CHAPTER-6
CONCLUSION, FINDINGS, HYPOTHESES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study sought to examine collection development and services in law libraries in Delhi. This chapter contains the findings, hypotheses, conclusion, suggestions and recommendations for further study, based on survey as well as literature review and also on the basis of data collected through the questionnaire method, its analyses and interpretation in tabular form. On the basis of this data and responses received from the Director, Librarians as well as from the users of various libraries, the analysis of the data has been done to get the following findings:

6.1 Major Findings Part-1

This part is based on the responses received from the Directors\Librarians\Head of the libraries.

1. The study shows that among both the categories of libraries (Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries) the oldest library is Parliament Library which was established in 1921 and the latest one is LLJMI which was established in 1989.

2. The analysis of the study shows that in both the categories of libraries designation and pay scale in highest rank differs, so no similarity is found in designation and pay scales of these libraries. Further, Academic Law Libraries are categorised as departmental libraries attached to the Central Library System and are headed by either Assistant Librarian or Semi-Professional Assistants while Special Law Libraries are fully independent and headed by Director or Librarian.

3. The study depicts that the total membership of Academic Law Libraries is 910 while in Special Law Libraries the total membership is 4133. The study also highlights the highest no. of membership in Parliament Library which is 3,703, followed by ILI-579, HCJL-398, LLUD-265,
LLJMI-66 and in SCJL only 32 members are there, as SCJL library is used by only Supreme Court Judges/PA to Supreme Court Judges.

4. The study reveals that the total collection of documents among three Academic Law Libraries is much lower than Special Law Libraries. Further, it is found that among Academic Law Libraries total acquisition of printed documents is highest in Indian Law Institute library and among the Special Law Libraries; the Parliament Library has highest acquisition of printed documents during the last five years.

5. The study shows that the total acquisition of e-documents during the last five years in all the three Academic Law Libraries under study is half than the total addition in Special Law Libraries.

6. It is also clear from the study that the annual budget for session 2010-11 in all the Academic Law Libraries is much lower than the Special Law Libraries under study, while among the Special Law Libraries the Parliament Library has maximum budget for session 2010-11.

7. The study also highlights that in Academic Law Libraries the increase of annual budget is not sufficient on the other hand, the increase of annual budget in Special Law Libraries is satisfactory during the last five years.

8. The study depicts that the budgeting provisions for print and electronic documents are adequate in all Special Law Libraries as compared to Academic Law Libraries under study, whereas in the Academic Law Libraries the budget is inadequate except in ILI library.

9. It is found that there is no collection development policy in any of the libraries under study but separate internal policy is being followed by all the libraries under study.

10. The study shows that in all the Academic Law Libraries, the selection of study materials is being done through the librarians and teachers only while in Special Law Libraries the selection of study materials is done by the members of Parliament/Honorable judges and library committee.

11. The study shows that in all the three Academic Law Libraries only the publishers’ catalogue is being used as tool for material selection whereas
in Special Law Libraries various methods such as reviews in journals, reviews in books and newspapers, online reviews and social media are being used for material selection.

12. The study finds that Academic Law Libraries use all types of modes of acquisition i.e. purchase, gift & exchange while Special Law Libraries use only two modes of acquisition i.e., purchase and gift.

13. The study concludes that in Special Law Libraries, all type of criteria such as quality, subject relevance, currency, language, uniqueness of content, cost effectiveness, hardware/software compatibility, strength of search engine/access point etc. are being followed to evaluate the documents for selection while Academic Law Libraries do not follow all types of criteria to evaluate the documents as mentioned above. They evaluate as per the requirements of the users.

14. The study identifies that only Academic Law Libraries specially LLUD & LLJMI face the problem of inadequate funds and ILI have sufficient funds whereas among Special Law Libraries SCJL faces the lack of autonomy because the acquisition is being done by the requisition given by the senior judges of Supreme Court.

15. It is found that in ILI, LLUD, LLJMI, PL and SCJL the criteria for weeding out of reading materials of the libraries are through obsolete materials, damaged books and surplus copies etc. In HCJL weeding out of reading material is done as per their own criteria.

16. It is observed that most of services such as circulation service, reprographic service, reference service, CAS service, etc are being provided by the libraries under study but only PL provides translation and microfilm services.

17. It is observed that Classification scheme i.e. Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) is being used by PL & LLJMI, Colon Classification (CC) is used by LLUD and Universal Decimal Classification (UDC) is used by ILI, SCJL, & HCJL.
18. It is found from the analysis that Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR-2) is being used by all libraries except LLUD, whereas Classified Catalogue Code (CCC) is being used for the cataloguing of library materials.

19. The study shows that there is a provision of resource sharing in ILI, LLUD, LLJMI, SCJL, & HCJL respectively while in PL there is no provision of resource sharing.

**Major Findings-Part-2**

This part of research findings is based on users’ responses received through the questionnaire, interview and observation method.

1. It is found from the analysis that the majority of the users in Academic Law Libraries use the library for the purpose of study and research work, while in Court Libraries and Parliament Library majority of the respondents said that they use the library for the purpose of updating their knowledge.

2. The study reveals that in all the Academic and Special Law Libraries majority of the respondents visit the library daily and the frequency of respondents visiting once in a month is highest in LLJMI and lowest in ILI.

3. It is observed that in all the Academic Law Libraries majority of respondents are using books, theses/dissertations and journals while in Special Law Libraries majority of respondents are using cases for references.

4. It is found from the analysis that in all the Special Law Libraries majority of respondents are using e-cases and e-reports whereas in Academic Law Libraries most of the respondents are using e-books, e-journals and online database. It is also found that in all the Academic Law Libraries the online users are lower than in Special Law Libraries.

5. It is observed that the collection of legal database i.e. SCC, AIR and Manupattra are used in all Academic Law Libraries and Special Law
Libraries under study, except LLJMI where only SCC and AIR databases are used by users.

6. The majority of the respondents are using e-books, e-journals, e-cases and e-reports whereas in HCJL which is the highest and in LLJMI it is lowest among all the libraries under study. The CD-ROM databases are used maximum in SCJL and minimum in ILI, as per responses by users. Moreover, frequencies of use of e-resources are highest in HCJL and lowest in SCJL. On the other hand, in Academic Law Libraries the use of e-resources is maximum in LLUD and minimum in LLJMI.

7. It reveals that e-mail service is a favorite activity by users of Special Law Libraries and Academic Law Libraries except LLJMI where the users use the library for preparing presentation and other academic activities.

8. It is observed that Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC) is mostly used in HCJL and least used in LLJMI.

9. It is observed that majority of the respondents do not face any difficulty in using OPAC, if they come across with any difficulty they take the help of the library staff.

10. In all the Academic and Special Law Libraries under study majority of the respondents are aware about the circulation, reprographic, reference, and CAS services. While only 50% users are aware about the translation services in all the Special Law Libraries.

11. It is observed that majority of respondents are satisfied with books in Academic Law Libraries and Parliament Library, while majority of the respondents are satisfied with cases in the Court library.

12. The study reveals that the behavior of library staff in Special Law Libraries is more satisfactory in comparison to Academic Law Libraries. The reason for the same is that in Special Law Libraries the users are more qualified and having some responsible position while in Academic Law Libraries they deal with the students mostly.
6.2 Tenability of Hypotheses/ Testing of Hypotheses Analysis and Interpretation

For any type of analysis, some statistical tools have to be used to ensure that the survey that was carried out is statistically significant or not. The entire test is based on a statistical method which is based on some rules. First of all in null hypothesis about the topic of the survey is made as well as the alternative hypothesis too is constructed. The result of the survey is then analyzed to help the rejection or acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Singh, S.P (2002) Defines Null hypothesis “as a statement about a status quo that asserts that any change from what has been thought to be true will be due entirely to sampling error”.

For doing any analysis of the data, the following process or procedures are put to note:

1) Null hypothesis
2) Alternative hypothesis
3) Test statistic (Chi-square test)
4) Level of significance (5%)
5) Conclusion

**Null Hypothesis (H₀) –** Any positive statement about the related topic of study is known as null hypothesis. This means or assumes that there is no significant difference/change about the said topic.

**Alternative Hypothesis (H₁) –** in case of alternate hypothesis there is a significant difference/change about the said topic.

The tenability of hypothesis can be checked in the light of the above.

The hypotheses for the present study are as follows:
Hypothesis-1

Null hypothesis (H₀)

In both the categories of Law Libraries in Delhi i.e., Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries are not adopting a uniform collection development policy.

Alternative hypothesis (H₁)

The alternative hypothesis assumes that both the categories of libraries i.e., Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries in Delhi are adopting a uniform collection development policy.

According to the result as shown in Table-5.1.4.4 that in both the categories of libraries do not have collection development policy in a uniform way but they follow their own collection development policy as per their requirements. It shows that both categories of law libraries in Delhi are not adopting the collection development policy in the uniform manner.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis-2

Null hypothesis (H₀)

Tools used for the Selection of Materials are not the same in all the libraries of both the categories.

Alternative hypothesis (H₁)

Tools used for the Selection of Materials are same in all the libraries of both the categories.

It is observed from Table-5.1.5.2 which clearly highlights that Special Law Libraries are using various methods and tools for material selection such as reviews in journals, reviews in books and news papers, publishers’ catalogues, subject bibliography, online reviews, social media, etc. while in Academic Law Libraries only the publishers’ catalogue is being used as tools for material selection. The result shows that all the libraries under study-100% users are using publishers’ catalogue, four libraries i.e., 66.67% users are using
online reviews and social media and 50% are using reviews published in journals and books.

Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected.

**Hypothesis-3**

**Null hypothesis** ($H_0$)

There is no significant difference in yearly addition of print as well as electronic documents of libraries under study during the last five years.

**Alternative hypothesis** ($H_1$)

There is significant difference in yearly addition of print as well as electronic documents of libraries under study during the last five years.

It is observed from Table 5.1.4.2 that in both the categories of libraries the yearly additions of print documents are constantly increasing.

It is also observed from Table 5.1.4.3 that in both the categories of libraries the yearly addition of e-documents is constantly increasing. In Academic Law Libraries it was 48 in 2006-07; it increased 57 up to 2010-11. It means total e-documents it becomes 48+57=105, while in Special Law Libraries it was 122 in 2006-07, it increased 54 up to 2010-11. Now the total e-documents are 122+54=176.

It means that in both the categories of libraries the collections (print as well as electronic) are constantly increasing.

So, the alternate hypothesis is accepted and null hypothesis is rejected.

**Hypothesis-4**

**Null hypothesis** ($H_0$)

In both the categories of libraries Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries of Delhi are not having the use of online legal databases.

**Alternate hypothesis** ($H_1$)

In both the categories of libraries Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries the online legal databases are being used.

It is observed from Table-5.1.7.1 that all the libraries have the good collection and use of legal databases required for law libraries under study,
except LLJMI, which is using only Supreme Court Cases (SCC online) and All India Reporter (AIR online) databases. It means that 83.33% libraries are having good collection and having their use of online legal databases to fulfill the requirement of the users.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis-5**

**Null hypothesis (H₀)**

In both the categories of libraries i.e., Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries the budget is not increasing constantly during the last five years.

**Alternative hypothesis (H₁)**

In both the categories of libraries i.e., in Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries the budget is increasing constantly during the last five years.

It is observed from Table 5.1.3.2 that the additions of annual budget of both the categories of libraries are constantly increasing. In Academic Law Libraries the speed is slow but in Special Law Libraries the proportion of addition is high, i.e. in ILI it increased 48% during 2006-2011, in LLUD it increased 14.60%, in LLJMI 33.33%, in SCJL 78.57%, HCJL 75.55% and in PL it increased 46%.

It means that in both the categories of libraries the budget is increasing constantly during the last five years.

Thus alternate hypothesis is accepted and null hypothesis is rejected.

**Hypothesis-6**

**Null hypothesis (H₀)**

There is no significant difference among the users of law libraries with regard to use of OPAC and traditional catalogue.

**Alternative hypothesis (H₁)**

There is a significant difference among the users of law libraries with regard to use of OPAC and traditional catalogue.
It is observed from Table 5.2.7 that the use of OPAC is much high in comparison to traditional catalogue.

Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

**Hypothesis-7**

**Null hypothesis (H₀)**

All the users in both the categories of libraries i.e., Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries are neither aware nor satisfied with the services provided by the libraries and also with the behavior of library staff.

**Alternate hypothesis (H₁)**

All the users in both the categories of libraries i.e., Academic Law Libraries and Special Law Libraries are aware and satisfied about the services provided by the libraries and also with the behavior of library staff.

It is observed from the Table-5.2.10 awareness with circulation service provided by various libraries, there is a significant difference where calculated value is less than the tabulated value, thus in this case null hypothesis is accepted, while in case of reference service (Table 5.2.10.2), in case of current awareness service (Table-5.2.10.3), reprographic service (Table-5.2.10.7), etc as there is significant difference in both the values, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis.

**6.3 Conclusion and Suggestions**

On the basis of the survey of libraries under study the following conclusions can be drawn:

Special Law Libraries, i.e. The Supreme Court Judges Library, The High Court Judges Library and The Parliament Library have good collections, adequate budget as well as qualified library staff to serve its users, but the situation in Academic Law Libraries under study i.e. Indian Law Institute Library, Law Library University of Delhi and Law Library Jamia Millia Islamia with regard to collections, budget, qualification of staff and services provided/level of satisfaction with library staff is not very satisfactory. As the academicians are the pillars of the nation, therefore, the government should
improve the standard of Academic Law Libraries. In this regard the increment of budget and the qualification of staff as per requirements during recruitment should be taken care of.

The reason for the slow pace of development of Law Library Collection Development and Services in Delhi may be:

Absence of National Law Library and National Legal Information System on the lines of National Medical Library (NML), National Agriculture Library (NAL) and there is no documentation center in the field of law as are in other fields such as the Defense Sciences (DESIDOC), Agriculture Sciences (AGRIS), Natural Sciences (INSDOC now NISCAIR) and Small Scale Industries (SENDOC). Though there is a Social Science Documentation Center in the country (NASSDOC), it does not cover legal literature.

The major factors responsible for the state of under-development of Law Libraries and Law Librarianship in India are:

- lack of any professional forum for law librarians,
- no provision for in-service training programs for Law Librarians,
- lack of any specialized academic course in Law Librarianship, as J.D. programme is started in Hong Kong University launched in September 2009, is a full time 2 years law degree that provides comprehensive and in depth legal education to students without prior background in law.
- the absence of a National Legal Information System supported by a network of Law Libraries in India.

Some suggestions for strengthening Law Librarianship in India:

On the basis of the survey from the Directors/Librarians of libraries under study some comments and suggestions is received.

- A National Law Library and a National Legal Information System consisting of a network of the National Law Schools, Supreme Court Library, all High Courts’ Libraries, libraries of the National and State judicial academies and libraries of the research institutions should be created by the Government of India to serve the information requirements of the legal fraternity in India.
Recently, the Registrar Generals’ Conference adopted the acquisition policy of the Supreme Court of India. It is to be followed in the coming years in all the High Courts. This forum should also address the issue of formulating standards for court libraries in India for consistency and uniformity.

The Indian Ministry of Law should take initiative to establish a consortium of law libraries for optimum utilization of funds in acquisition of library materials and e-resources and should also prescribe qualifications and pay scales for different levels of Court Libraries to ensure consistency and uniformity.

Librarians working in Law Libraries should come together and form an Association of Law Libraries in India so as to establish an effective forum for sharing and exchanging their experiences for their mutual benefit. This association should publish a law library journal and a newsletter and organize conferences and seminars regularly, and it should also organize refresher courses and training programs for Law Librarians in India on the pattern of AALL (American Association of Law Libraries).

Efforts should be made to start a specialized course in Law Librarianship by any of the Indian Law schools, or by any of the other universities.

6.4 Recommendations for Further Research

On the basis of the findings of the present study the following suggestions/may be withdrawn/ have been made for further research.

1. A study can be conducted on collection development and services of ent of Law Libraries in India: a comparative study.

2. A study can be conducted on Collection Development of National Law University Libraries in India.

3. A comparative study can be conducted to find on collection development and services of Academic Law Libraries in India.

4. A comparative study can also be conducted on Collection development and services of Academic Law Libraries and court libraries in India.
5. A comparative study can be conducted to find out the collection
development and services of Academic Law Libraries at national and
international level.


7. Impact of services of Academic Law Libraries in the development of the
nation.

8. Use of Electronic Information Resources in Law Libraries in India.