A Study on institutional repositories policies in Open Access Korea(OAK)

Hyekyong Hwang*, Jong-Myung Baek**
*,**Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information
E-mail : hkhwang@kisti.re.kr, jm100@kisti.re.kr

1. Introduction

Institutional Repositories (IRs) may be a service-policy, -platform that enables open access (OA) of research output. If the sharing of Korean research output is to be extended, there should be a great deal of content registered at IRs; however, although it has been over 10 years since IRs were established in Korea, there is little content listed on the IRs. As a growth strategy for the content of IRs, this study was proposed the need of OA policy. Ahead of developing an OA policy, this study was to review how the operational IRs in Korea had collected and disseminated content and to propose points for consideration in the establishment of an OA policy for the future.

2. Previous Studies

According to the Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies (ROARMAP), an authoritative worldwide registry, IRs that have a registered OA policy is 458. In looking into this in detail, 208 institutes adopted institutional mandates, 44 institutes sub-institutional mandates, and 9 institutes multi-institutional mandates. Also, 87 institutes adopted funder mandates while 110 institutes adopted thesis mandates ([1]). This statistics shows that 56.98% of institutes have pursued an OA mandate policy except for funder mandates and thesis mandates. Operational Irs in Korea have not registered officially an OA policy. Xia et al.[2] proposed that although an OA mandate policy has a positive aspect in the self-archiving of the research output of researchers through a review of OA self-archiving mandate policies, this policy does not change existing practices of the scholarly works of researchers. Swan and Brown[3] revealed through an author survey that if a policy of sharing scholarly work by submitting it mandatorily to an IR operated by a university is proclaimed, the authors have an adoptive intention to follow the policy.

3. Data Collection

This study is to help in developing a guideline for an OA policy at a national level in the future by reviewing the submission and dissemination process of IRs that have been in operation in Korea. The study was aimed at 23 OAK repositories, which were constructed through budget support by the Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information (KISTI) and Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism (MCST). These repositories were selected because all of these institutes have used the same OAK repository system with support from the national budget; thus, it seemed to be easy to propose or adopt policies for them in the future.

Data were collected by IRs websites and OAK portal(http://www.oak.go.kr/) and telephone interviews with IR staff was conducted as necessary.

4. Research Results

In looking into institutes that operate an OAK repository by type, there are 14 government-funded research institutes (60.9%), which is the highest percentile. This was followed by 3 university libraries (12.0%), 2 information centers (8.7%), 2 public libraries (8.7%), and 2 other institutes (8.7%)(refer to <table 1>). This demonstrates that IRs have been operated mainly by government funded research institutes in Korea. Any institute that develops and operates an IR with its own budget, such as the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST) or Seoul National University, was excluded from the research scope. With respect to the content types on OAK Repositories, the number of journal articles was 54,626, the dissertations were 16,389, followed by 2,590 for the monographs. The amount of patents was 2,501 and report was 3,815.

[Table 1] Type of IRs operational agents

Type of Institution	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Research library(Government funded)	14	60.9
University library	3	12.0
Information Center	2	8.7
Public library	2	8.7
Other	2	8.7
Total	23	100.0

Next, only one institute adopted a submission policy under which a researcher is able to undertake self-archiving of his or her research output, and all the remaining 22 institutes adopted a batch upload using a system and registration method undertaken by the IR staff(refer to <table 2>) for the deposit process of contents. In Korea, majority of IR provide a mediated deposit service on affiliated member's behalf. But, the most used mediated deposit service is one in which an IR staff downloads research output as an excel file and uploads it manually rather than an automatic linked with the research assessment system

[Table 2] Submission policies

Submission	Frequency	Percentage (%)
batch (system)	17	73.9
manual (IR staff)	2	8.7
batch/manual	3	13.0
self-archiving	1	4.3
	23	

Regarding dissemination policies, it was confirmed that all the institutes agreed with open access to the public and pursued global dissemination through OAI-PMH; however, it was confirmed that some institutes have experienced difficulty in opening to the outside owing to personal information protection and system security.

5. Discussion

This study was to identify the submission and dissemination process of IRs in Korea and to derive considerations for developing an OA policy guideline. All of the operational IRs in Korea agreed with the spirit of open access; however, they have experienced difficulty in open access to their research output because of personal information protection and system security. In the submission process in OAK repositories, as a batch method rather than an automatic connection with the institution's internal system has been adopted, it is necessary to improve a method of automatic link with the internal system. To overcome this problem, there is a need for close cooperation with the related internal functional department. And the operational agents should collect the opinion of authors, related staff, executives, and other stakeholders for building OA policy.

6. References

[1] University of Southampton, 2012, *ROARMAP: Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies*, [cited 05.07. 2014], http://roarmap.eprints.org/.
[2] Xia, Jingfeng, Sarah B. Gilchrist, Nathaniel X.P. Smith, Justin A.Kingery, Jennifer R.Radecki, Marcia L. Wilhelm, Keith C. Harrison, Michael L.Ashby, Alyson J.Mahn, 2012, "A Review of Open Access Self-Archiving Mandate Policies", *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 12(1): 85-102.
[3] Swan, Alma, and Sheridan Brown, 2005, *Open access self-archiving: An author study*, Key Perspective. [cited 2014.05.01], <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/Open%20Access%20Self%20Archiving-an%20Author%20study.pdf>.