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CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

The study conducted on collection development in Central Library, University of Delhi and Central Library Jawaharlal Nehru University. The following are major findings of present survey generated.

- Central Library, University of Delhi and Central Library, Jawaharlal Nehru University has a good collection of documents such as: books, Journals and e-journals.

- In case of library budget, the budget allocated more for journals than books.

- Selection of study materials is done by librarian, teachers and students recommendations.

- The library uses all the automated function facilities like automated acquisition, cataloguing and circulation etc.

- Central Library, University of Delhi and Central Library Jawaharlal Nehru uses bibliographic as well as online selection tools for selection of study materials.

- The libraries share their resources with DELNET.
TENABILITY OF HYPOTHESIS

The hypotheses formulated in chapter 4 were put to test on the basis of collected and analyzed data as given below:

HYPOTHESIS-I

The total collection of Central Library, University of Delhi is greater than the collection of Central Library, Jawaharlal Nehru University.

Data given in table 1 shows that the total collection of Central Library, University of Delhi is 7,50,000 as compared to that of total collection of Central Library Jawaharlal Nehru University is 6,00,000 Thus the total of Central Library (DU) exceeds that of the total collection of Central Library (JNU) by 1,50,000.

The hypothesis is proved true.

HYPOTHESIS-II

The total allocation of budget for collection development in Central Library, University of Delhi is more than the budget allocated to Central Library, Jawaharlal Nehru University.

The data given in table 2.1 shows that the budgetary allocation in Central Library is 9,00,00,000, while in Central Library, Jawaharlal Nehru University it is 8,70,00,000. Thus the budgetary allocation in Central Library, University of Delhi exceeds by 30,00,000 from the total budgetary allocation to Central Library Jawaharlal Nehru University.
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So, the hypothesis is proved to be true.

HYPOTHESIS-III

The procedure of collection development in Central Library, University of Delhi and Central Library Jawaharlal Nehru University is through librarian and also the recommendations of teachers as well as students are also taken into consideration in both the libraries.

The table 3 shows in both the libraries the selection of study materials is done by librarian, teachers' recommendation and students recommendation.

So the hypothesis is this proved positive.

HYPOTHESIS-IV

Both the libraries use documentary as well as online book selection tools for the selection of books.

Data collected from tables 4 shows both the libraries used documentary as well as online selection tools like bibliographic tools, reviews in journals, Publishers' catalogue and online catalogue.

Thus the hypothesis is proved to be true.

HYPOTHESIS-V

Both the libraries have automated their in-house procedure including acquisition and use a particular library software package.
Data given table 6 shows that both the libraries have automated their in-house activities by using library automation software.

So, the hypothesis is thus proved positive.

**HYPOTHESIS-VI**

Both the libraries resort to resource sharing because no library can be self-sufficient in fulfilling the ever increasing demand of users.

The data given in table 7 shows that both the libraries has been making resource sharing arrangements with other libraries which are member of DELNET.

The hypothesis is proved, true.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of aforesaid mentioned study, certain conclusions are drawn:

1. Both the libraries Central Library (DU) and Central Library (JNU) have a good collection of books and periodicals but comparatively the Central Library (DU) has a large collection than the Central library (JNU).

2. In case of budget, the Central Library (DU) exceeds in size than the Central Library (JNU).

3. Selection of study materials in both the libraries is done by their respective librarians, teachers and students’ recommendations for collection development.
4. The selection tools that have been used in Central Library (DU) are bibliographic tools, reviews in journals, publishers' catalogue, while in Central Library (JNU), bibliographic tools, reviews in journals and online catalogue are used as selection tools.

5. Both the Libraries are automated. They have almost same automated operational infrastructure facilities. But there are some difference in some fields in both the libraries. Microfilm readers is there in Central Library (JNU) but it is not in Central Library (DU).

6. Both the libraries under purview are making resource sharing arrangements with all the member libraries of DELNET.

The present study puts the following suggestions to be implements for the collection development in Central Library, University of Delhi and Central Library Jawaharlal Nehru University.
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SUGGESTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Though the budgetary allocation for collection development are more or less sufficient in both the libraries under purview but there is no budget allocation for floppies/magnetic tapes and CD-ROMS in both the libraries, it therefore advisable to have separate budget allocation for the subscription of floppies/magnetic tapes and CD-ROMS.

2) Though the teachers and students are involved in books selection process in both the libraries, but a well constituted library committee should be there for the selection of study materials in both the libraries.