

Factors Influencing the Contribution in Institutional Repository System among the Faculty Members, Coimbatore: A Study

P. Sankar

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

Dr. E. S. Kavitha

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

Abstract:

Libraries have a strategic and tactical role to play in moving beyond their traditional custodial role to active engagement in the scholarly communication enterprise. As more and more universities establish Institutional Repositories (IR), awareness is developing about the limitations of IRs in enhancing the academic research service. The concept of an IR needs to be expanded to include the integration of the processes that transform intellectual endeavor into a broadening array of academic and research support services which are fundamentally social. 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 aimed to analysis the factors influencing the contribution of Institutional Repository systems by the faculty members in the Coimbatore. The Study examined the vaious factors such 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 for their contribution in the *Institutional Repositories*.

Keywords: Institutional Repository, IRS

1. Introduction

Libraries play a fundamental role, making easier for the students, teachers and researchers to access the means and resources to discover and build knowledge. In the same way, the professional staffs of these libraries acquire the function of a guide, in the sense of supporting the development of those competences that allow an effective and significant use of information and knowledge. 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

According to Mark Ware, *Pathfinder Research on Web-based Repositories* An institutional repository (IR) is defined to be a web-based database (repository) of scholarly material which is institutionally defined (as opposed to a subject-based repository); cumulative and perpetual (a collection of record); open and interoperable (e.g. using OAI-compliant software); and thus collects, stores and disseminates (is part of the process of scholarly communication). In addition, most would include long-term preservation of digital materials as a key function of IRs.

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 factors influencing the contribution faculty members towards 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(Abtract)	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**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 13 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: 14**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 14 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: 15
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 15 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: 16
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 16 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: 17
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	N	25	7	19	19	20	90	3.02	1.52

	work very quickly	%	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 17 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: 18**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 18 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: 19**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 19 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: 20

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 20 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: 21

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 21 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.

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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.

- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ 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.

- ❖ 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.

6. Conclusion:

In any event, new technologies such as those designed to create IRs can be utilized in far more creative ways to enhance the research endeavour. 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. Institutional repositories (IRs) are increasingly deployed in academic institutions to manage a variety of digital content including educational, research, and archival materials. The benefits of IRs have been touted by many authors and include increased knowledge sharing

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.