

# Attitude Towards Quality of Contents in Open Access Sources and Services among Management College Professionals in Karnataka

N. N. Prasad<sup>1</sup>, M. Chandrashekara<sup>2</sup> and Umesha<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Librarian, Library and Information Centre,

National Institute of Mental Health and Neuro Sciences, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Studies in Library and Information Science,  
University of Mysore, Manasagangotri, Mysuru, Karnataka, India

<sup>3</sup>Chief Librarian, Kempegowda Institute of Medical Sciences and Hospital, Bangalore, Karnataka, India  
E-Mail: nisargaprasad@gmail.com, chandra.uom@gmail.com, umeshlib@gmail.com

(Received 20 September 2018; Revised 14 October 2018; Accepted 26 October 2018; Available online 3 November 2018)

**Abstract** - Research is one of the key elements that require special focus in management education at present. It has become imperative for management institutions to brace up to the challenges posed by globalisation, and augment the quality of research and allied activities. Researchers today can access resources online, anytime from anywhere—thanks to the “open access” movement, which enables free and unrestricted access to scientific research publications. The present study aimed at assessing and comparing attitude towards open access sources and services among students, researchers and faculty of management colleges in Karnataka. A total of 923 respondents were selected through stratified random sampling. Interview schedule was employed to obtain the required data from the respondents through a structured questionnaire based on vital aspects of open access sources and services. Findings of the study revealed that the respondents, on the whole, held favourable attitudes towards open access. It was found that the faculty group had significantly higher preferences than students and researchers for quality of contents in open access, in terms of increasing reputation of authors, publishers and organisations, and improving peer review process.

**Keywords:** Open Access, Management Education, Attitudes, Student’s Researchers, Faculty, E-Resources

## I. INTRODUCTION

Management education has undergone a tremendous metamorphosis over the last five decades. Today, it has emerged as a vibrant field and one of the most preferred choices for higher education. Business environment is becoming more competitive and more complex owing to the challenges thrown up by globalisation. Technological advancements and rapid changes in economic environments have kept the growth chart of management education and research ascending. Increasing competition within management education has stressed the need for more professional approach in research and academic activities. Research is one of the key elements that require special focus in management education at present, particularly in the Indian context. It has become imperative for management institutions to brace up to the challenges posed by global competition and augment the quality of research and allied activities in India.

Availability and accessibility of information resources are some of the vital elements of the research process. Academic libraries play pivotal roles in facilitating access to information and supporting research activities in various disciplines. However, rapid growth of technology and availability of information resources online have changed the landscape of research and the dynamics in which the academic libraries function. Research and communication practices have been profoundly impacted by the networked world over the last couple of decades. Researchers today can access resources online, anytime from anywhere—thanks to the “open access” movement, which enables free and unrestricted access to scientific research publications. Faster availability of information, greater visibility and increased opportunity for collaboration are some of the major advantages of open access. However, the quality of open access research and publishing is still often subject to debate. The present study focuses on the users’ perception regarding the quality of contents available through open access resources and services. Favourable attitude towards quality of contents in open sources access fosters more utility of information. A thorough search of the literature did not yield much information on attitude towards quality of contents in open access sources in the Indian scenario, especially in the management field. In this context, the study is designed to determine the attitude towards quality of contents in open access sources among students, researchers and faculty of management studies in Karnataka.

### A. Open Access Resources for Management Education

Various management information resources/databases are available today. Some of the popular resources used by management professionals for academic practice and research include Hindawi Publishing Corporation, Directory of Open Access Books, American Libraries, Biz/ed: Business studies teaching and education resources, The WWW Virtual Library: Business and Economics, SOSIG: Social Science Information Gateway, Academia.edu, Academic Earth, BASE–Biefeld Academic Search Engine, Cross Archive Search Service for Indian Institutional

Repositories (CASSIR), MGU PhD Theses Archive and Shodhganga-Indian ETDs (INFLIBNET).

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the present study, the researcher has made an attempt to briefly review the studies related to the attitude towards quality of content in open access. Attitude is conceptualized as readiness to accept or a mindset regarding quality of contents in open access sources and services. Lustig, (2013) states, “attitude is a hypothetical construct that represents an individual's degree of like or dislike for something. Attitudes are generally positive or negative views of a person, place, thing, or event— this is often referred to as the attitude object. People can also be conflicted or ambivalent toward an object, meaning that they simultaneously possess both positive and negative attitudes toward the item in question”.

“Although scholarly communication has undergone tremendous changes over the last few decades, creating new modes and technologies for accessing information and reaching readers, trust in quality remains the foundation in decisions about what to read, what to cite, or where to publish” (Tenopir, et. al., 2016). Open access resources offer a significant way to deliver high quality content to higher education. The important issue is whether these open access resources are engaging, relevant, and accurate (Mills, 2016). Age groups and fields of study, traditional methods, criteria and peer review processes are some of the important factors which influence the quality and trustworthiness of research (Tenopir, et. al., 2016). Wealthier research environment is always lead by contents of richer quality. Preservation is also another important topic in maintaining quality of contents in open access resources. According to Regan (2016), “the quality of future of scholarship and teaching hinges on the preservation of the scholarly record”. Good editorial practices and policies in publishing the scholarly work are important part of open access resources.

## III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To determine the attitudes of students, researchers and faculty members towards quality of contents in open access sources and services
2. To compare the perceptions and attitudes of students, researchers and faculty members towards open access sources and services

## IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A total of 923 respondents viz. students (470), researchers (176) and faculty (277) were selected through stratified random sampling. Various colleges/educational institutions, across the state of Karnataka, offering postgraduate, MPhil and PhD programmes in varied branches of management were chosen for the study. The study focused only on the open sources and services relevant to the respondents in the field of management sciences.

A structured questionnaire was developed by the researcher in consultation with experts to assess the attitude of the respondents towards quality of contents in open sources vis-a-vis the commercial and traditional sources. The questionnaire consisted of five items to elicit response from the respondents on a four-point scale: “highly”, “moderately”, “slightly” or “not relevant”. Various statements for formulated to determine the behaviour and perceptions of the respondents about open access.

The researcher personally visited each respondent and administered the questionnaire. Prior permission was obtained from the respective heads of the institutions to collect data from students and faculty. They were briefed about the study and informed consent was obtained so that they could opt out at any stage of data collection. After data collection, the questionnaires were scrutinized and checked for completeness and the responses were fed to the data sheet for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics and contingency table analysis were employed in the present study keeping with the objectives framed initially.

## V. RESULTS

The results of the study are presented in the following tables.

TABLE I QUALITY OF THE CONTENTS IN OPEN ACCESS INCREASE REPUTATION OF AUTHORS

Agreement	Students	Research Scholars	Faculty	Total
Highly	126 (26.8%)	52 (29.54%)	75 (27.07%)	253 (27.41%)
Moderately	224 (47.65%)	105 (59.65%)	185 (66.78%)	514 (55.69%)
Little	45 (9.57%)	12 (6.81%)	6 (2.16%)	63 (6.83%)
Not relevant	75 (15.95%)	7 (3.97%)	11 (3.97%)	93 (10.08%)
CC= 0.155, P value=.004				

TABLE II QUALITY OF THE CONTENTS IN OPEN ACCESS INCREASE REPUTATION OF PUBLISHERS

Agreement	Students	Research Scholars	Faculty	Total
Highly	160 (34.04%)	85 (48.29%)	61 (22.02%)	306 (33.15%)
Moderately	226 (48.08%)	79 (44.88%)	204 (73.64%)	509 (55.15%)
Little	62 (13.19%)	4 (2.27%)	8 (2.88%)	74 (8.02%)
Not relevant	22 (4.68%)	8 (4.54%)	4 (1.44%)	34 (3.6%)
CC= 0.215, P value=.001				

The table I shows that 27.41 percent of the respondents had high agreement, 55.69 percent had moderate levels of agreement, 6.83 percent had little, and the remaining 10.08 percent had no preference at all for the statement, “Quality

of the contents in open access increase reputation of authors”. However, this pattern was found to be different for students, researchers and faculty, where the test statistics indicated that the faculty had significantly high preferences (CC=.155; p=.004).

For the statement, “Quality of the contents in open access increase reputation of publishers”, 33.15 percent of the respondents had high agreement, 55.15 percent had moderate levels of agreement, 8.02 percent had little, and the remaining 3.6 percent had no preference at all. However, this pattern was found to be different for students, researchers and faculty, where the test statistics indicated that the faculty had significantly high preferences (CC=.215; p=.004).

TABLE III QUALITY OF THE CONTENTS IN OPEN ACCESS INCREASE REPUTATION OF ORGANIZATION/SOCIETIES

Agreement	Students	Research Scholars	Faculty	Total
Highly	145 (30.85%)	37 (21.02%)	87 (31.40%)	269 (29.14%)
Moderately	276 (58.72%)	123 (69.88%)	165 (59.56%)	564 (61.11%)
Little	35 (7.44%)	2 (1.13%)	6 (2.16%)	43 (4.66%)
Not relevant	14 (2.97%)	14 (7.95%)	19 (6.85%)	47 (5.09%)
CC= 0.135, P value=.002				

When the statement “Quality of the contents in open access increase reputation of organization/societies” was analyzed, 29.14 percent of the respondents had high agreement, 61.11 percent had moderate levels of agreement, 4.66 percent had little, and the remaining 5.09 percent had no preference at all. However, this pattern was found to be different for students, researchers and faculty, where the test statistics indicated that the faculty and research scholars had significantly high preferences than students (CC=.155; p=.004).

TABLE IV QUALITY OF THE CONTENTS IN OPEN ACCESS INCREASE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Agreement	Students	Research Scholars	Faculty	Total
Highly	176 (37.44%)	63 (35.79%)	87 (31.40%)	326 (35.32%)
Moderately	221 (47.02%)	77 (43.75%)	165 (59.56%)	463 (50.16%)
Little	61 (12.97%)	23 (13.06%)	6 (2.16%)	90 (9.75%)
Not relevant	12 (2.55%)	13 (7.38%)	19 (6.85%)	44 (4.77%)
CC= 0.256, P value=.001				

It is found from the table IV that, 35.32 percent of the respondents had high agreement, 50.16 percent had moderate levels of agreement, 9.75 percent had little, and the remaining 4.77 percent had no preference at all for the

statement, “Quality of the contents in open access increase peer review process”. However, this pattern was found to be different for students, researchers and faculty, where the test statistics indicated that the faculty had significantly high preferences than the researchers and students (CC=.256; p=.001).

TABLE V QUALITY OF THE CONTENTS IN OPEN ACCESS INCREASE BRAND OF E-RESOURCES

Agreement	Students	Research Scholars	Faculty	Total
Highly	189 (40.21%)	72 (40.9%)	81 (29.24%)	342 (37.05%)
Moderately	223 (47.44%)	67 (38.06%)	145 (52.34%)	435 (47.13%)
Little	56 (11.91%)	14 (7.95%)	6 (2.16%)	76 (8.23%)
Not relevant	2 (0.42%)	23 (13.06%)	45 (16.24%)	70 (7.58%)
CC= 0.204, P value=<0.001				

For the statement, “Quality of the contents in open access increase brand of e-resources”, 37.05 percent of the respondents had high agreement, 47.13 percent had moderate levels of agreement, 8.23 percent had little, and the remaining 7.58 percent had no preference at all. However, this pattern was found to be different for students, researchers and faculty, where the test statistics indicated that the faculty had significantly high preferences than the researchers and students (CC=.204; p=.001).

## VI. CONCLUSION

Open access has garnered much attention and approbation for having greater impact on research and academia in management education. It has become imperative for the stakeholders of research and scholarly publishing to be well-informed about the progression and benefits of open access. The findings of the study reveal that usage patterns of open access differ among distinct academic groups of management education. It is recommended that stakeholders and all part of the research publishing—including faculty, publishers, policymakers, governments, librarians, etc. — should focus more on promoting open access through various academic programmes and activities. Deliberate efforts should be geared towards creating awareness about the techniques and advantages of open access, and developing supporting infrastructure and policies.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Andreas Kaplan (2014). European management and European business schools: insights from the history of business schools, *European Management Journal*.
- [2] Baruah, B.G. (2007). *Role of open access, open standards and open sources in libraries: A study*. Gandhinagar: INFLIBNET Centre, 378-391.
- [3] Lustig, M.V., (2013). Intercultural competence, interpersonal communication across cultures. *Content Technologies, Inc*.
- [4] Management.Business Dictionary. Retrieved from [http:// www.businessdictionary.com/definition/management.html](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/management.html).

- [5] Mills, M. (2016). A case for authoring multi-touch interactive open educational resources. *Techtrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 60(5), 456-464. doi:10.1007/s11528-016-0097-5
- [6] Onzonol, S. I. (2010). Management education: The best is yet to come. In 'From challenge to change: Business schools in the wake of financial crisis' (Acompendium of essays put together by Global Foundation for ManagementEducation) Retrieved from [http://www.gfme.org/pdf/complete\\_web.pdf](http://www.gfme.org/pdf/complete_web.pdf).
- [7] Prasad, Lallan & Gulsha S.S. (2011). *Management principles and practice*. .Excel Books India, 272.
- [8] Regan, S. (2016). Strategies for expanding e-journal preservation. *Serials Librarian*, 70(1-4), 89-99. doi:10.1080/0361526X.2016.1144159.
- [9] Sinha, D. P. (2004). Management education in India, perspective and challenges. pp. 100. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.in/>,
- [10] Tenopir, C., Levine, K., Allard, S., Christian, L., Volentine, R., Boehm, R., & Watkinson, A. (2016). Trustworthiness and authority of scholarly information in a digital age: Results of an international questionnaire. *Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology*, 67(10), 2344-2361. doi:10.1002/asi.23598.