Chapter No. 6

FINDING, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a brief summary of the finding and conclusions, and to offer some suggestions. It also define hypothesis testing and suggest topic for further research.

6.1 Findings:

1. As per opinions, commercial library Software SOUL (Mean 149.61) is more efficient than other software. LIBSOFT is less efficient than other commercial library software. Open source library software koha (Mean 155.56) is more efficient than others. (Table no. 5.2-5.5)

2. About Capabilities of various library management Software packages, it is found that, SOUL (Mean 2.75) is on top level. Secondly LIBMAN and DELPLUS also capable packages for automation. Open source software KOHA (Mean 2.47) and E-Granthalaya are best than other open source software packages. (Table no. 5.6)

3. On the basis of evaluation criteria Maintenance, commercial library software Librarian (Mean 2.67) and LIBMAN (Mean 2.47) are excellent. In this criteria open source software Nalanda (Mean 1.33) is better than KOHA and others. (Table no. 5.8)

4. Commercial library management software packages, Librarian (Mean 2.83), SOUL (Mean 2.75), DELPLUS (Mean 2.67), and LIBMAN (Mean 2.64) are userfriendly packages for automation. Open source software KOHA (Mean 2.60) and E-Granthalaya (Mean 2.38) are also user friendly other than other open source software packages. (Table no. 5.10)

5. Documentation is powerful in SOUL (Mean 2.87), DELSIS (Mean 2.33), Libsys (Mean 2.28) and Librarian (Mean 2.08) software packages. Open source software KOHA (Mean 2.47) and E-Granthalaya are also powerful software packages. (Table no. 5.12)

6. SOUL (Mean 2.47) and DELPLUS (Mean 2.44) commercial library management software packages are more cost effective. And open source software packages are always free of cost. (Table no. 5.14)

7. Technical Support for DELPLUS (Mean 2.67), SOUL (Mean 2.64), Librarian
Updating facility of SOUL (Mean 2.75), Librarian (Mean 2.58) and SLIM (Mean 2.42) is excellent. And open source software packages are also good in this sense. (Table no. 5.18)

Documentation (Mean 2.86) of SOUL are significantly higher than its capabilities, maintenance , userfriendly, cost, tech.support and updation. (Table no. 5.20)

Documentation (Mean 2.28) of LIBSYS are also significantly higher than its capabilities, maintenance, userfriendly, cost, tech.support and updation in LIBSYS. (Table no. 5.22)

Technical support (Mean 1.72) of LIBSOFT are significantly higher than its documentation, capabilities, maintenance, userfriendly, cost and updation. (Table no. 5.24)

In SLIM library management software package, updation (Mean 2.42) is significantly higher than its documentation, capabilities, maintenance , userfriendly, cost and Tech.support. (Table no. 5.26)

User friendliness (Mean 2.64) of LIBMAN is significantly higher than its documentation, capabilities, maintenance, cost, tech.support and updation. (Table no. 5.28)

In open source library management software package KOHA, user friendliness (Mean 2.66) is significantly higher than its documentation, capabilities, maintenance , cost, tech.support and updation. (Table no. 5.30)

In E-Granthalaya open source library management Software, user friendliness (Mean 2.38) is significantly higher than its documentation, capabilities, maintenance, cost, tech.support and updation. (Table no. 5.32)

Commercial software suchika (Mean 11) , LIBRARIAN and Trishana are more efficient about acquisition function, LIBSOFT (Mean 3), DELSIS, Tulib and Gyanodaya are less efficient and Koha (Mean 11) open source software is also more efficient about acquisition function. (Table no. 5.34-5.37)

LIBRARIAN (Mean 14.75) and LIBSYS (Mean 14.59) are best for cataloguing module. And Autolib (Mean 4.33) are less useful than others. Koha (Mean 14.75) open source software is also useful for cataloguing module. (Table no. 5.38-5.41)
18 Circulation module of Tulib (Mean 18), LIBSYS (Mean 17.46) and SOUL (Mean 17.17) are more powerful than other commercial softwares. Open source software Koha (Mean 18) is also powerful than other open source softwares. (Table no. 5.42-5.45)

19 Serial control Module of DELSIS (Mean 15), SOUL (Mean 13.80), LIBRARIAN (Mean 13.58) and SLIM (Mean 11.39) is most effective than other commercial softwares. serial control module of Koha (Mean 12.81) is also effective. (Table no. 5.46-5.49)

20 Important functions of library software (i.e. budget control, accession work, MARC based data entry, OPAC, book lables, barcode lables, catalogue cards printing, user registration, fine calculation, stock taking, creating purchase order, serial holding list and boolean searching.) is available in almost all softwares. But spine lables printing facility is found in 45.54 percent library software, out of which 50 percent are open source software and 44.09 percent are commercial software. (Table no. 5.50-5.63)

6.2 Testing of Hypothesis:

1. **SOUL 2.0 is the best compatible to library needs.**

   In the light of acquired results it is found that, commercial library software SOUL is more efficient (Table no. 5.2-5.5), SOUL is on top level in capabilities (Table no. 5.6), documentation is powerful (Table no. 5.12 & 5.20), more suitable about cost (Table no. 5.14), updating facility are excellent (Table no. 5.18), circulation module and serial control module is good in SOUL (Table no. 5.42 & 5.45). As per descriptive opinions of professionals, best things noticed in SOUL i.e. user friendly, easy to handle, searching facility, data import-export, AACR and CCF support. Therefore it is concluded that SOUL 2.0 is the best best compatible to library needs. So hypothesis no.1 is true.

2. **Priority for software selection as SOUL 2.0, LIBRARIAN, LIBMAN, MAITRAYEE, GRANTHALAYA, SANJAY, KOHA etc.**

   Acquired results shows that, SOUL 2.0 is the best library management software for automation but, priority for software selection are different from
hypothesis no 2. Priority for software selection is as ‘SOUL, Librarian, DELSIS, LIBSYS, LIBMAN and DELPLUS’. Open source software KOHA is also included in first priority. So hypothesis no.2 is partially true. (Table no. 5.78)

3. **OPAC service is available in most of all softwares.**

The result of Table 5.53 shows that OPAC facility is found in 97.94 percent library software, out of which 100 percent are open source software and 97.27 percent are commercial software. Therefore it is conclude that OPAC service is available in most of all softwares. So hypothesis no.3 is true.

4. **Most of librarians are satisfied with SOUL 2.0 and LIBMAN.**

Acquired results reveal that, best things noticed in SOUL is its user friendliness, easy to handle, searching facility, data import-export, AACR and CCF support. And Table no. 5.2-5.5 shows that SOUL is more efficient. SOUL is also best library management software in evaluation criteria ‘userfriendliness’(Table no 5.10 & 5.20-5.33). Therefore it is conclude that most of librarians are satisfied with SOUL 2.0. On the other hand, Table no. 5.2-5.5 shows that LIBMAN is more efficient as per opinions, Acquired results reveal that, best things noticed in LIBMAN are ‘New user can handle in short training’. On the basis of this reasons it is conclude that most of librarians are satisfied with LIBMAN. So hypothesis no.4 is true.

6.3 **Conclusions of the study:**

Following conclusions are based on the literature review and findings of the study:

1. A variety of softwares are being used by the libraries in India.
2. SOUL 2.0 is the best library management software for automation.
3. Commercial library software SOUL and open source software KOHA is more efficient.
4. SOUL is on top level in capability, documentation, cost effectiveness and updating. Librarian package is higher in maintenance and user friendliness. DELPLUS is best for technical support.
5. Most of the libraries are purchasing or developing software without any sharing of experience with each other.
6. KOHA and E-Granthalaya open source software are more popular than commercial software packages.
7. Priority for software selection is as SOUL, Librarian, DELSIS, LIBSYS, LIBMAN and DELPLUS. Open source software KOHA is also included in priority list.
8. Most of the libraries are dissatisfied with the performance of their software.
9. LIBRARIAN and LIBSYS are best for cataloguing module.
10. Most of the software providers are not providing training facility or online help.
11. OPAC service is available in most of all softwares.
12. There is no coordination among the libraries even after using the same software.
13. Spine labels printing facility is found in 45.54 percent library software only.
14. Most of librarians are satisfied with SOUL 2.0 and LIBMAN.
15. All the libraries cannot afford standard software due to their high cost. Some softwares, which as available free of cost are not providing all desired software modules, updation and Technical support.
16. Librarian and LIBMAN are excellent in ‘Maintenance’. Open source software KOHA is better than Nalanda.
17. Serial control module of DELSIS, SOUL, LIBRARIAN and SLIM are most effective than other commercial softwares. Koha is also effective.
18. Most of the libraries are using open source software, due to the availability of essential library software modules.
19. Librarians found difficult, to enter the bibliographical details of entire collection and shared cataloging is not found.

6.4 Suggestions :

Following suggestions are made for the improvement of library software on the basis of conclusions and the literature reviewed.

1. Librarians should participate in the survey of different automated libraries for exchange of experience before selecting software for their library.
2. To assure the greatest degree of user satisfaction and effective services, opinions of library staff members and users should be considered while selecting foreign, local or developing in-house software.
3. Open source softwares should start technical support and database security.
4. Due to similarity in library automation government should made compulsion in using specific library management software package.

5. Software provider/vendors especially, who are providing software, Upgrad their software regularly.

6. Government should create a post of Automation officer in each and every academic library.

7. Software provider/vendors especially, who are providing software free of cost, should also provide proper training, online help and establish online user groups to facilitate the clients. Software users should share their problems and solutions.

8. Seminars/workshops should be arranged for to find out the librarians’ experience and views about the different library software.

9. National softwares are providing the best services and the highest user satisfaction but very high in cost, should be available on low cost for libraries in India.

10. Checklist used for this study is useful to software evaluation before selecting it for a library.

6.5 **Topics for further study:**

The study has opened different offshoots for further study; the following are some suggestions in this regard.

1. Keeping in view the rapid changes in information Technology, the study should be replicated after every three years.

2. Comparative study of the open source library softwares used in India should be conducted.

3. Comparative study of the digitization softwares, are essential for modern age.


5. Applications of 5S Technique in library management softwares.

6. Applications of various softwares in libraries.

7. In-depth case studies of individual library software packages can be conducted.
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