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FINDINGS, TENABILITY OF HYPOTHESES, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The present study is “Retroconversion of Documents in Central Secretariat Library, Zakir Husain Library, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi: An Evaluative Study”. The present chapter deals with the findings, tenability of hypotheses, conclusion and suggestions.

7.1. Major Findings from Part-A

On the basis of the data analysis of Librarians and Directors responses, the following findings have been derived.

7.1.1 Table 6.1.1 shows that Central Secretariat Library was established in 1891, followed by Nehru Memorial Museum and Library in 1966, whereas Zakir Husain Library was established in 1973. It can be found that CSL is one of the oldest library out of selected three libraries, establish in 1891.

7.1.2. Table 6.1.2 represents that CSL and NMML have a director post, whereas JMI has a full time Librarian post. Table further clarifies that the strength of total staff in ZHL is maximum, i.e., (51), followed by (29) in NMML, whereas CSL has (25) staff members only.

7.1.3. Table 6.1.3 clearly shows that the total collection of CSL has highest collection, i.e., 7.85 lakhs, followed by, i.e. 3.44 lakhs, whereas NMML has only 2.48 lakhs collections.

7.1.4. Table 6.1.4 presents that NMML has highest number of registered users, i.e., (17646), followed by CSL, i.e., (3533) registered users, whereas ZHL has (14718) registered users.

7.1.5. Table 6.1.5 clearly indicates that CSL has highest annual budget, i.e. (2.4 crore) planned and (2.00 crore) non-planned budget, followed by ZHL, i.e, (1.00 crore) and NMML has lowest annual budget, i.e, (54, 76,413 lakhs).

7.1.6. Table 6.1.6 shows the services provided by the selected libraries. Most of the services are providing by these three libraries, i.e, I.L, referral service,
bibliographic service, automated circulation service, OPAC and internet service but no library is providing translation service. The CSL and NMML libraries do not provide e-journal service, whereas ZHL provides e-journal service.

7.2. **Major Findings from Part-B**

7.2.1. Table 6.2.1 reveals that CSL started retroconversion process in 2002 and completed in 2005, ZHL started in 1998 and still continuing retroconversion process, whereas NMML started the retroconversion process in 2003 and completed by 2006.

7.2.2. Table 6.2.2 clearly depicts that CSL and NMML have completed the retroconversion process with the help of outsourced agency, whereas ZHL is still continuing retroconversion process through their own staff.

7.2.3. Table 6.2.3 shows that only ZHL staff is involved in retroconversion process, i.e., (20), whereas other two libraries got the retroconversion work completed by outsourced agencies.

7.2.4. Table 6.2.4 indicates that CSL and NMML have completed retroconversion work through outsourced agencies, i.e., M/s Udbhav computers Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Vergis Electronic Pvt. Ltd. Both are well known agencies in the field of retroconversion work.

7.2.5. The analysis of table 6.2.5 reveals that all the three libraries, i.e., CSL, ZHL and NMML appointed supervisory staff for the supervision of retroconversion work.

7.2.6. It is clear from table 6.2.6 that all the three libraries, i.e., CSL, ZHL and NMML have provided training to their staff members for retroconversion process.

7.2.7. Table 6.2.7 clearly indicates that CSL and ZHL are using Libsys 4.0 software, whereas NMML is using Libsys (Rel. 6.0) software for retroconversion work.

7.2.8. It has been observed from the table 6.2.8 that CSL is using UNIX operating system, ZHL using LINUX, whereas NMML is using WINDOW 98 operating system for retroconversion.
7.2.9. Table 6.2.9 reveals that budget allocated for retroconversion work in CSL was Rs.1.15 crore, followed by 75 lakhs NMML, whereas ZHL did not give any answer regarding allocation of budget for retroconversion work because ZHL is still continuing retroconversion work through their existing staff.

7.2.10. Table 6.2.10 shows that sources of budget of CSL and NMML are Ministry of Culture, Govt. of India, whereas ZHL source of budget is University of Grant Commission, New Delhi-India (U.G.C).

7.2.11. Table 6.2.11 clearly indicates that CSL decided 2002 as cut off period for retroconversion, followed by NMML’s 2003 as cut off period, whereas ZHL did not decide any cut off period because ZHL is doing retroconversion of all the documents from establishment of the library to till today.

7.2.12. Table 6.2.12 depicts that CSL has converted 7, 54,084 lakhs records, followed by ZHL, i.e., 3.44 lakhs approximately, whereas NMML has converted, i.e., 1.83 lakhs records approximately through retroconversion.

7.2.13. Table 6.2.13 reveals that CSL and NMML converted their records through UNIMARC exchange format, whereas ZHL is converting records through MARC exchange format.

7.2.14. Table 6.2.14 shows that CSL and NMML are using Dewey Decimal Classification (21st ed.) scheme for classification, whereas ZHL is using DDC (22nd ed.) for classification of documents.

7.2.15. Table 6.2.15 depicts that all the three libraries are using AACR- II cataloguing format for cataloguing of the documents.

7.2.16. Table 6.2.16 explains that ZHL and NMML did reclassification and recataloguing for the retroversion, whereas CSL did not do any reclassification and recataloguing of the documents.

7.2.17. Table 6.2.17 clearly shows that CSL and NMML are using Library of Congress List of Subject Heading (LCSH) for assigning subject heading for the documents, whereas ZHL is using Sear’s List of Subject Heading for assigning subject heading for the documents.
7.2.18. Table 6.2.18 reveals that CSL and NMML used ISO 2709 exchange format for retroconversion work, whereas ZHL are using Z39.50 exchange format for the retroconversion work.

7.2.19. Table 6.2.19 clearly indicates that the process of retroconversion is done by CSL, i.e., directly through books, followed by ZHL, i.e., through manual card; whereas NMML did through preparing data sheet prepared by project staff and checked by supervisory staff of NMML randomly.

7.2.20. Table 6.2.20 depicts that all the three libraries have OPAC facility for the users.

7.2.21. Table 6.2.21 shows that ZHL has the highest terminals for OPAC, i.e., 10, followed by NMML, i.e., 5 terminals, whereas CSL has 3 terminals for OPAC facility for the users.

7.2.22. Table 6.2.22 clearly examines that CSL and NMML are not providing WEB OPAC facility for the users, whereas ZHL is providing WEB OPAC facility for the users.

7.3. Major Findings from Part-C

On the basis of data analysis of users responses, the following findings have been derived.

7.3.1. Table 6.3.1 depicts that majority of the respondents of ZHL, 125, i.e., (47.17%) visit 2-3 times in a week, followed by 167, i.e., (46.39%) of CSL visit the library daily, whereas 55, i.e., (36.18%) of NMML visit weekly. On the other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 15, i.e., (5.66%) visit monthly, followed by 22, i.e., (6.11%) of CSL visit occasionally, whereas 15, i.e., (9.87%) of NMML visit monthly.

7.3.2. Table 6.3.2 reveals that most of the respondents of ZHL, 258, i.e., (97.36%) are aware of library computerisation, followed by 345, i.e., (95.83%) of CSL, whereas 141, i.e., (92.76%) of NMML are aware of library computerisation.

7.3.3. Table 6.3.3 clearly shows that maximum number of respondents of CSL, 277, i.e., (76.94%) never use manual catalogue, followed by 113, i.e., (74.34%) respondents of NMML and 196, i.e., (73.96%) of ZHL. On the other hand
minimum number of respondents of NMML, 07, i.e., (4.61%) use manual catalogue frequently and rarely, followed by CSL, 18, i.e., (5%) use manual catalogue moderately, whereas 17, i.e., (6.42%) of ZHL use manual catalogue rarely.

7.3.4. The analysis of the table 6.3.4 indicates that most of the respondents are aware of OPAC, 261, i.e., (98.49%) of ZHL, followed by 148, i.e., (97.37%) of NMML, whereas 347, i.e., (96.39%) of CSL. On the other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 04, i.e., (1.51%) are not aware of OPAC, followed by 04, i.e., (2.63%) of NMML, whereas 13, i.e., (3.61%) of CSL are not aware of OPAC.

7.3.5. The analysis of the table 6.3.5 clearly indicates that most of the respondents use OPAC frequently, 227, i.e., (85.66%) of ZHL, followed by 285, i.e., (79.17%) of CSL, whereas 87, i.e., (57.24%) of NMML use OPAC frequently. On the other hand least number of respondents of CSL, 03, i.e., (0.83%) never use OPAC, followed by 03, i.e., (1.13%) of ZHL, whereas 02, i.e., (1.32%) of NMML.

7.3.6. It is clear from the table 6.3.6 that large number of respondents of ZHL, 154, i.e., (58.11%) search through OPAC, followed by CSL, 172, i.e., (47.78%), whereas 62, i.e., (40.79%) of NMML also search through OPAC. On the other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 19, i.e., (7.17%) consult manual catalogue as a searching tool, followed by 27, i.e., (7.5%) of CSL, whereas 20, i.e., (13.16%) of NMML ask the library staff.

7.3.7. Table 6.3.7 clearly examines that the most of the respondents have not received any training for OPAC 248, i.e., (93.58%) of ZHL, followed by 311, i.e., (86.39%) of CSL, whereas 77 respondents of, i.e., (50.66%) have received training for OPAC. On the other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 17, i.e., (6.42%) have received training for the use of OPAC, followed by CSL, 49, i.e., (13.61%), whereas 75, i.e., (49.34%) of NMML have not received any training for the use of OPAC.

7.3.8. Table 6.3.8 clearly indicates that majority of the respondents of CSL, ZHL and NMML, i.e., (69.72%), (68.30%) and (49.34%) gave their views that orientation/workshop programs are not essential for the use of OPAC. On the
other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 17, i.e., (6.42%) gave their views that orientation/workshop programs are very essential, followed by CSL, 29, i.e., (8.06%) least essential, whereas 16, i.e., (10.53%) of NMML responded that orientation/workshop programs are very essential.

7.3.9. Table 6.3.9 shows that maximum number of respondents of ZHL, 246, i.e., (92.83%) do not face any problem in using OPAC, followed by 140, i.e., (92.11%) of NMML, whereas 290, i.e., (80.56%) of CSL. On the other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 19, i.e., (7.17%) face problem in using OPAC, followed by 12, i.e., (7.89%) of NMML, whereas 70, i.e., (19.44%) of CSL face the problem in using OPAC.

7.3.10. Table 6.3.10 the maximum number of respondents face problem due to guidance problem, i.e., (42.11%) of ZHL, followed by (33.33%) of NMML, whereas (30%) of CSL. On the other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 2, i.e., (10.53%) face problem due to limited access terminals and lack of training, followed 2, i.e., (16.67%) of NMML face problem due to limited access terminals, whereas 15, i.e., (21.43%) of CSL due to limited access terminals and lack of training.

7.3.11. Table 6.3.11 depicts that maximum number of respondents of NMML, 146, i.e., (96.05%) search the documents through title, followed by 252, i.e., (95.09%) of ZHL search through subject, whereas 242, i.e., (67.22%) of CSL search through author. On the other hand minimum number of respondents of CSL, 25, i.e., (6.94%) search through call number, followed by 21, i.e., (13.82%) of NMML, whereas 44, i.e., (16.60%) of ZHL also search through call number.

7.3.12. It is clearly from the table 6.3.12 that most of respondents gave their view that the new system adopted by library in accessing relevant document/information facilitated the search, i.e., (97.78%) of CSL, followed by (91.70%) of ZHL, whereas (90.13%) respondents of NMML gave their view that it facilitated the search. On the other hand least number of respondents of CSL, 2, i.e., (1.11%) did not give any response regarding the new system adopted by library in accessing relevant document/information, followed by ZHL, 2, i.e., (2.64%) and 6, i.e., (3.95%) of NMML.
7.3.13. Table 6.3.13 shows that maximum number of respondents of CSL, 347, i.e., (96.39%) say that computerised catalogue is less time consuming in the comparison of card catalogue, followed by 253, i.e., (95.47%) of ZHL, whereas 143, i.e., (94.08%) respondents of NMML. On the other hand least number of respondents of ZHL, 57, i.e., (21.51%) respond that computerised catalogue provides better subject approach, followed by 79, i.e., (21.94%)of CSL more user friendly, whereas 39, i.e., (25.66%) of NMML responded that it provides better subject approach.

7.3.14. Table 6.3.14 depicts that most of the respondents feel the need of trained library staff to acquiring relevant information, i.e., (96.71%) of NMML, followed by (93.61%) of CSL, whereas (79.62%) of ZHL. On the other hand least number of respondents of NMML, 05, i.e., (3.29%) do not feel the need of trained staff in acquiring relevant information in the library, followed by CSL, 23, i.e., (6.39%), whereas 54, i.e., (20.38%) ZHL.

7.3.15. Table 6.3.15 reveals that maximum number of respondents are fully satisfied with OPAC results, i.e., (71.39%) of CSL, followed by (65.66%) of ZHL, whereas (44.08%) of NMML. On the other hand least number of respondents of CSL, 25, i.e., (6.94%) respondents are not satisfied with the OPAC results, followed by 21, i.e., (7.92%) respondents of ZHL rarely satisfied, whereas 22, i.e., (14.47%) of NMML are not satisfied with the OPAC results.

7.3.16. Table 6.3.16 explains that maximum number of respondents of CSL, 211, i.e, (58.61%) are frequently aware of complex search in OPAC, followed by 59, i.e., (38.82%) of NMML, whereas 77, i.e., (29.06%) of ZHL are moderately aware. On the other hand least number of respondents of CSL, 22, i.e., (6.11%) are rarely aware of complex search in OPAC, followed by 24, i.e., (15.79%) of NMML, whereas 56, i.e., (21.13%) of ZHL.

7.3.17. Table 6.3.17 shows that the most of the respondents of ZHL, 93, i.e., (35.09%) response that the behaviour of the library staff is excellent, followed by 113, i.e., (31.39%) of CSL, whereas 43, i.e., (28.29%) of NMML say the behaviour of library staff is very good. On the other hand least number of respondents 02, i.e., (1.32%) of NMML did not give any response regarding
the behaviour of library staff, followed by ZHL, 05, i.e., (1.89%), whereas 07, i.e., (1.94%) of CSL.

7.3.18. Table 6.3.18 depicts that that maximum number of respondents of ZHL, 227, i.e., (85.66%) are satisfied with OPAC in the library, followed by 298, i.e., (82.78%) of CSL, whereas 124, i.e., (81.58%) of NMML. On the other hand least number of respondents 38, i.e., (14.34%) of ZHL are not satisfied with OPAC in the library, followed by 62, i.e., (17.22%) of CSL, whereas 28, i.e., (18.42%) of NMML.

7.3.19. It can be shown in the table 6.3.19 that maximum number of respondents 149, i.e., (98.03%) of NML are aware of automated circulation service, followed by 249, i.e., (93.96%) respondents of ZHL online journal service, whereas 313, i.e., (86.38%) of CSL are aware of automated circulation service. On the other hand least number of respondents of CSL, 37, i.e., (10.28%) are aware of SDI service, followed by 39, i.e., (14.72%) of ZHL, whereas 27, i.e., (17.76%) of NMML are aware of E-CAS and E-Reference Service.

7.4. TENABILITY OF HYPOTHESES

The researcher developed hypotheses based on objectives of the research through answer the research questions. The tenability of hypotheses can be checked in the light of above findings.

HYPOTHESIS-1

Most of the libraries are doing outsourcing retroconversion process.

- Table 6.2.2 clearly depicts that, out of three libraries only two libraries, i.e., CSL and NMML have completed the retroconversion with the help of outsourced agency, i.e., (66.67%), whereas ZHL is still continuing retroconversion process through their own staff, i.e., (33.3%)

The findings of the study exhibit that, out of three libraries the two libraries, CSL and NMML, i.e., (66.67%) of the libraries have done retroconversion with the help of outsourced agency. So the hypothesis is proved to be true.
HYPOTHESIS-I

Most of the staff members of libraries are trained for retroconversion.

- It is clear from table 6.2.6 that all the three libraries, i.e., CSL, ZHL and NMML have provided training to their staff members and their staff members are fully trained for retroconversion process, i.e., (100%).

The findings of the study reveals that all staff members of the three libraries, i.e., (100%). are trained for retroconversion. **So the hypothesis is proved to be true.**

HYPOTHESIS-Ill

Most of the users are aware of library computerisation in the library.

- Table 6.3.2 reveals most of the users of ZHL, i.e., (97.36%) are aware of library computerisation, followed by (95.83%) of CSL, whereas (92.76%) of NMML are aware of library computerisation.

The findings of the study depicts that most of the users of selected libraries are aware of library computerisation. **So the hypothesis is proved to be true.**

HYPOTHESIS-IV

Most of the libraries have done reclassification and recataloguing for retroconversion work.

- Table 6.2.16 explains that, out of three libraries the two libraries, i.e., ZHL and NMML have done reclassification and recataloguing for the retroversion.

The findings of the study exhibit that, out of three libraries, the two libraries, ZHL and NMML, i.e., (66.67%) of the selected libraries have done reclassification and recataloguing for the retroversion. **So the hypothesis is proved to be true.**

The findings of the study explains that all the three libraries, i.e., (100%) have introduced OPAC for their users. **So the hypothesis is proved true.**
HYPOTHESIS-V

Most of the users face problem in using OPAC in the library.

- Table 6.3.9 shows that least number of users of selected libraries face problem in using OPAC, i.e., (7.17%) of ZHL, followed (7.89%) of NMML, whereas (19.44%) of CSL face problem in using OPAC.

The findings of the study exhibit that least number of users of selected libraries face problem in using OPAC. So the hypothesis is proved to be null.

7.5 CONCLUSION

The study sought to examine the parameters of retroconversion process, its methods, staff training, software used and other important aspect related to retroconversion process as well as users perception etc.

It is clear from the findings that selected two libraries, i.e., CSL and NMML have done the process the retroconversion successfully, whereas ZHL is still continuing the process of reroconversion. The study also reveals that all the staff members of selected libraries were trained for retroconversion and all the libraries are using common software, classification scheme and cataloguing code, i.e, Libsys software, DDC and AACR-2. All the libraries have introduced OPAC facility for their users by which they can easily search their document without wastage of time.

The study further identifies that most of the users have not received any training for using facility and they do not face any problem in searching the documents through OPAC and even most of the users felt the need of trained staff in the library for acquiring relevant information. The users were also satisfied with the OPAC results and are aware of various automated services provided by the libraries.

7.6 SUGGESTIONS

Based on the above discussion and observations, following suggestions are made for the implementation of retroconversion in libraries.

- Retroconversion of catalogue being a massive work, should be carried out as crash programme in a time-bound manner. As library staff remains busy with
routine jobs of the library, an outsourced agency should be appointed for this work.

- A separate fund exclusively for retroconversion work needs to be allocated to facilitate speedy implementation.

- Computer training should be provided and made mandatory for all the professional library staff. In-house training programme should be conducted. This mode of training programme will help the staff to practice and assimilate more.

- In-service training at regular intervals should be provided to keep staff abreast with the latest technology.