Editorial

Prof. Michael Seadle
Berlin School of Library and Information Science, the HEADT\(^1\) Centre, and the iSchools

This issue contains the usual broad range of topics such as automation, digitisation, and open access. Open access is particularly in the news lately because of a new British project called ‘Octopus’ that allows for sharing and commenting on articles as they are being written. Of course preprint servers have long allowed sharing before publication, but project ‘Octopus’ changes both the granularity of access and potentially the writing process itself.\(^2\) It will be interesting to see whether Indian scholars adopt the tools that Octopus proposes, and how that might shape the Open Access environment.

M. Deori, F. Nisha, and M. K. Verma wrote an article about “Analysing the Acceptance and Adoption of Open Access Publications Among Academic Community: a case study of Mizoram University” in which they say that the “purpose of the study, … was to evaluate the acceptance and adoption of open access (OA) publications amongst the scholarly community of Mizoram University, north–east, India Central University.”\(^3\) They retrieved the data “by exporting directly from the Scopus database…”\(^4\) Their conclusion states that “49% out of the total publications were available on open access and the graph shows a rapid increase in the succeeding years.”\(^5\) This is a percentage many western institutions could not boast of.

The article on the “Status of Library Automation in Government College Libraries of Karnataka, India” by M. B. Nashipudi and Muthuraj “deals with the current scenario of automation activities of Government First Grade College (GFGC) Libraries of Karnataka.”\(^6\) The authors hope that the findings will help “to frame a policy for the uniform implementation of the library automation project across the entire academic libraries of Karnataka.”\(^7\) Nonetheless they warn that libraries “need to implement the latest and standard ILMS with immediate effect.” And that training is needed to deliver the “best services and to meet the increasing demands of the clientele.”\(^8\)
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M. I. Lone, A. Wahid, and A. Shakoor wrote an article on “Digitization of Manuscripts and Rare Documents in Select Institutions Located in Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir: a status report” that tries “to understand the present status of digitization of manuscripts and other rare documents maintained in various institutions in Srinagar, [where] … approximately half of the manuscripts and other rare documents have been digitized and the rest are yet to be preserved in the electronic format.” The authors note that a “[m]ajority of the institutions have started outsourcing digitization programmes which should be changed to in-house so that private collection can be digitized...” Outsourcing is often tempting, but ultimately it limits preservation efforts as awareness grows for the need for more digitization.

The article on “Social Media and its Impact on Indian Society” by M. Tyagi looks broadly at the social media role of libraries. The authors write: “Before the use of social media, [the] library as an institution had played a crucial role in sharing the knowledge in the society.” They admonish libraries as active users that “it is our duty that we must understand and pros and cons of social media while using it excessively.” They recognize some dangers in social media too, and warn that it “must not disturb the basic fabric of a society—social interaction, social relations, and social solidarity—as these are essential elements that ensure survival of the human society.”

A. Kaushik’s article on a “Content Analysis of Top Fifty Engineering and Technology Universities Library Websites in the World” showed that none of the institutions studied had a perfect record. “The results also revealed that general information, services, resources, navigation and search tools, copyright information, design, social networking site, and so on were present on the majority of library websites.” They also criticized the fact that some important features “such as job opportunities, Boolean search, person with disabilities service, mobile apps, e-newsletter, website update date, and Web 2.0 Tools were available [only] on limited library websites.”

As always, I hope you will enjoy reading this issue and will learn from the articles.