CHAPTER 6
FINDINGS, OBSERVATIONS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The Chapter 4 presents the detailed analysis of digitisation process, infrastructure and facilities of digitisation in manuscript libraries of Tamil Nadu. The Chapter 5, the case study, describes the usage of digitisation of palm life manuscripts in SCSVMV University libraries. In this chapter, based on the data analysis and the case studies, the findings, observation and suggestions are discussed.

6.2 FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

6.2.1 Sample Size

- There are 104 manuscripts libraries in the Tamil Nadu of which 94 libraries were responded and the response rate is 90.38% (Table 4.1). This libraries are categories into Public libraries 14(14.89%), Academic institutions 19(20.21%), NGO’s 24(25.53%) and Private organisations 37(39.37%)

6.2.2 Digitisation Prelude

- 32(34.00%) libraries are following the batch mode of digitisation. It is followed by 31(33.00%) libraries adopting phase mode of digitisation, 12 (12.80%) libraries with continuous digitisation and 19 (20.20%) libraries with other mode of digitisation. In the case of public libraries 6(42.90%) libraries adopting the “Phase” mode, 5(35.70%) libraries follows the “Continuous” mode of digitisation and 3 (21.40%) libraries follows the “batch” mode of digitisation.6 (31.60%) Academic institutions are adopting the “Batch” mode of digitisation, whereas 5
(26.30%) libraries are adopting “Continuous” mode of digitisation. 4 (21.10%) libraries are adopting both “Phase mode” and “Other mode” of digitisation respectively. In the case of NGO’s 9 (37.50%) are following the “Batch” mode, 8 (33.30%) are adopting the “Phase” mode, 2(8.30%) libraries are adopting the “Continuous” mode of digitisation and 5(20.80%) libraries follows the “Other” mode. In the Private Organisations 14(37.80%) libraries follows the “Batch” mode, 13(35.1%) libraries adopting “Phase” mode and 10 (27.00%) libraries are adopting “other” mode of digitisation. (Table 4.2)

- 82 (87.20%) respondents indicated that “Accessible at anytime and anywhere” is the major reason for digitisation. It is followed by “Digital Materials occupy less space and large volumes can be stored” by 74 (78.70%) respondents and “easy to access of documents both e-books and e-journals” by 70 (74.50%), “easy to connect intranet server” by 63 (67.00%) and “users are more interested in digital form of documents’ by 58 (61.70%) respondents respectively.

- In general “Accessible at any time and anywhere” has been considered as prime reason for digitisation. It is followed by “Digital Materials occupy less space and large volumes can be stored” and “Easy access to the documents” are the other reasons. In the case of Public Libraries, the preferences were “Digital materials occupy less space and large volumes can be stored” and “Easy access of documents”. (Table 4.3)

- Nearly 82(87.20%) libraries have carried out the digitisation work as in-house and remaining 12(12.80%) libraries provides digitizing as outsourcing. Majority of the private organisations 37(100%) libraries have carried out their digitisation work as in-house, followed by NGO’s 22(91.70%) libraries. In the case of Public libraries 5(35.70%) and academic libraries 5(26.30%) have carried out their digitisation work by outsourcing. (Table 4.4)
6.2.3 Training Received for Digitisation

- It is found that, only 6(6.40%) respondents have received training for digitisation, among this 5(35.70%) in public libraries and 1(4.20%) in NGO’s libraries respectively (Table 4.5)

- Out of 94 libraries, 16(17.00%) libraries preferred “On the Job” and 6(6.40%) libraries preferred Off the Job. 72 (76.6%) of respondents preferred both on the job and off the job training. All the private organisations libraries and 22(91.70%) NGO’s libraries preferred “Both”. In the case of academic institution, 15(78.90%) libraries preferred “On the Job” training and one (4.20%) in NGO’s libraries preferred both “On the Job” and “Off the Job”. (Table 4.6)

- 86.20% of the respondent opined that the training can be had from “Head of the Department of Institution; Consultant/Trainers at Same Cadre; Person who involved in the work and All the Above”. It is followed by 74(78.70%) belongs to “Person who involved in the work”, 42(44.70%) belongs to “Seniors at same cadre”, 36(38.30%) belongs to “Consultants/Trainers”, and 18(19.10%) belongs to “Head of the Department of Institution”. Out of 81(86.20%), utmost 34(91.90%) private organisations opinions are “All the Above” and the least 9(64.30%) in public libraries. 6(42.90%) public libraries and 9(37.50%) NGO’s respondents opinion are both “Consultants/Trainers”, and “seniors at same cadre”. In the case of private organisation 32(86.50%) opinion were “Person who involved in the work”, whereas in public libraries only 8(57.10%) respondent were received training from expert. (Table 4.7)

- 70(74.50%) libraries preferred for digitisation training for “Supportive Staff”. Among this all the libraries in private organisations, 20(93.20%) in NGO’s, 9(64.30%) in public libraries and the least 4(21.10%) in academic institutions preferred for supportive staff. Training to
“Technical Staff” were preferred 10(52.60%) in academic institutions and 3(12.50%) in NGO’s organisation. Whereas in public libraries 5(35.70%) and academic institutions 5(26.30%) preferred training for academic staff. (Table 4.8)

- 15(16.00%) respondent prefer “Classroom training”, and “Training through attending meetings/seminars/conference and workshop” and 12(12.80%) prefer “Training at outside centre”. 52(55.30%) preferred training by all means. Out of 52 (55.30%) libraries, 31(83.80%) private organisations. 15(62.50%) in NGO’s and 6(42.90%) in public libraries prefer training by all means. 13(68.40%) academic institutions and 2(8.30%) NGOs prefer “classroom training”. Five each of public libraries and academic institutions and 2 NGO organisation prefer training at outside centres. Training through meeting/seminar/conference and workshop are preferred to 6(16.20%) private organisations; 5(20.80%) NGOs; 3(21.40%) public libraries and 1(5.30%) academic institutions. (Table 4.9)

- Public libraries expect incentive training, on “Digitisation Creation” 11(78.60%), “Conversion Process” 8(57.10%), “Data Mining”, 8(57.10%), “DBMS” 8(57.10%) and for “Method of Updating” 7(50.00%). 9(64.34%) libraries expect “All the above” area. The academic institutions responded as, 17(89.50%) for “Digitisation Creation”, 14(73.70%) for “Conversion Process”, 12(63.20%) for “Data Mining”, 15(78.90%) for “DBMS” and 13(68.40%) for “Method of Updating”. 14(73.70%) responded for “All the above”. In the case of NGO’s 19(79.20%) for “Digitisation Creation”, 15(62.50%) for “Conversion Process”, 15(62.50%) for “Data Mining”, 19(79.20%) for “DBMS” and 15(62.50%) for “Method of Updating”. 15(62.50%) responded for “All the above”. On the Other hand the Private Organisations responded 29(78.40%) for “Digitisation Creation”, 21(56.80%) for “Conversion Process”, 17(45.90%) for “Data Mining”,
32(86.50%) for “DBMS” and 22(59.50%) for “Method of Updating”. 30(81.10%) responded for “All the above” respectively. (Table 4.10)

- Majority of the respondents 67(7.30%) identify their training requirement “As per Organisation Norms”, followed by 23(24.50%) “Employee’s Feedback” and 4(4.30%) as “Employee’s Performance”. Out of 67(71.30%) libraries, 37(100%) in private organisation follow “As per Organisation Norms”, followed by 20(83.30%) in NGO’s, 9(64.30%) in public libraries and only 1(5.30%) in academic institutions. In the case of academic institutions 15(78.90%) identify the “Employee’s Feedback” whereas in public libraries 5(35.70%) and 3(15.80%) academic institutions identify based on their “Employee's Performance”. (Table 4.11)

- The “infrastructure support”, “Content Selection”, “Modules (Phases)” are the choice of preferences as expressed by the respondents for the training on digitisation. The duration of training place is the least preference among nine parameters (Table 4.12).

- Out of 94 libraries, 7 libraries indicates that the effectiveness of training can be measured by means of “Measuring output after Training” followed by 20(21.30%) libraries indicated “Employees feedback”. 67(71.30%) libraries indicated both the methods. Similarly all the private organisations libraries, 20(83.30%) NGO’s libraries and 9(64.30%) public libraries have also preferred “Both” the methods. 13(68.40%) academic institution, libraries, 2(8.30%) NGO’s libraries and 5(26.30%) public libraries prefer only “Employees feedback”. (Table 4.14)
6.2.4 Different Process of Digitisation of Palm Leaf

- Majority of the respondents 86(91.50%) are willing to convert the manuscript into digitised form. Amongst these all the academic institution and private organizations (100%), 21(87.50%) NGOs and 9(64.30%) public libraries are desired to convert manuscript in digital form. (Table 4.15)

- Out of 93(98.90%) libraries, all the libraries have sufficient manuscript or palm leaf data related to digitisation except one NGO’s libraries. (Table 4.16)

- Out of 10(10.60%) libraries, only five libraries each in public libraries 5(35.70%) and academic libraries 5(26.30%) were adopt pre-quality verification before commencing the process of digitisation. (Table 4.17)

- Out of 94 libraries, only seven libraries (7.40%) are employing outside agencies for data conversion. Of which 5 belongs to public libraries and 2(8.30%) NGO’s libraries. (Table 4.18)

- All the libraries in private organisations identify the source “Through reliable references”, which is followed by 22(91.70%) NGO’s libraries, 9(47.40%) academic institutions, 9(64.30%) public libraries. 10(10.60%) academic institutions indicated that they do not by saying have any Idea. Only 5(35.70%) public libraries identify the source “Through net advertisements”, and 1(4.20%) NGO’s libraries each identifies “Through professional data capturing agencies” and “Through existing source of supply”. (Table 4.19)

- Out of 94 libraries, only 5(35.70%) public libraries are entering into contract for procuring data for digitisation process. (Table 4.20)
6.2.5 Policies and Procedure of Digitisation

- Five (35.70%) public libraries and 10 (52.60%) academic libraries have preferred to digitise “Royal/Rare manuscripts”, whereas 2 (8.30%) NGO’s libraries have preferred to digitise “Unpublished Manuscripts”. 3 (15.80%) academic institutions have preferred to digitise “Based on the Year of Manuscripts”. All the libraries in private organisations 22 (91.70%) NGO’s 9 (64.30%) public libraries and 6 (31.60%) of academic institutions have preferred to digitise “All the palm leaves materials”. (Table 4.21)

- All the libraries in private organisation and 22 (91.70%) NGO’s libraries and 9 (64.30%) public libraries are identify the rare manuscript that are having “Hints available in the MSS” for digitisation. Out of 19 academic institutions only 18 (94.70%) libraries identify rare manuscripts “Based on the condition”. 5 (35.70%) public libraries and 2 (8.30%) NGO’s are identifying the rare manuscript by the “Style of Writing in the MSS”. (Table 4.22)

- Out of 82 (87.20%) libraries that are preferring digitisation of palm leaves in various languages 37 (100%) private organisation, 22 (91.70%) NGO’s libraries, 14 (73.70%) academic institutions and 9 (64.30%) in public libraries alone prefer it. (Table 4.23)

- Out of 94 libraries, 88 (93.60%) libraries are adopting “Digital imaging”. Among this 36 (97.30%) private organisation, 22 (91.70%) NGO’s libraries, 18 (94.70%) academic institutions and 12 (85.70%) in public libraries, are adopting imaging method. Six (6.40%) libraries are adopting “Microfilming”. Out of 6 libraries, 2 each in Public libraries and NGO’s and 1 each in Academic institutions and private organisation libraries were adopting “Microfilming”. (Table 4.24)

- 3 (12.50%) NGO’s libraries indicated “On the Job Training”, is a mean to overcome the technical complexity. Five public libraries are
indicated “Job Simplification” and 8 academic institutions indicated “Job rotation” as a mean to overcome technical complicity. Out of 78 libraries, all 37(100%) private organisation, 21(87.50%) NGO’s, 11(57.90%) academic institutions and 9(64.30%) public libraries are indicated conquer “Frequency Job Evaluation” as a mean to overcome technical complicity. (Table 4.25)

- 83(88.30%) libraries indicated that technical updating is carried out “As and when required”. Six libraries (6.40%) indicates that the technical updating is preferred “Every three years” and 5 libraries (5.30%) indicated once in “Every year” All the libraries in private organisations 23(95.80%) NGO’s libraries, 14(73.70%) academic institutions and 9(64.30%) public libraries indicated that technical up gradation done at “As and when required”. Five (33.70%) public libraries indicated that up gradation is to be done by “Every year”, whereas 5(26.30%) academic institutions (26.30%) and 1(4.20%) NGO’s libraries indicated that up gradation can be done once in “Every three years”. (Table 4.26)

- 88(93.60%) libraries prefer final quality verification at the end of digitisation process and 6(6.40%) libraries prefer in the beginning of digitisation process. Five (35.70%) public libraries and one (4.20%) NGO’s libraries alone indicated that final quality verification is to be carried out at the beginning of the digitisation. (Table 4.27)

- Out of 94 respondents, 80(85.10%) libraries indicated that they also not have any idea on digital image format. 1(4.20%) NGO’s library and 5(26.30%) academic institutions prefer “Black and White” formats and only one NGO’s libraries prefer “Color”. On the other hand 5(35.70%) libraries that to public libraries prefer “All the above format” and 2(8.30%) NGO’s libraries prefer “Grey Level”. (Table 4.28)
• Out of 94 libraries, 83(88.30%) libraries are using GIF format, 10(10.60%) libraries are adopting PDF whereas one library (1.10%) is using JPEG. All the libraries of private organisations are using GIF file format. Similarly 23(95.80%) NGO’s libraries, 14(73.70%) academic institution and 9(64.30%) are adopting GIF formats. Out of 10 (10.60%) libraries that are using PDF format, five each belongs to public and academic institutions. Only one library in NGO’s is using JPEG file formats. (Table 4.29)

• Among the 94 libraries, 81(86.20%) libraries have made available their digital document for references “Only within in the library”, 6(6.40%) libraries have made available the digital document “Only within the institution” and 7(7.40%) libraries made available “through a website”. All the 37(100%) private organisation libraries have made available the digital document within their library”. Similarly 21(87.50%) NGO’s, 14(73.70%) academic libraries and 9(64.30%) public libraries are made available their digital documents “Only within in the library”. Out of 6(6.40%) libraries that made available the document within the documents 5 (35.70%) belongs to public libraries and 1(4.20%) belongs to NGO’s libraries. In all only 7 libraries were made available their digital document through website of which 5(26.30%) belongs to academic institutions and 2(8.30%) belongs to NGO’s libraries. (Table 4.30)

• Out of the 94 libraries, 62(65.95%) libraries included their digital materials document in the main catalog itself whereas only 32(14.05%) libraries are maintaining separately. Out of 62 libraries, all the private organisation and 14(73.70%) academic institutions, 9(64.30%) public libraries and 2(8.30%) NGO’s have included there digitised materials record in the main catalogue itself. 22(91.70%) NGO’s libraries, 5 each in public libraries and academic libraries are having “Separate catalogue” for their digital collection. (Table 4.31)
6.2.6 Financial Support

- Out of 94 libraries, 47(50%) libraries are getting financial support from management. It is followed by 31(32.98%) libraries are getting funds from other sources, 17(18.09%) libraries are separate budget for digitisation process and 16(17.02%) libraries have getting grants from Nodal agencies. Out of 47 libraries, 18(94.70%) academic libraries, 12(50%) NGO’s libraries, 11(29.73%) private organisation libraries and 5(35.70%) libraries are getting financial support from management. Among 31(32.98%) libraries, 5 each in public libraries, academic institutions, NGO’s libraries and 16(43.24%) private organisation are supported from other sources.5 (26.30%) academic institutions, 4 each in NGO’s libraries and private organisation libraries are getting grants from nodal agencies. Out of 17(18.09%) libraries, 6(16.22%) private organisation libraries, 5(35.70%) public libraries, 4(16.66%) NGO’s libraries and 3(15.80%) academic institutions have adopted Separate budget for Digitisation Process. (Table 4.32)

- Out of 89(97.70%) libraries, all the libraries in private organisations, NGO’s libraries and public libraries provides budget allocation for digitisation process as and “when required”. Five (33.70%) libraries get budget allocation “Every Year. (Table 4.33)

6.2.7 Utility Aspect

- Out of 71(75.5%) libraries, all the libraries in private organisation, NGO’s libraries, 9(64.30%) public libraries and 1(5.30%) academic institutions libraries says that “Extract the needy information at one place” whereas in 5(35.70%) public libraries and 3(15.80%) academic institutions libraries says “Reduce searching cost/energy”. In the case of academic institutions 15(78.90%) libraries says that “Less dependability of searching through man power” respectively.(Table 4.34)
Out of 94 libraries, 22(23.40%) respondents says that the target user of digital documents are “Teaching community”. It is followed by 16(17.00%) respondents says “Government agencies”, 13(13.80%) respondent opinion is “All the above”, 12(12.80%) respondent says “Consultants/agencies”, 11(11.70%) respondent says both “User” and “Institutions” and the least 9(9.60%) respondent says “Research Scholars” Out of 22(23.40%) libraries, 11(29.70%) libraries in private organisation and 4 each in public libraries and academic institutions target group is “Teaching community” whereas in 7(18.90%) private organisation and 4(21.10%) academic institutions target group is “Government agencies”. 5(20.80%) NGO’s libraries and 4(10.80%) private organisation says “All the above”. out of 11(11.70%) libraries 3 libraries each in private organisation and NGO’s libraries target group is both “Users” and “Institutions” respectively. 5 libraries each in private organisation and NGO’s libraries target group is “Consultants/agencies”. Four private organisation and three academic institutions target group is “Research Scholars”.(Table 4.35)

60% of the respondents indicated the level of satisfaction existing process of palm leaf as very good. The remaining 18(19.10%) respondents indicated “Good”. However 16(17.00%) respondent says that existing process seems to be “Average”. In the other hand 2(2.10%) respondent were not satisfy with the existing process and their opinion is “Very Poor” and finally one respondent opinion is “Poor”. 28(75.70%) private organization and 15(62.50%) NGO’s indicated “Very good”. 10(52.60%) academic institutions and 5(35.70%) public libraries indicated “Good”. One each in public libraries and private organisations libraries indicated “Poor”.(Table 4.36)

Out of 79(84.00%) libraries, all the libraries in private organization, 22(91.70%) NGO’s libraries, 11(57.90%) academic institutions and 9(64.30%) public libraries acquire promotional programmes by
“Awareness programme at various institutions”. It is further noticed that about 8(8.50%) libraries acquire “Organising periodical seminars/conferences/workshops” among this 5(35.70%) belongs to public libraries and 3(15.80%) belongs to academic institutions respectively. Only 5(26.30%) academic institutions acquire through “Sponsorship programmes” and 2(8.30%) NGO’s libraries are acquired by “Advertisements in suitable media”. (Table 4.37)

6.2.8 Duration / Period of Digitisation of Palm-Leaf

- In regard to duration/period of digitisation of palm leaf, 79(84.00%) libraries indicated that it “Depends on the volume of palm-leaf”. 14(14.90%) respondents indicated “One Year” and 1(4.20%) NGO’s library indicated “6 Months”. Out of 79 libraries, all the private organization and 22(91.70%) NGO’s libraries opinion is “Depends on the volume of palm-leaf” whereas in the academic institutions libraries 8(42.10%) and Public libraries 5(35.70%) the opinion is “One year” respectively. (Table 4.40)

- 77(81.90%) libraries average time to redesign the digitization process is “Depends on the volume of palm-leaf” followed by 15(16.00%) respondents opinion is “One Year” and 2(8.30%) NGO’s libraries opinion is “6 Months”. Out of 77 libraries, all the private organization and 20(83.30%) NGO’s libraries opinion is “Depends on the volume of palm-leaf” whereas in the academic institutions libraries 8(42.10%) and Public libraries 5(35.70%) opinion is “One year” respectively. (Table 4.41)

- All the libraries in private organization, NGO’s libraries, academic institutions and 9(64.30%) public libraries have expressed that the time duration required between testing and implementation is “One year” and only 5(35.70%) public indicated the libraries time duration “6 months”. (Table 4.42)
6.2.9 Source Preservation of Digitised Manuscripts

- Out of 94 libraries, 69(73.40%) libraries were identified the source of management digital collection by “Based on Enquires” followed by 10(10.60%) libraries “Based on the usage volume/circulation” and 5(5.30%) libraries “Based on application” respectively. Remaining 10 (10.60%) libraries that to academic institutions have identified all the above factors are essential. Out of 69(73.40%) libraries, all the private organization libraries, 22(91.70%) NGO’s libraries, 9(64.30%) public libraries and 1(5.30%) academic institutions identify the source by “Based on Enquires”. It is further noticed that 8(42.10%) academic institutions and 2(8.30%) NGO’s are identifying “Based on the usage volume/circulation”. (Table 4.43)

- All the libraries in private organisations, 20(83.30%) NGO’s libraries, 9(47.40%) academic institutions and 9(64.30%) public libraries are frequently updating the palm-leaf into digitization that to “Every Year”. In the case of 10(52.60%) academic institutions and 1(4.20%) NGO’s libraries Updation has been done once in “Every 6 months”, whereas 2 libraries were updating the palm-leaf at “Every 3 months”. It is also further noticed that 6(6.40%) libraries are updating “Every month” respectively. (Table 4.44)

- Majority of 84(89.40%) libraries are digitising the palm-leaves in various languages, which comprises of all private organisations, 8(42.10%) academic institution, 5(35.70%) public libraries and one (4.20%) NGO’s libraries. (Table 4.45)

- Out of 94 libraries, in 84(89.40%) libraries still users are accessing original palm-leaves. Among this all the private organisations, 16(84.20%) academic institution, 9(64.30%) public libraries and 22(91.70%) NGO’s libraries respectively” are preferring original palm leaves. (Table 4.46)
6.2.10 Digital Preservation of Manuscripts

- Out of 94 libraries 36(38.30%) libraries preserved manuscripts in the form of “Soft Copy”. It is followed by 34(36.20%) libraries preserved in the form of “Hard Copy” and 24(25.50%) libraries preserved by both the form of hard copy as well as soft copy respectively. Out of 36(38.30%) libraries, 14(37.80%) private organization, 11(45.80%) NGO’s libraries, 8(42.10%) academic institutions and 3(21.40%) public libraries were preserving their manuscripts in “Soft Copy” form. Further, it is good to notice that, 17(45.90%) private organization, 7(29.20%) NGO’s libraries, 6(42.90%) public libraries and 4(21.10%) academic institutions are preserved their manuscripts in the form of “Hard Copy”. 7(36.80%) academic institutions and 6 each library in NGO’s libraries and private organization are preserved both softcopy and hard copy. (Table 4.47)

- Out of 89 libraries, all the private organisations libraries, NGO’s libraries, academic institutions and 9(64.30%) public libraries are frequently updating the digitized material by “Every Year”. It is further noticed that only 5(35.70%) public libraries are updating “Every six Months”. (Table 4.48)

- All the private organizations, 23(95.80%) NGO’s libraries, 9(63.30%) public libraries and 2(10.50%) academic institutions majority of the users are of digital materials “Students” whereas 9(47.40%) academic institutions and 1(4.20%) NGO’s libraries users are “Research Scholars”. It further seen that 8(42.10%) academic institutions and 5(35.70%) public libraries users of digital materials are “Faculty”. (Table 4.49)

- Out of 71(75.50%) libraries, all the private organisations, 21(87.50%) NGO’s libraries, 9(64.30%) public libraries and 4(21.10%) academic institutions. The use of percentage of digitize materials range between
26% and 50%. 15(78.90%) academic institutions, 5(35.70%) public libraries and one (4.20%) NGO’s library the use percentage were below 25%. However it is worthy to note that 2(8.30%) NGO’s libraries the use percentage of digital materials ranging between 51% and 75%. (Table 4.50)

- Out of 94 libraries, only 76(80.85%) libraries are having plan to publish digitised materials. Of which, 34(91.90%) were private organisations. The remaining 18(75.00%) NGO’s libraries, 14(73.70%) academic libraries and 10(71.40%) public libraries plan to publish the same. (Table 4.51)

6.3 FINDINGS IN RELATION TO CASE STUDIES

6.3.1 Sample Size

- 70 users belong to the Department of Sanskrit and Indian culture of the SCSVMV University are taken up for case studies of which 63 have responded and the response rate is 90% (Table 5.1)

6.3.2 Background Information of Respondents

- Out of 63 students, 48(76.19%) were male and 15(23.81%) were female, 52(82.54%) were hostler and 11(17.46%) were days scholar. It is observed that in region wise the students from Andhra Pradesh is the highest 33(52.38%) followed by Odissa 13(20.63%), Tamil Nadu 12(19.05%) and Kerala is 5(7.94%). 30(47.62%) students can read Telugu and 28(44.44%) are known to speak Telugu, in the case of Tamil language 10(15.87%) students can read and speak Tamil, Only 3(4.76%) students can Read and speak Oriya Language.(Table 5.2)
6.3.3 Visit to the Library

- 13(86.7%) female students visit the library “twice in a week” then 18(37.5%) male students. 16(33.3%) male and one (6.7%) female student visit as and when required. Only 13(27.1%) male students visit thrice in a week. One male (2.1%) and one female (6.7%) student visit the library once in a week. 27 (51.90%) PG students visit the library twice in a week then Research 4(36.40%) students, 14(26.90%) PG students and 3(27.30%) Research students visit the library as and when they required, only 9(17.30%) PG students and 4(36.40%) Research students visit thrice in a week. 2(3.80%) PG students visit the library only once in a week. It can be inferred that male students are visiting the library more than female students. There is no significant difference between PG students and Research scholars in visiting the library. (Table 5.3)

- Irrespective of state 17(26.98%) students visit the library “As and When required”, 13(20.63%) students visit the library “Thrice” a week and 31(49.22%) visit the library twice. It is observed that 20(60.6%) Andhra Pradesh, 9(69.20%) Odissa and 2(16.70%) Tamil Nadu students visit the library twice in a week. Similarly 6(50.0%) Tamil Nadu, 6(18.2%) and 1(7.70%) Odissa students visit the library thrice in a week. 6(18.2%) Andhra Pradesh 5(100.00%) Kerala 3(25.00%) Tamil Nadu and 3(23.10%) Odissa students visit the library as and when required. Only one (8.30%) Tamil Nadu and one (3.00%) Andhra Pradesh students visit the library “once in a week”. (Table 5.4)
6.3.4 Preference to Library Resources

- 26(54.20%) male students are interested in the area of Subject Reference then female 12(80.0%) students. 19(39.60%) male and 1(6.70%) female students are showing their interest in both the newspapers and subject references. Only 3(6.3%) male and 2(13.3%) female students are visiting the library for newspaper. 33(63.50%) PG and 5(45.5%) Research students are interested in subject references. 15(28.8%) PG and 5(45.5%) Research students are interested in both the newspapers and subject reference areas. Only 4(7.7%) PG and 1(9.1%) Research students are interested in the area of newspapers. (Table 5.5)

- Out of 63 users, 38(60.32%) are interested in the area of “Subject Reference”, 20(31.75%) interested area is both newspapers and subject reference and only 5(7.93%) interested with newspapers. It is observed that 27(81.8%) from Andhra Pradesh, 6(50.0%) from Tamil Nadu and 5(38.5%) from Odissa are interested in the area of subject references whereas six each in Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh, 5(100.0%) Kerala and 3(23.1%) Odissa are interested in both the areas such as newspapers and subject references. Only Odissa 5(38.5%) students are interested in the area of newspapers alone. (Table 5.6)

6.3.5 Time Spent in Library

- 22(45.8%) male and 6(40.0%) female students are spending their time of “one to two hours” daily in the library. 20(41.7%) male and 9(60.0%) female students are spending their time “depends upon their situation” in library. Only 3(6.3%) male students are spending either “less than half an hour” or spending “more than two hours” in the library. Further it is noticed that 25(48.1%) PG and 4(36.4%) Research students are spending their time at library “depending upon their situation”. 24(46.2%) PG and 4(36.4%) Research students are
spending nearly “one to two hours daily in the library”. 2(3.8%) PG and 1(9.1%) Research students are spending “less than half an hour” in library. 1(1.9%) PG and 2(18.2%) Research students are spending “more than two hours daily” at library. PG students are using the library than Research scholars. (Table 5.7)

- 29(46.04%) student’s time spent in the library “Depending on the Situation”, 28(44.44%) students spent time in library is “1-2 hrs”, 3(4.76%) students spent the time in library both “Less than half an hour” and “More than two hrs”.18(54.5%) Andhra Pradesh, 5(38.5%) Odissa, 4(33.3%) Tamil Nadu and 1(20.0%) Kerala students are spending nearly “one to two hours daily” in the library. Similarly it can also notice that Andhra Pradesh 15(45.5%), Odissa 8(61.5%), Kerala 4(80.0%) and Tamil Nadu 2(16.7%) students are spending their time “depends upon their situation”. Only 3(25.0%) Tamil Nadu students are spending less than half an hour and 3(25.0%) Tamil Nadu students are spending more than two hours of their time at library. Andhra Pradesh, Odissa and Kerala are spending more time in the library. (Table 5.8)

6.3.6 Source of Motivation

- 29(60.4%) male and 4(26.7%) female students are visiting the library out of their own self interest. One male student visiting the library based on friend suggestion. 18(37.5%) male and 11(73.3%) female students are visiting the library based on both “friend’s suggestion” and their own “self interest”. Majority of PG 26(50.0%) and Research students 7(63.6%) are visiting to the library out of their own self interest. 25(48.1%) PG and 4(36.4%) Research students visiting the library based on both “friends suggestion” and “self interest” is their source of motivation to visit the library. Only 1(1.9%) PG student mentioned that their source of motivation as friends suggestion. Male
and Research student are visiting the library on their own self interest. (Table 5.9)

- 33(52.38%) of users visits the library by self interest. Only one user alone visits the library by “friends suggestion”. It is observed that students from Andhra Pradesh 14(42.4%), Tamil Nadu 10(83.3%), Kerala 5(100.0%) Odissa 4(30.8%) students are mentioned that their source of motivation to visit the library is self interest. Only 1(3.0%) Andhra Pradesh students sharing that its his friends suggestion, Andhra Pradesh 18(54.5%), Odissa 9(69.2%) and Tamil Nadu 2(16.7%) students are mentioning their source of motivation is both self interest and friend’s suggestion. (Table 5.10)

- 27(56.3%) male and 15(100.0%) female students have indicated their section priorities to books and reference books. 21(43.8%) male students are showing their section priorities in all the above such as Book and Reference book, periodicals. It is observed that 35(67.3%) PG and 7(63.6%) Research students are visiting the library for Book and reference books. 17(32.7%) PG and 4(36.4%) Research students are mentioning their section priorities as books references, periodicals.(Table 5.11)

- 42(66.67%) users are visiting the library for “Books and Reference Books” and 24(33.33%) users visit the library for “Books and Reference Books” and “Periodicals”. It is also observed that Andhra Pradesh 27(81.8%), Odissa 9(69.2%) and Tamil Nadu 6(50.0%) students are showing their priorities to books and reference books. 6(50.0%) Tamil Nadu, 6(18.2%) Andhra Pradesh, 4(30.8%) Odissa and 5(100.0%) Kerala students are showing their priorities in all the book references, periodicals etc. (Table 5.12)

- 13(86.7%) female and 45(93.8%) male students refer their friends to utilize the library for references. Among that 48(92.3%) PG and
10(90.9%) Research students refer their friends to utilize the library services for future references. Similarly 33(100.0%) Andhra Pradesh, 12(100.0%) Tamil Nadu, 8(61.5%) Odissa and 5(100.0%) Kerala students are willing to refer their friends to utilize the library services for future references. (Table 5.13)

- Among the different services “Online Reference”, “Digital Facility” and “Seating Facility” are the first three preferences marked by the users. The least preferences marked by the users were for “Lending Services”. (Table 5.14)

6.3.7 Opinion on Library Services

- Male students prefer the “online reference” highly. It is followed by “Digital facility” and “Quick reference” as second and third preference. The ranking of “Seating facility” and “Library Infrastructure” as 4th and 5th positions respectively. In the case of female students the “Digital facility” is highly preferred. It is followed by “online reference” and “Seating facility” as second and third position. The ranking of “Availability of Books and Journals” and “Updation of Subject books” as 4th and 5th rank respectively. (Table 5.15)

- The PG students prefer the “online reference”, “Digital facility” and “Seating facility” as their order of preference. It is followed by “Quick reference” and “Updation of subject books” as 4th and 5th preferences respectively. In the case of research students the “Online reference” is highly preferred. This is followed by “Digital facility” (2.27) as second preferences. The ranking of “Quick reference” (1.45), “Seating facility” (1.45) “Supporting services” as 3rd, 4th and 5th rank respectively. (Table 5.16)

- Majority of male 21(43.8%) and female 7(46.7%) students are visiting the manuscript section daily. 12(25.0%) male students are visiting the manuscript section once in a week. 10(20.80%) male and 8(53.3%)
female students are visiting to the manuscript section twice in a week or more. 2(4.2%) male students are visiting once in a month, one (2.1%) male student is visiting the library twice and above. It is further observed that 17(32.7%) PG and 11(100.0%) Research students are visiting the manuscript section daily. 2(3.8%) PG students are visiting the manuscript section once in a week. 12(23.1%) PG students are visiting the library twice in a week. 11(21.2%) PG students are visiting the manuscript section as and when required. 7(13.5%) PG students are visiting the manuscript section once in a month. 1(1.9%) of PG students are visiting the manuscript section thrice in a week and twice or more in a month. Similarly, it is observed that 18(54.5%) Andhra Pradesh, 4(33.3%) Tamil Nadu, 4(30.85%) Odissa and 2(40.0%) Kerala students are visiting the manuscript section daily. Further, 5(15.2%) Andhra Pradesh, 34(25.0%) Tamil Nadu, 3(23.1%) Odissa and one Kerala (20.0%) students are visiting the manuscript section twice in a week. 7(21.2%) Andhra Pradesh, 2(15.4%) Odissa, one Kerala (20.0%) and one Tamil Nadu (8.3%) students are visiting the manuscript section as and when required. 3(23.1%) Odissa, 2(16.7%) Tamil Nadu and 2(6.1%) Andhra Pradesh students are visiting the manuscript section once in a month. It is surprise to note that one Odissa (7.7%) student is visiting the manuscript section twice in a month. (Table 5.17)

- 16(33.3%) male and 3(20.0%) female students are availing the manuscript facility due to friends motivation, 15(31.3%) male and 4(26.7%) female students are availing due to teacher’s motivation, then 10(20.8%) male and one (6.7%) female students are availing out of their own interest. 6(40.0%) female and 4(8.3%) male students are availing the facility due to library staff’s motivation. 3(6.3%) Male and one female (6.7%) students are availing the manuscript facility due to self interest, friend’s motivation, teacher’s motivation and library staff motivation. In the other hand 17(32.7%) PG and 2(18.2%) Research
students are availing the manuscript facility due to teacher’s motivation. PG 13(25.0%) and 6(54.5%) Research students are availing due to friend’s motivation, then 10(19.2%) PG students are availing the facility due to library staff motivation. 9(17.3%) PG and 2(18.2%) Research students are availing the facility due to self interest. 3(5.8%) PG and one Research (9.1%) students are availing the manuscript facility due to self interest, friend’s motivation, teacher’s motivation and library staff motivation. (Table 5.18)

- Out of 63 users, 19(30.15%) users indicated “Friends Motivation”, and other 19(30.16%) users indicated “Teacher’s Motivation” are means of availing manuscript library. 11(17.46%) users indicated “Self Interest” and 10(15.87%) users indicated “Library Staff Motivation”. Only 4(6.35%) indicated that “all the above” made them to avail manuscripts library. It is observed that 11(33.3%) Andhra Pradesh, 4(33.3%) Tamil Nadu and 4(30.8%) Odissa students are availing the manuscript facility due to teacher’s motivation. 9(27.3%) Andhra Pradesh, 4(80.0%) Kerala, 3(25.0%) Tamil Nadu and 3(23.1%) Odissa students are availing the facility due to friend’s motivation, 7(21.2%) Andhra Pradesh, 2(15.4%) Odissa and 1(8.3%) Tamil Nadu students are availing the facility due to Library staff’s motivation. 4(33.3%) Tamil Nadu, 3(23.1%) Odissa, 3(9.1%) Andhra Pradesh and 1(20.0%) Kerala students are availing the facility out of their own self interest. Andhra Pradesh 3(9.1%) and Odissa 1(7.7%) students are availing the manuscript facility due to self interest, friend’s motivation, teacher’s motivation and library staff motivation (Table 5.19)

- 13(27.1%) male and 4(26.7%) female students are making subject related references in manuscripts. 8(16.7%) male and 9(60.0%) female students are making general references in manuscripts. 27(56.3%) male and 2(13.3%) female students are making both subject related and general references in manuscripts. Further 15(28.8%) and 2(18.2%) research students are making subject related references in manuscripts.
13(25.0%) PG and 4(36.4%) research students are making general references in manuscripts. 24(46.2%) PG and 5(45.5%) research students are making both subject related and general references in manuscripts (Table 5.20)

- Seventeen users (26.98%) each are referring manuscripts for “Subject Related” and “General Collections”. 29(46.04%) users are referring manuscript for both “Subject related and “General Collections”. It is observed that 11(33.3%) Andhra Pradesh, 3(25.0%) Tamil Nadu and 3(23.1%) Odissa students are making subject related references in manuscripts. 11(33.3%) Andhra Pradesh, 3(25.0%) Tamil Nadu and 3(23.1%) Odissa students are making general references in manuscripts. 11(33.3%) Andhra Pradesh, 7(53.8%) Odissa, 6(50.0%) Tamil Nadu and 5(100.0%) Kerala students are making both subject related and general references in manuscripts. (Table 5.21)

- 31(64.6%) Male and 9(60.0%) female students are having the awareness about the digitisation of manuscripts. 33(63.75%) PG and 7(63.6%) research students are having the awareness. 21(63.6%) Andhra Pradesh, 7(58.3%) Tamil Nadu, 7(53.8%) Odissa and 5(100.0%) Kerala are having the awareness about the digitisation of manuscripts (Table 5.22)

- 20(41.7%) male and 5(33.3%) female students are aware of manuscript section on their self interest. Those who have visited the manuscript section have motivated their friends to visit the same. In that category 10(20.8%) male and 3(20.0%) female students are aware of manuscript by their friend’s motivation. 7(14.6%) male and (26.7%) female are aware of manuscript due to their teacher’s motivation. 11(22.9%) male and 3(20.0%) female students are aware manuscript through library staff. It is observed that 21(40.4%) PG and 4(36.4%) Research students are aware of manuscript section on their self interest. Those who have visited the manuscript section have motivated their friends to visit the
same. In that category 10(19.2%) PG and 3(27.3%) Research students are aware of manuscript by their friend’s motivation. 9(17.3%) PG and 2(18.2%) Research scholars are aware of manuscript due to their teacher’s motivation. 12(23.1%) PG and 2(18.2%) research students are awared by library staff. (Table 5.23)

- Twenty five (39.68%) of user are motivated by “Self Interest” in regard to use of manuscript section. Similarly 14(22.22%) users motivated by “Library Staff” and 13(20.64%) are motivated by “Friends”. Eleven (17.46%) of users are motivated by “Teachers”. It is observed that Andhra Pradesh 14(42.4%), Tamil Nadu 5(41.7%), Kerala 4(80.0%) and Odissa 2(15.4%) students are aware of manuscript section on their self interest. Andhra Pradesh 7(21.2%), Tamil Nadu (33.3%) and Odissa 2(15.4%) students are aware of manuscript by their friend’s motivation. Andhra Pradesh 8(24.2%) and Odissa 3(23.1%) are aware of manuscript due to their teacher’s motivation. Odissa 6(46.2%), Andhra Pradesh 4(12.1%), Tamil Nadu 3(25.0%) and Kerala 1(20.0%) students are awared by library staff. (Table 5.24)

- More male students 34(70.8%) and female 9(60.0%) students are describing their opinion about digitization of manuscripts are good. 14(29.2%) male students and 6(40.0%) female students state their opinion as satisfactory. Whereas PG students 36(69.2%) and research 7(63.6%) students are describing that their opinion about digitization of manuscripts as good. 16(30.8%) PG students and 4(36.4%) research students state their opinion as satisfactory. It can be observed that Andhra Pradesh students 24(72.7%), both Tamil Nadu (58.3%) and Odissa 7(53.8%) and Kerala 5(100.0%) students are describing that their opinion about digitization of manuscripts were good. 9(27.3%) Andhra Pradesh students, 6(46.2%) Odissa and 5(41.7%) Tamil Nadu students state their opinion as satisfactory. (Table 5.25)
• 25(52.1%) male students and 3(20.0%) female students are referring the digital palm leaf manuscripts daily. 8(53.3%) female students and 4(8.3%) male students were referring twice in a week. Six male students (12.5%) and one (6.7%) female students are referring the digital palm leaf only once in a month. 9(18.8%) male and 2(13.3%) female students are referring the digital palm leaf as and when they required. Only 2(4.2%) of male students are referring weekly once and 1(2.1%) of male students referring weekly thrice respectively. 25(48.1%) PG students and 3(27.3%) Research students are referring the digital palm leaf manuscripts daily. 9(17.3%) PG students and 3(27.3%) research students were referring twice in a week. 6(11.5%) PG students and one (9.1%) research students are referring the digital palm leaf only once in a month. 11(21.2%) PG students are referring the digital palm leaf as and when they required. Only 2(18.2%) of research students are referring weekly once, one PG student are referring monthly twice and one (9.1%) research students referring weekly thrice respectively. (Table 5.26)

• 28(44.44%) users are referring the digital palm leaf “daily”. Similarly 13(20.63%) users are using “weekly twice and above” and 11(17.63%) are refering “as and when required”. 7(11.11%) users are referring digital palm leaf “Monthly once”. It is observed that Andhra Pradesh 12(36.4%), Tamil Nadu 9(75.0%), Odissa 4(30.8%) and Kerala 3(60.0%) students are referring the digital palm leaf manuscripts daily, 7(21.2%) Andhra Pradesh, one Tamil Nadu (8.3%), 3(23.1%) Odissa and one Kerala (20.0%) students are referring the digital palm leaf manuscript section twice in a week. 5(15.2%) Andhra Pradesh, 4(30.8%) Odissa, one Kerala (20.0%) and one Tamil Nadu (8.3%) students are referring the digital palm leaf manuscript section as and when required. 6(18.2%) Andhra Pradesh and one Odissa (7.7%) students are referring the digital palm leaf manuscript section once in a month; Only one Odissa (7.7%) and Tamil one Nadu (8.3%) students
are referring the digital palm leaf manuscript section twice in a month.(Table 5.27)

- 10(20.8%) male and 4(26.7%) female students are making subject related references in digitized palm leaf manuscripts. 20(41.7%) Male and 9(60.0%) Female students are making general references in digitized palm leaf manuscripts. 18(37.5%) Male and 2(13.3%) Female students are making both subject related and general references in manuscripts. However PG 13(25.0%) and 1(9.1%) research students are making subject related references in the digitized palm leaf manuscripts. 23(44.2%) PG and 6(54.5%) research students are making general references in the digitized palm leaf manuscripts. 16(30.8%) PG and 4(36.4%) research students are making both subject related and general references in the digitized palm leaf manuscripts.(Table 5.28)

- 29(46.03%) students are refered “General” manuscript, 14(22.22%) of students are refering “Subject related manuscripts” and 20(31.75%) students refering both General manuscripts as well as subject related manuscripts. Tamil Nadu students 7(58.3%) were make their references from general collection of the digitized palm leaf, 2(16.7%) students are referring subject related references in the digitized palm leaf and 3(25.0%) students were make their references in the digitized palm leaf both as general collection and subject related. Among 5(38.5%) Andhra Pradesh students were make their references in the digitized palm leaf as a general collection, 6(46.2%) students are referring subject related references in the digitized palm leaf and 2(15.4%) students were make their references in the digitized palm leaf both as general collection and subject related. The Odissa students 17(51.5%) were make their references in the digitized palm leaf as a general collection, 5(15.2%) are referring subject related references in the digitized palm leaf and 11(33.3%) were make their references in the digitized palm leaf both as general collection and subject related Whereas the Kerala students 1(20.0%) making their references in the digitized palm leaf related to
their subjects and remaining 4(80.0%) students were making their references in the digitized palm leaf both as general collection and subject related (Table 5.29)

- “Digital technology is updated with reference to Digitisation of Manuscripts” is highly noticed in the services under study. This is followed by “Coverage of Digitized Palm Leaf Manuscript is high”, “level of reference through digitized manuscript” and as second and third rank respectively. (Table 5.30)

6.4 FINDINGS IN RELATION TO HYPOTHESES

The study undertaken as indicated that the hypotheses:

1. There exist variations in the collection of palm leaf materials in the palm leaf libraries of Tamil Nadu

2. There exist adequate infrastructure in the palm leaf libraries for digitisation

3. There is significant difference in the hardware and software facilities in different palm leaf libraries in Tamil Nadu.

4. Library administration focuses on hurdles / problems / constraints in the digitisation of palm leaf.

5. There exist differences in the digital infrastructure establishment such as Scanner and digital camera

All the hypotheses have been tested and found valid.

6.5 SUGGESTIONS

This study has identified the importance of information particularly in the field of digitisation of palm leaf manuscripts libraries. The use of digitised palm leaf manuscripts and preservation techniques adopted for palm leaf manuscripts,
digitisation process in the manuscript libraries differs from person to person. On analyzing the data in chapter four, a number of findings and observations facilitates the formulation of the following suggestions to enhance the capabilities of palm leaf manuscripts libraries.

6.5.1 General Suggestions

- Draft a set of guidelines, standards and practices for digital preservation.
- Develop means to coordinate digital preservation activities among institutions
- Develop institutional policies for acquisition, conversion, storage and maintenance of digital materials
- Redesigning of library and information science curriculum with reference to digital preservation.
- Plan and programme for education and training of digital preservationists.
- Prepare a model for infrastructure required for digital preservation.
- Sharing of technical know how of digital preservation from and among the fellow professionals.

6.5.2 Building Provision

In the light of observation made by researcher about the inadequate provision of library building in most of the libraries under study and in view of the demand for the provision of effective digitisation process and services which needs better physical infrastructure. It is suggested the authorities shall take necessary steps for the provision of building, physical infrastructure, etc.
6.5.3  Provision of Computers Terminals, Hardware and Software

In the view of existing situation with regard to the provision of computer terminals, hardware, software and others ICT infrastructure in most of the libraries, it is suggested to provide more computer terminals, hardware and software to facilitate the easy access to digital library resources by the users.

6.5.4  System of Procedure

In the light of examination made by investigator it is being found that there is no uniformity maintained in the process of digitisation. Therefore a uniform code of process/system of procedure has to be evolved and guide the LIS professional to follow the same.

6.5.5  Creating Awareness

Awareness has to be created amongst the custodians of the manuscripts about the treasure contents in the manuscripts. In other words, it is essential to make the people aware that the contents in the palm leaf manuscripts are the real treasures. This can be achieved by conducting workshops/seminars/conferences and through public media.

6.5.6  Declare as National Property

All the palm leaf manuscript possessed by organisation or individual should be declared as national asset. This is with the idea that individuals or organisations holds the manuscripts has no right to claim the ownership for knowledge. In fact the knowledge taken out from the manuscript should be brought under Intellectual Property Right. It is the knowledge or inventions of our ancestors by their sheer interest, out of their hard work and research, with limited resources.
6.5.7 Financial Resources

Financial resources becoming a stumbling block in the case of digitisation. It is essential to provide a substantial involvement in hardware, software and human work on digitisation projects. Due importance for providing funds for digitisation has not been provided by administration and organisations, especially in the case of palm leaves. Few suggestions were put further for the financial resources.

- The cultural heritage department should come forward to allocate more funds for this purpose. Tough it is being carried out in a humble manner right now.

- The Ministry of Human Resources Development, National Mission for Manuscripts and its NAMAMI should form a separate expert board to organise the standardised method and process of digitisation.

- The public charity organisations and NGO's should also be brought under this umbrella and should be involved in identifying the custodians and educate them about the process of digitisation of palm leaf manuscripts.

- The corporate sector that are providing financial resources towards digitisation of palm leaf manuscripts provided with tax exemptions under income tax act and if possible provide the publishing right to them.

- The quality verification of the digitisation of manuscripts can be made by experts.

6.5.8 Take Care of Palm Leaf Manuscripts

Palm leaf manuscripts are to be taken care for the following reasons:
6.5.8.1 Duty

Those who have taken on the role of custodians, curators, conservators or employees of an institution which deals with manuscripts has to take care of the manuscripts. As scholars and students also, it is their duty to take care of manuscripts as these are the source of knowledge. For the common man too the Constitution of India states, under Fundamental Duties in Article 51A, "It shall be the duty of every citizen of India to value and preserve the rich heritage of our composite culture".

6.5.8.2 Respect

One of the values that find presence in almost all Indians is that of respect for that which provides us knowledge. This is a good reason to take care of our manuscripts with sincerity.

6.5.8.3 Knowledge

Manuscripts contain knowledge and wisdom that have developed over millennia through the efforts and experiences of generations of families. Much of this knowledge may not have been recorded or known and if such knowledge disappears through the loss of the manuscript, then it will be very unfortunate to have lost this memory of human progress.

6.5.8.4 Historical significance

Many manuscripts contain references to events of the past. At the same time, those manuscripts which have survived for centuries, themselves have significance of antiquity. Many of the manuscripts have been written by eminent personalities of their times, and contain their thoughts. The material of the manuscripts, the methods and techniques with which the leaf, the bark or the paper was processed and the manners in which the inks were prepared also have great historical significance as most of these practices have fallen to disuse and the manuscripts are the only unique surviving examples of these practices.
6.5.8.5 Motivated Staff

One of the first things affecting the care of collections is the lack of motivation in the staff to look after the collections. This motivation could arise from many things such as the presence of a well-defined duty, avenues for promotions or professional development, a cheerful work environment and interest in the job and suitable incentives.

6.5.8.6 Trained staff

A well-trained staff member can take care of manuscripts in the correct manner and more efficiently. At the same time by doing a good job, the self-esteem of the person also rises.

6.5.8.7 Job description of a manuscript custodian

A custodian of manuscripts should have a clearly defined job description specifies that the care of the collection as one of the priorities. In the absence of this job description, the focus of work shifts to other issues. For ‘Care of Manuscripts’ to be part of the conscious agenda, activities related to the care of manuscripts must be specifically mentioned in the job descriptions of various levels of employees or persons taking care of collections.

6.5.8.8 Specific responsibility

It is important that specific responsibilities for the care of collections be fixed on persons in charge of collections. At the same time credit should also be given to these functionaries when collections have been well looked after.

6.5.8.9 Standard Operating Procedures

For the care of manuscripts and for guiding the staff and other assistants, a basic standard methodology of executing steps to take care of manuscripts should be laid out.
6.5.8.10 Monitoring

If there is regular monitoring of the way the care of manuscripts is being taken, and of the results, then the health of the collection will improve with every passing day.

6.5.8.11 Documentation

Very few manuscript collections in India have been completely documented, as most documentation efforts are aid to be ‘ongoing’. A proper and complete documentation of the collection is of great advantage as it helps to keep manuscript collections in order.

6.5.8.12 Administrative support

For the administrative staff of the organization, including the Head or Owner of a collection, the manuscript section in-charge and staff should make periodical presentations about the collection, the problems and work to be done, or being done. The administration section in turn should provide all reasonable support to the manuscript section to complete their duties in an efficient manner.

6.5.8.13 Written preventive conservation guidelines

It is very helpful to have written step-by-step instructions on what action to take to ensure that the condition of manuscript collections will remain good for years to come. These instructions should be in clear and simple language and should be updated periodically. Case studies and examples should be included with every step.

6.5.8.14 Disaster management or retrieval plans in place

When disaster strikes, the eventual loss is almost total and instantaneous. A regular implementation of preventive conservation guidelines can prevent disasters. In case disaster does strike, it is most helpful to have a plan of action written down and rehearsed by all members of the staff and volunteers identified for the purpose.
For the manuscripts damaged in the disaster, there must also be a written plan to prevent further damage and to salvage them.

6.5.8.15 Proper storage

One of the first lines of defence for the care of a collection is a proper storage of the manuscripts. Assuming that most collections already have stores arranged in a certain manner, it becomes very important for the institution to reorganise the manuscripts storage once again according to preventive conservation guidelines. This action when properly implemented will remove most of the negative factors that combine to destroy entire manuscript collections either slowly or instantaneously.

6.5.9 Basic Responsibilities of Custodians of Collections

Majority of the users are preferring the original palm leaves even though they access the digital format. Hence it becomes mandatory to preserve the original. Further, these manuscripts describe the cultural heritage of the nation.

There exist a set of basic responsibilities of the custodian of palm leaf collection. The responsibilities were grouped under four broader categories such as

- Owners, Custodians and Head of the Institutions
- Manuscript Conservators-Restorers
- Trainers of Manuscript Conservation
- Manuscript Storage Area

The responsibilities are discussed below to facilitate the NGOs and private organisation to adopt the same.
6.5.9.1 Owners, Custodians and Heads of Institutions having manuscript collections

The owners, custodians and head of the institutions have to adopt certain procedures in order to maintain the palm leaf collection. The responsibilities are:

- They must know their collection, why it is important, its problems and how they can be solved.

- They must have written action plans for preventive conservation and a time schedule for its implementation.

- They should be in contact with the institutions that can help them conserve manuscripts.

- They must ensure that the staff is trained in how to look after the collection in the proper manner.

- They should be able to mobilize resources to implement the conservation action plans.

- They should monitor the condition of the collection, the implementation of the conservation action plan as well as the systems in place to run the manuscript section.

6.5.9.2 Manuscripts Conservators-Restorers (MCR)

- The MCR should be aware of the nature and problems of the collection

- The MCR should have a preventive and curative conservation action plan with a time schedule

- The MCR should set up a work-oriented conservation section with necessary tools, equipment and materials for conservation.
• The MCR should be aware of the limitations of their knowledge and practical skills and should do no harm to the manuscripts intentionally or by wrong treatment

• The MCR should understand the problem well and then treat it according to principles of conservation

• The MCR should ensure that proper records of the treatment are maintained and kept in an appropriate place for reference

• The MCR should continuously upgrade their technical skills.

• The MCR should assist in raising resources for conservation by presenting the work done in an effective manner.

6.5.9.3 Trainers of manuscripts conservation

• The trainer should understand the nature and problems of the collection and think of the possible solutions. Then the trainer should tailor the contents of the session to address the problem in light of the solutions.

• The trainer should first of all have complete command of all aspects related to the nature and composition of manuscripts, how they degrade, and how to prevent or treat this deterioration

• The trainer should have a clear understanding of the nature of the audience, their level of knowledge/experience, should prepare the sessions well and not take any audience for granted

• For every session being conducted, the trainer should have a clear objective of what is being taught and why

• The trainer should be able to assess how much of what has been taught has been understood
• The trainer should know how to prepare and handle various types of teaching materials and equipment

• The trainer should refresh his or her knowledge by reading books, attending conferences and train-the-trainers meets.

6.5.9.4 Manuscripts Storage Area

The basic requirements of manuscript storage area are:

• Clean and tidy room

• Precautionary measures from fire or water disaster

• Electric switchboard should be outside the room if possible

• Good lighting

• Good ventilation

• Manuscripts kept in an ordered manner in clean boxes or cupboards

• Shelves should be able to take the load of the manuscripts

• Space for at least one person to move

• Manuscripts should not be on the floor

• The storage area should be inspected regularly

• At least one table and chair near the storage area to prepare inspection reports etc.

• A quarantine room where recently acquired or donated manuscripts should be examined for insect or fungus attack and kept under observation before being documented and brought into the storage area.
6.6 DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The investigator has identifies the following topics for further research based on the present study:

1. Preservation Conservation and Dissemination of Digital Palm Leaf Manuscripts in India.

2. Digitisation and Preservation of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in India.

3. Digital Preservation needs and methods in Palm Leaf Manuscript Library institutions.

4. Information Management in Digitised Manuscripts.

5. Comparative study on the digitisation of palm leaf manuscripts between public libraries and academic institutions in Tamil Nadu.

6. Problems and prospects of library digitization in institutes of higher education: with special reference to India.
6.7 CONCLUSION

The study on the digitisation of palm leaf manuscripts in Tamil Nadu emphasizes that the existing manuscripts libraries such as public libraries, academic institutions, NGO's libraries, and private organisations infrastructure in terms of such as hardware and software, internet facilities, financial support, utility aspect are more to be strengthened.

In libraries the most obvious benefit of digitization is to preserve and provide the aggregation of various resources, in digital form, using digital technology and resources are preserved for future generation and simultaneously made accessible for current use. Most of the rare materials housed in various libraries are not in good shape and required special preservation techniques. Digital preservation needs the availability of appropriate infrastructure tools and techniques and also manpower. Digitization projects have been important for libraries aiming the digitization of manuscripts, which are special in nature. Preservation issues, copyright, intellectual copy right issues, bibliographic integrity, identification, standards are important issues to be kept in mind while proceeding digitization.

It is in the best of interests of institutions authorities and manuscripts custodians to understand the strengths and limitations of this technology and to participate in establishing guidelines for its use for creating records that will ultimately come under their jurisdiction. Keeping in view of the significance of digitizing of manuscripts and their present state of storage, it is seriously urged that in this new millennium, the digitization of manuscripts in Tamil Nadu will go in for “Digitization” in order to preserve and disseminate the manuscripts of cultural heritage.