CHAPTER – 5
FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Traditionally, there are a number of library classification schemes, such as, Dewey Decimal Classification, Universal Decimal Classification, Library of Congress Classification, Colon Classification and Subject Classification. They provide very limited types of indexes like alphabetical indexes. DDC provides its relative index. But, in the 21st century, with the impact of IT some traditional library classification schemes have changed in a glorious way. DDC and UDC are the top most web based library classification schemes. They provide a variety of online services to the users. Users can browse and search the class number by clicking on that it is used to organize electronic data as well as classify libraries. It is the power of hypertext on the web, any item or class number placed at multiple positions in a web based classification schemes. It provides several ways on how to get the same class number and the concept. Online library classification system plays an exclusive role on web. Online editions have many additional features over the print version and allow multiple searching by terms and numbers and have user friendly browsing option.

5.1 Inferences of the Application of Cronbach’s Alpha Techniques and their Findings
To test the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha Technique has been applied on the 93 items which is the most common measure of internal consistency or reliability.

Table 5.1: Result of Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.952</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>α ≥ 0.9</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cronbach's_alpha)
Result
The alpha coefficient for the 93 items is .952 indicating that the items have a relatively higher internal consistency or reliability.

5.2 Findings of the Study

5.2.1 Most Popular Scheme and its Edition Used in the Libraries
The most popular scheme amongst all categories of libraries is found to be using Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC). About 176 (74.6%) libraries are using DDC, 32 (13.6%) are using UDC and 28 (11.9%) are using CC. (Table 4.3)

The most widely used edition in the libraries using CC is the 6th Edition i.e. 25 (89.29%) libraries; 22nd edition of DDC in 58 (31.52%) libraries and UDC-International Medium Edition in 21 (65.63%) libraries. (Table 4.4; 4.4.1; 4.4.2)

5.2.2 Authority to take the Decisions about the Scheme and major reason behind the choice of Scheme
As per decisions to be taken about the classification schemes are concerned, it was found out that in all the categories of libraries, Librarians with the highest percentage of 193 (81.77%) take the decision about the usage of the scheme. (Table 4.5)

The major reason for choosing the classification scheme among the three schemes is the Historical Reason (already in use) with the percentage of CC with 25 (86.20%), DDC 143 (73.71%) and UDC 27 (84.37%) respectively. (Table 4.8)

5.2.3 Adaptation of Modifications with regard to Library Classification Schemes
Only 60 (25.4%) libraries adopt the modifications with regard to the classification schemes used in the libraries and one of the modifications adopted by the librarians is
amongst all the three schemes is the Local Variation with the highest number of 32 (53.34%). (Table 4.6; 4.6.1)

5.2.4 Most Desirable Feature of the Classification Scheme
One of the most desirable features of classification schemes is the Helpful Order in all the three schemes with the highest number in CC with 23 (18.86%) respondents and DDC with 130 (21.92%) respondents and UDC with 26 (20.97%) respondents. (Table 4.7)

5.2.5 Classification of Library Material
As far as the classification of the library material is concerned, 141 (59.7%) respondents classify all the material received in the library. (Table 4.9)

Among all the categories of libraries, classification work is mostly done by Professional Assistants and Librarians themselves with 120 (44.44%) and 122 (45.18%) respondents respectively. (Table 4.10)

5.2.6 Assigning of the Book Number
With regard to assigning of book numbers among all the three schemes, first three letters of the author came out to be on highest position with 116 (54.71%) respondents. (Table 4.11)

5.2.7 Re-Classification of Library Material
As far as re-classification of library material is concerned, 38 (16.1%) respondents agreed to major changes and 68 (28.8%) respondents agreed to slight changes to be made if subsequent edition of the classification scheme would undergo changes. (Table 4.12; 4.12.1)
5.2.8 Consultation with others in making the class numbers
Only 85 (36%) respondents have pointed out that they consult other classifiers or subject specialist in making the class numbers. Among the respondents who consult others emerged as the Librarians of the Other Institutes with a total of 40 (40.40%) respondents. (Table 4.13; 4.13.1)

5.2.9 Collection not yet classified but is in service
Out of the total only 64 (27.1%) libraries have a collection which is not yet classified but is in service. (Table 4.14)

5.2.10 Source for providing the subject heading
Amongst all the categories of libraries, 96 (40.7%) respondents use the source for providing the subject headings as a classification tool and as far as the three classification schemes are concerned, the major source came out to be Sear’s List of Subject heading with 37 (39.36%) responses and Library of Congress Subject headings with 36 (38.30%) responses. (Table 4.15; 4.15.1)

5.2.11 User Complaints with regard to Scheme
Amongst all the categories of libraries, only 23 (9.7%) respondents receive user complaints about the complexities of the schemes. (Table 4.16)

5.2.12 Satisfaction with the Present Scheme
Almost 214 (90.7%) libraries are satisfied with the scheme that they are using. (Table 4.17)

5.2.13 Subjects which are in greatest need for revision
With regard to the revision of subjects for the next edition of the scheme, ICT with 46 (29.48%) respondents came on the top. (Table 4.18)
5.2.14 Major Defect of Library Classification Scheme
One of the major defects of classification scheme is the revision policy in CC with 21 (29.16%) respondents and UDC with 14 (29.16%) respondents; whereas in DDC it is the long class numbers with 120 (40.13%) respondents. (Table 4.19)

5.2.15 Major Problem faced in classifying the library material
The major problem faced in classifying the library material among all categories of libraries is Lack of knowledge of the subject with 93 (37.5%) responses in total. (Table 4.21)

5.2.16 Changer over to the Other Edition/Scheme
From all the categories of the libraries only 13 (5.5%) libraries are intended to change over to the other editions or schemes. (Table 4.20)

5.2.17 Usage and preference of Classification Scheme in the electronic form
A very low percentage 3 (1.3%) of libraries use the electronic version of the scheme (Table 4.22).

The percentage of 109 (46.2%) libraries from all the categories gave preference to online classification tools. Web Dewey has been preferred the most with 25 (59.52%) respondents. (Table 4.25; 4.25.1)

5.2.18 Use of classification schemes for other purpose
The library classification schemes are being used as a tool for searching the document with a highest percentage of respondents 192 (45.17%), Indexing with 102 (24%), Compiling Bibliography with 78 (18.35%), Documentation List with 41 (9.65%) and Organizing Content Page with least percentage 12 (2.83%) respectively. (Table 4.24)
5.2.19 Preference to online version or printed version of the scheme
Only 3 (1.27%) libraries gave preference to online version of the scheme and 233
(98.73%) libraries gave preference to the printed version of the scheme. (Table 4.23)

5.2.20 Awareness about the online classification systems
The most important reason for the lack of awareness about the online classification tools
is budgetary constraints with 103 (39.16%) respondents. (Table 4.26)

5.3 Testing of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis – 1: Library professionals are satisfied with the schemes of classification
currently in use in the library.

To conduct a hypothesis test for measuring the significant differences in the satisfaction
level amongst the library professionals, the chi-square test was applied:

\[
\text{Chi-Square Statistics} = 8.033 \quad (P \text{ Value} = .430)
\]

Since the P Value is lower than the significance level of 0.05%, hence the conclusion
drawn is that the satisfaction level is significantly different amongst the library
professionals. (Table 4.17, 4.17.1)

Thus, the above hypothesis has been supported

Hypothesis – 2: Library classification schemes are used only as a tool for classifying the
collection in the library

The Table 4.24 proves that the library classification schemes are used not only as a tool
for classifying the collection of the libraries but are also being used for other purposes
such as indexing, searching, compiling bibliography and documentation list and
organizing content page.
It is clearly pointed out that in all the categories of libraries, library classification schemes are being used as a tool for searching the document with a highest percentage of respondents 192 (45.17%), Indexing with 102 (24%), Compiling Bibliography with 78 (18.35%), Documentation List with 41 (9.65%) and Organizing Content Page with least percentage 12 (2.83%) respectively.

Thus, the above hypothesis has not been proved

Hypothesis – 3: LIS professionals are adequately trained in the usage of the scheme to classify the library material.

The Table 4.10 proves that the library professionals are adequately trained in the usage of the scheme to classify the library material.

It is clearly pointed out that among all categories of libraries; classification work is mostly done by Professional Assistants and Librarians themselves.

Thus, the above hypothesis has been proved

Hypothesis – 4: Dewey Decimal Classification is amongst the most widely used schemes in the libraries.

To conduct a hypothesis test for measuring the significant differences in the usage of the scheme in all the categories of libraries, the chi-square test has been applied:

Chi-Square Statistics = 24.900 (P Value = .002)
Since the P Value is lower than the significance level of 0.05%, hence the conclusion drawn is that the usage of classification schemes is significantly different in all the categories of libraries. (Table 4.3, 4.3.1)

**Thus, the above hypothesis has also been supported**

**Hypothesis – 5:** The online version of the classification schemes are adequately used in the libraries.

To conduct a hypothesis test for measuring the significant differences in the usage of online version of the classification schemes in all the categories of libraries, the chi-square test has been applied:

\[
\text{Chi-Square Statistics} = 2.396 \text{ (P Value} = .966)\]

Since the P Value is higher than the significance level of 0.05%, hence the conclusion drawn is that the usage of online version of the classification schemes is insignificantly different in all the categories of libraries. (Table 4.22, 4.22.1)

**Thus, the above hypothesis has not been supported**

### 5.4 Suggestions

The following suggestions have been drawn on the basis of the responses received from the respondents and the researcher’s point of view:

1. ICT applications can be extensively be used to simplify the classification process and can increase the efficiency and speed manifold.
2. The classification schemes should have unlimited scope for advances in technological developments.
3. Revision policy should be made simpler and schedules of the schemes should be revised at regular intervals to incorporate new and upcoming subjects.

4. With the help of online classification tools available, such as Web Dewey, UDC online etc. one can have a user friendly approach.

5. There is hardly any awareness amongst library professionals about the online classification tools that are available and this awareness is required, therefore, user awareness programs or information literacy programs should be undertaken in order to maximize the use of online classification tools available.

6. There should be adequate training methodologies made available to train the professionals and the staff in the use of online classification systems that would result in upgradation of their skills.

7. Hence, it is the high time that library science schools/departments or other professional associations should conduct short term training programs especially for classification purposes.

5.5 Areas of Further Research

1. To study the usage of the classification schemes at other metros and state levels.

2. To study the comparative study of the schemes of classification in the ICT Environment.

3. To study the implication of ICT tools in the usage of the classification schemes.

5.6 Conclusion

With the advancement of knowledge and the amount of new data and books being created, these systems have rendered themselves not only invaluable but indispensable. Classification schemes have a major role play in aiding information retrieval in a network environment, especially for providing browsing structures for subject-based information gateways on the Internet. Advantages of using classification schemes include improved subject browsing facilities, potential multi-lingual access and improved interoperability
with other services. Classification schemes vary in scope and methodology, but can be divided into universal, national general, subject specific and home-grown schemes.

In summation, the following conclusions have emanated from the above study carried out:

✓ In the present ICT environment, DDC and UDC are the most suitable schemes of classification that are being used in comparison to the CC scheme since no emerging libraries are ready to adapt to the CC scheme.

✓ The CC scheme is being used only in the age old libraries during the time of Dr. S.R. Ranganathan and the reason for its limited use is due to its rigidity and there is hardly any room for expansion.

✓ The major reasons for the limited use of the electronic version of the schemes are budgetary constraints, lack of requisite infrastructure and awareness about online classification systems.

✓ The Classification Schemes hold a bright future in the ICT environment and therefore cannot be replaced although with the current online classification tools available, these can be supported in a much more convenient and better manner.