	2.47
12	Health & Medicine	4	2.47
13	Management & Planning	4	2.47
14	Psychology	4	2.47
15	History & Archaeology	3	1.85
16	Agriculture, Food & Veterinary	3	1.85
17	Civil Engineering	3	1.85
18	Electrical & Electronics Engineering	3	1.85
19	Mechanical Engineering & Materials	3	1.85
20	Fine & Performing Arts	3	1.85
21	Biology & Biochemistry	2	1.23
22	Chemistry & Chemical Technology	2	1.23
23	Ecology & Environment	2	1.23
24	Earth & Planetary Sciences	1	0.62
25	Physics & Astronomy	1	0.62
26	Architecture	1	0.62
27	Geography & Regional Studies	1	0.62
28	Library & Information Science	1	0.62
	Total	162	100

6.5 Content-wise Distribution of IRs :Table 5 shows that number and % of types of content stored in Open Access IRs. We observed from table 5 that within types of contents– theses 44(24.31%) followed by articles 42(23.20%), conference 23(12.71%) books 20(11.05%), learning objects 16 (8.84%), unpublished 15 (8.29%) multimedia & references 8 (4.42%), special 3(1.66%), datasets & patents 1(0.55%). The findings of contents wise distribution of Open Access IRs shows that thesis, articles, conferences & books are more deposited contents.

Table 5: Content wise Distributions of records

S. No.	Contents	No. of IRs	%age
1	Theses	44	24.31
2	Articles	42	23.20
3	Conferences	23	12.71
4	Books	20	11.05
5	Learning objects	16	8.84
6	Unpublished	15	8.29
7	Multimedia	8	4.42
8	References	8	4.42
9	Special	3	1.66
10	Datasets	1	0.55
11	Patents	1	0.55
12	Software	0	0.00
Total		181	100

7.0 Findings and Conclusions

From the above study of Indonesian Open Access institutional repositories, major key finding are given below:

- It was found that OpenDOAR lists 69 Indonesian Open Access repositories.
- It was observed that in Indonesia there is trend of establishing institution-based repositories to provide Open Access to the institution’s research output.
- Eprints (76.81%) was widely used software in Indonesia Open Access IRs.
- There are varied numbers of subjects which may be covered by the repositories ranging from sciences to social sciences. Multidisciplinary hold all the subjects in their Open Access IRs.
- The prominent language of content in the repositories was found to be Indonesian (53.76%), followed by English (38.70%).
- In Indonesian institutional repositories more focus is given to archiving of thesis and articles than other forms.

8.0 References

1. Abrizah, A., Noorhidawati, A. &Kiran, K. (2017).Global visibility of Asian universities’ Open Access institutional repositories. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 15(3), 53-73.
2. Chan, L. (2004). Supporting and enhancing scholarship in the digital age: the role of open access institutional repository. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 29(3).
3. Chang, S. H. (2003). Institutional repositories: the library’s new role. *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives*, 19(3), 77-79.
4. Crow, R. (2002). The case for institutional repositories: a SPARC position paper. Washington, DC: Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition. Retrieved from www.arl.org/sparc/IR/IR_Final_Release_102.pdf
5. Cullen, R., &Chawner, B. (2011). Institutional repositories, open access, and scholarly communication: a study of conflicting paradigms. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 37(6), 460-470.
6. Das, K. C. & Singh, K. (2017). Current Status of Chinese Open Access Institutional Repositories: A Case Study. *Journal of Library & Information Science*, 7(1).
7. Jantz, R. C., & Wilson, M. C. (2008). Institutional repositories: Faculty deposits, marketing, and the reform of scholarly communication. *The journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(3), 186-195.
8. Kumar, S. & Siwach, A. K. (2013). An Analysis of Indian Open Access Repositories in “OpenDOAR”. *E-Library Science Research Journal*, 1 (11).

9. Mamtora, J., Yang, T., & Singh, D. (2015). Open access repositories in the Asia–Oceania region: Experiences and guidelines from three academic institutions. *IFLA Journal*, 41(2), 162-176.
10. *OpenDOAR* Homepage. Retrieved from <http://www.opendoar.org/>
11. Singh, K. (2017). Assessment of Open-Access Institutional Repositories: A Case Study of Australia. *Pearl: A Journal of Library and Information Science*, 11(4), 400-404.
12. Singh, P. (2016). Open access repositories in India: Characteristics and future potential. *IFLA journal*, 42(1), 16-24.