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CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, detailed discussion on the analysis of data collected from the university libraries under study regarding library security in university libraries has been presented. In this chapter, the major findings and observations and suggestions based on the outcome of the Chapter-V are highlighted to prove the hypotheses and fulfill the stated objectives in Chapter-I

5.2 FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

The findings and observations are broadly classified under appropriate headings with reference to the concerned table and figure numbers.

5.2.1 Sample

i. 647 questionnaires were distributed among LIS professionals working 348 higher educational institutions in and around Chennai. Out of which 459 were responded and the response rate is 70.94% (Table 4.1).

ii. Among the 459 respondents there are 296 (64.5%) male and 163 (35.5%) female respondents; 239 (52.1%) Librarians, 11 (2.4%) Deputy Librarians, 178 (38.8%) Assistant Librarians and 32 (6.8%) Library Assistants; 258 (56.2%) belong to engineering
and technology domain, 85 (18.5%) arts & sciences, 74 (16.1%) medical sciences and 42 (9.2%) polytechnic institutions. The respondents spread over 111 (24.2%) government, 73 (15.9%) government aided, 83 (18.1%) self-financing minority and 192 (41.8%) self-financing non-minority institutions (Table 4.2).

5.2.2 Importance of Library Related Acts

i. There is a significant difference on the importance of the library related acts. The LIS professionals have indicated that they must have fair amount of information pertaining to acts such as ‘Copyright Act’, ‘Trademarks Act’, ‘Right to Information Act’ and ‘Information Technology Act’ and indicated high priority. Similarly LIS professionals must also have awareness on second level priority acts such as ‘Delivery of Books and Newspapers (Public Libraries) Act’, ‘Patents Act’, ‘Designs Act’ and ‘Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act’. (Table 4.3 and Fig. 4.2)

5.2.3 Method of Measures

There are four approaches used for identifying the awareness on 11 different types of information acts (para 4.4). The approaches are

- Self appraisal by respondents on general awareness on various acts
- Source used for obtaining the awareness on acts
- Measure the level of self appraisal
- Comparison of level of awareness with self appraisal
5.2.4 Acts Pertaining to Public Libraries

5.2.4.1 General Awareness on Acts of Public Libraries

i. ‘Delivery of Books and Newspapers (Public Libraries) Act is familiar among LIS professionals than that of Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act. Similarly male professionals are more aware than female (Tables 4.5 and 4.6).

ii. In both, Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act and Delivery of Books and Newspapers (Public Libraries) Act, the professionals working in arts and sciences institutions are more ‘proficient’. It is followed by the professionals in medical sciences institutions (Table 4.7).

iii. Comparing the proficiency and unknown about these acts shows that the professionals working in engineering and technology institutions has the low performance whereas it seems to be high in arts and sciences domain (Table 4.7).

5.2.4.2 Sources for Awareness on Acts of Public Libraries

i. The predominant source for awareness about Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act is ‘books’ (50.5%). It is followed by ‘formal course’ (26.1%) , through ‘friends’ (18.3%) and ‘internet’ (5.0).

In the case of Delivery of Books and Newspapers (Public Libraries) Act ‘books’ (32.2%) are used as primary means for awareness. It is followed by ‘Formal course’ (31.4%), ‘internet’ (24.2) and ‘friends’ (12.2%) is the order of preference among LIS professionals for the act (Table 4.9).
ii. There is no significant difference among the respondents based on their gender on the sources used for acquiring awareness on the acts related to public libraries (Table 4.10).

iii. Similarly there is no significant deviation among domain and nature of management of the institutions in the sources used for acquiring information on acts. In both acts the sources of inspiration is ‘books’ followed by ‘formal course’ (Table 4.11 and 4.12).

5.2.4.3 Level of Awareness on Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act

i. Regarding awareness on various aspects of the Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act reveal that the respondents are well aware about the ‘beneficiaries’ of the act followed by the ‘department responsible for the enactment and amendment’ of the act (Table 4.13).

ii. The male respondents are well aware of the ‘persons behind the enactment’ and ‘beneficiaries’ of the act whereas the female respondents are well aware the ‘department responsible for enactment and amendment’ of the act and ‘sources for the funds to the public libraries’ in regarding awareness on Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act (Table 4.14).

iii. The respondents belong to engineering and technology institutions are well aware of the ‘department responsible for enactment and amendment’ of the act and the ‘persons behind
the enactment’ in regard to Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act. The respondents belong to arts & sciences institutions are well aware of the ‘source for the funds to the public libraries’ and the ‘year of enactment’ of the act. The respondents belong to medical sciences institutions are well aware of the ‘beneficiaries’ and the ‘year of enactment’ of the act. The respondents belong to polytechnic institutions are given their first two preference to the ‘beneficiaries’ of the act and the ‘persons behind the enactment’ of the act (Table 4.15).

iv. As for as Tamil Nadu Public Libraries Act, the professionals working in government institutions provided top two ranks to the ‘beneficiaries’ and ‘source for the funds to public libraries’. Whereas the professional in government aided institutions provided top two ranks to ‘year of enactment’ and ‘source for the funds to public libraries’. The respondents belong to self-financing minority institutions provided top two ranks to ‘department responsible’ for enactment and amendment and the ‘persons behind the enactment’ of the act and whereas the professionals self-financing non-minority institutions provided top two ranks to ‘year of enactment’ and ‘department responsible for the enactment and amendment’ (Table 4.16).
5.2.4.4 Level of Awareness on Delivery of Books and Newspapers (Public Libraries) Act

i. Awareness on various aspects of the Delivery of Books and Newspapers Act reveal that the respondents are well aware about the 'beneficiaries', 'depositary libraries' and the 'year of enactment' (Table 4.17).

ii. The gender wise distribution of respondents regarding awareness on Delivery of Books and Newspapers Act reveal the fact that the male respondents have fair amount of awareness on ‘year of enactment’, ‘depository libraries’ and the, ‘year of amendment’ of the act and the female respondents have on ‘beneficiaries’, ‘depository libraries’ and ‘department responsible. Both male and female respondents are not well aware about the provisions in this act for e-publications (Table 4.18).

iii. There exist significant difference among the professionals working in different domains and nature of management of the institutions on the awareness on Delivery of Books and Newspapers Act (Tables 4.19 and 4.20).

5.2.4.5 Comparison of Self Appraisal with Level of Awareness on Acts Pertaining to Public Libraries

i. Those who have specified as ‘unknown’ in the self appraisal, 12.3% to 22.8% respondents have given correct answers. Those
who have specified ‘

proficient’ in the self appraisal 40.7% to 67.5% of the respondents alone provided right answers. Among the proficient group not answered ranges is between 5.6% and 16.9%. It is surprised to note that those who specified as ‘

known’ have correctly answered (100%) to the ‘

year of enactment’ (Table 4.21).

ii. Those who have specified ‘

unknown’ (21) provided correct answers for eight parameters and it ranges from 14.3% to 66.7%. Near correct answers also ranges from 14.3% to 52.4%. This indicates that the more than 70% respondents are aware about the act eventhough they have indicated ‘

unknown’ in their self appraisal. Similarly those who have marked ‘

proficient’ (235) have answered correctly and it ranges from 28.5% to 54.0% in eight parameters. In the case of one parameter i.e. ‘

enactment’ 90.2% have answered correctly. It can be inferred that the self appraisal has a deviation with the reality. This indicates that few professional lack confidence and few have over confidence (Table 4.22).

5.2.5 Acts Pertaining to Intellectual Property Rights

5.2.5.1 General Awareness on Acts Pertaining to Intellectual Property Rights

i. Among the six acts relevant to IPRs the respondents are well aware about copyright act which is followed by trademarks act
and they are less aware about geographical indications act (Table 4.23).

ii. There is a deviation in the preference between male and female. Chi-square test also indicates the significance on awareness on various IPR acts (Table 4.24).

iii. The copyright act and trademarks act are the top two preferences among the engineering and technology, arts and sciences and medical sciences institutions where as the respondents belong to polytechnic institutions prefer trademarks act and copyright act as top two (Table 4.25).

iv. The respondents in government and government aided institutions are well aware about the copyright act whereas respondents in self-financing minority and self-financing non-minority institutions having fair knowledge on trademarks act (Table 4.26).

5.2.5.2 Sources for Awareness on Acts Pertaining to Intellectual Property Rights

i. The ‘formal course’ is the major source for acquiring awareness on copyright act, designs act, geographical indications act and semiconductor integrated circuits layout-design act and it ranges from 30.7% to 38.1%. In case of patents act and trademarks act, the respondents obtained knowledge through their ‘friends’ (Table 4.27).
ii. There is a significant difference among the respondents in the source used for acquiring awareness on various acts pertaining to intellectual property rights (Table 4.28).

iii. The source of awareness among the domain seems to be ‘formal course’ for all acts irrespective of the domain and nature of management. It is followed by ‘friends’ (Tables 4.29 and 4.30).

### 5.2.5.3 Level of Awareness on Copyright Act

i. The respondents are well aware ‘year of enactment’, ‘copyright’, ‘beneficiaries’ and the ‘artistic and literary works’ covered under copyright act. The least awareness can be seen to Provisions for copying Government documents, Registration for a material and Registration of a name under this act (Table-4.31).

ii. There exist significant difference among gender, nature of management and domain of institutions regarding awareness on Copyrights Act (Tables 4.32 - 4.34).

### 5.2.5.4 Level of Awareness on Patents Act

i. In regard to the Patents, the respondents are well aware about ‘beneficiaries’, ‘applying for already published works’ and the ‘year of enactment’. They are not well aware about ‘term of the right’, ‘department responsible’ and ‘applying a non-inventor for the right’ (Table 4.35).
ii. There is no significant deviation between gender, domain and nature of the management of institutions regarding awareness on various aspects of Patents Act (Tables 4.36-4.38).

5.2.5.5 Level of Awareness on Trademarks Act

i. The awareness on various aspects of the Trademarks Act reveals that the LIS professionals are well aware of ‘trademark that avoids confusion in markets’, ‘registering a name as trade name’ and ‘year of enactment’ comparing to ‘term of the registration’, ‘transfer of the right’ and the ‘beneficiaries’ (Table 4.39).

ii. There exists significant difference in the awareness among male and female in regard Trademarks Act. ‘Trademark avoids confusion in the markets’, ‘year of enactment’ and the ‘registering a name as trade name’ are the preferences among male whereas in case of female the preferences are ‘trademark avoids confusion in the markets’, ‘department responsible’ and the ‘registering a name as trade name’ (Table 4.40).

iii. Similar to gender, there exist difference between domains and nature of management of the institutions on trademark act. However there exists uniform opinion on the variable ‘trademark avoids confusion in the market’ irrespective of domains and nature of management (Table 4.41).
5.2.5.6 Level of Awareness on Designs Act

i. Designs Act reveals that the respondents are well aware of ‘protecting web design’, ‘beneficiaries’ and the ‘department responsible’. The least preferences are provided to ‘transfer of the right’, ‘year of enactment’ and ‘renewal of the registration’ (Table 4.43).

ii. The gender wise distribution of respondents regarding awareness on Designs Act reveals that the male respondents have awareness on ‘protecting web design’, ‘department responsible’ and the ‘year of enactment’ whereas female respondents have awareness on ‘beneficiaries’, ‘renewal of the registration’ and ‘term of the registration’ (Table 4.44).

iii. The domain wise distribution of respondents regarding the awareness on Designs Act reveals that the respondents belong to engineering and technology and arts and sciences institutions were aware on ‘protecting web design’, ‘department responsible’. The respondents belong to medical sciences institutions preference on ‘protecting a web design’, ‘beneficiaries’ and ‘renewal of the registration’ whereas polytechnic institutions preference ‘protecting a web design’ and ‘beneficiaries’ and ‘transfer of the right’ to others (Table 4.45).

iv. The awareness on Designs Act in regard to nature of management of institutions indicates that LIS professionals in government institutions are aware on ‘beneficiaries’, ‘protecting
a web design’ and ‘year of enactment’ whereas in government aided institutions professionals’ preferences are ‘protecting a web design’, ‘renewal of the registration’ and ‘year of enactment’. Self-financing minority institutions preferences are ‘department responsible’, ‘protecting a web design’ and ‘year of enactment’ whereas self-financing non-minority institutions preferences were ‘protecting a web design’, ‘beneficiaries’ and ‘term of the registration’ (Table 4.46).

5.2.5.7 Level of Awareness on Geographical Indications Act

i. In case of Geographical Indications Act, the respondents are well aware about ‘year of enactment’, ‘beneficiaries’ and the ‘department responsible’. The least ranks are provided to ‘transfer of the right’ to others, ‘term of the registration’ and ‘requirement of registration for the right’ (Table 4.47).

5.2.5.8 Level of Awareness on Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act

i. The respondents are well aware about ‘beneficiaries’, ‘department responsible’ and the ‘requirement of registration’ for the right in regard to Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout-Design Act. The least ranks are provided to Year of enactment, Renewal of the registration and Term of the registration (Table 4.48).
5.2.5.9 Comparison of Self Appraisal with Level of Awareness on Acts Pertaining to Intellectual Property Rights

i. There is no much deviation in the opinion on the level of awareness and self appraisal on the awareness in the case of various IPR acts. (Tables 4.49 - 4.52).

5.2.6 Acts Pertaining to Information Technology and Right To Information

5.2.6.1 General Awareness on Acts Pertaining to Information Technology and Right to Information

i. The majority of the LIS professionals are known about the acts pertaining to information technology and right to information.

ii. The male are ‘proficient’ in both Information Technology Act and Right to Information Act, whereas 24.5% of female are ‘proficient’ on Information Technology Act. However it can be seen that both male and female are keen in knowing these acts (Table 4.54).

iii. ‘Proficiency’ in Information Technology Act can be seen more among engineering and technology domain respondents (48.4%). It is followed by polytechnic (40.5%), arts and sciences (25.9%) and medical sciences (24.3%) (Table 4.55).

iv. The respondents irrespective of the nature of management of institutions have given their self appraisal on the acts pertaining
to information technology and right to information as ‘proficient’ (Table 4.56).

5.2.6.2 Sources for Awareness on Acts Pertaining to Information Technology and Right to Information

i. ‘Friends’ are the major source of awareness for having knowledge on information technology act where as ‘book’ is the major source for right to information act (Table 4.57).

ii. The professional have acquired knowledge on information technology through ‘friends’ irrespective of their gender (Table 4.58).

iii. There is deviation among the respondents of different domain of the institutions on using the source of awareness (Table 4.59).

iv. There is deviation among the respondents of different nature of management of the institutions on using the source of awareness (Table 4.60)

5.2.6.3 Level of Awareness on Information Technology Act

i. Awareness on various aspects of the information technology act reveals that the respondents are well aware about ‘department responsible’, ‘year of enactment’ and the ‘digital watermarking’. The least awareness are ‘digital encryption’, ‘security techniques’ and the ‘year of amendment’ of the act (Table 4.61).
ii. The male respondents have provided preferences to ‘year of enactment’, ‘department responsible’ and the ‘digital watermarking’ in the case of information technology act, whereas the least preferences are ‘digital encryption’, ‘security techniques’ and the ‘types of cyber crimes’. The Female respondents’ preferences were ‘department responsible’, ‘beneficiaries’ and the ‘web link to the illegal and banned sites’ and the least preferences are ‘year of amendment’, ‘digital encryption’ and ‘security techniques’ (Table 4.62).

iii. The respondents belong to engineering and technology institutions preferences were ‘department responsible’, ‘year of enactment’ and the ‘digital watermarking’ whereas arts and sciences institutions respondents’ preferences to ‘department responsible’, ‘web link to the illegal sites’ and the ‘year of enactment’. The least three ranks are provided to ‘year of amendment’, ‘digital watermarking’ and ‘digital encryption’. In the case of medical sciences institutions the preferences are ‘security techniques’, ‘year of enactment’ and the ‘web links to the illegal sites’ and polytechnic institutions preference are ‘web links to the illegal and banned sites’, ‘year of amendment’ and ‘beneficiaries’ The least preferences were to ‘security techniques’, ‘digital encryption’ and ‘digital watermarking’ irrespective of domain (Table 4.63).

iv. The respondents in government institutions provide preferences to ‘beneficiaries’, ‘web links to the illegal sites’ and the
‘department responsible’ whereas in government aided institutions’ prefer ‘year of enactment’, ‘department responsible’ and the ‘types of cyber crimes’. In case of Information Technology act, the respondents belong to self-financing minority institutions prefer ‘department responsible’, ‘virus attacks’ and the ‘digital watermarking’ whereas self-financing non-minority institutions’ preferences are ‘year of enactment’, ‘department responsible’ and the ‘digital watermarking’. The least preferences to ‘virus attacks’, ‘Beneficiaries’ and the ‘security techniques’; (Table 4.64).

5.2.6.4 Level of Awareness on Right to Information Act

i. The respondents are well aware about the aspects such as ‘beneficiaries’, ‘year of enactment’ and the ‘fee for information disclosure’ in regard to Right to Information act. The least awareness is seen in ‘visit to the documents’, ‘government which can amend the act’ and the ‘disclosure of third party information’ by Public Information Officer under the act (Table 4.65).

ii. The male respondents have awareness on ‘beneficiaries’, ‘year of enactment’ and the ‘department responsible’. The Female have on ‘beneficiaries’, ‘fee for information disclosure’ and the ‘year of enactment’. The least awareness irrespective of gender can be seen to ‘documents’, ‘period for the disclosure of
information’ and the ‘exemptions from the disclosure of information’ (Table 4.66).

iii. There exists significant difference in regard to awareness on Right to Information Act among different domains and nature of management of institutions (Tables 4.67 and 4.68).

5.2.6.5 Comparison of Self Appraisal with Level of Awareness on Acts Pertaining to Information Technology and Right to Information

i. There is a deviation in the opinion given the respondents between self appraisal and level of awareness on information technology act and right to information act (Tables 4.69 and 4.70).

5.2.7 Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Act

5.2.7.1 General Awareness on Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Act

i. In the case of Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Act, respondents were seems to be ‘proficient’ and it is ranges from 37.5% to 50.7% irrespective of gender, domain and nature of management of institutions. Similarly ‘known’ ranges between 19.2% and 38.6% (Table 4.71).

5.2.7.2 Level of Awareness on Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Act

i. The respondents are aware on ‘beneficiaries’, ‘information available in tender bulletin’ and the ‘year of amendment’. The
least interest can be seen in the case of ‘information published in Indian trade journal’, ‘State tender bulletin’ and ‘periodicity’ of the tender bulletins (Table 4.72).

5.2.8 Barriers in Acquiring Awareness

i. Among the barriers identified in acquiring awareness on various information acts ‘lack of interest from associations’, ‘lack of literacy programmes’, ‘lack of inclusion on information acts in curriculum’, ‘lack of information facilities’, and ‘lack of organisational support’ are the major barriers among the professionals (4.73).

5.3 FINDINGS IN RELATION TO HYPOTHESES

i. The LIS professionals have fair knowledge on the acts pertaining to Public Libraries and there is deviation on awareness with respect to gender, domain and nature of management of institution.

ii. The library professionals are well aware on the IPR issues. There is a significant difference in awareness on various aspects of the acts pertaining to IPRs with respect to gender, domain and nature of management of institution.

iii. The library professionals have fair amount of knowledge on the Information Technology Act and the Right to Information Act. The level of significance on the awareness on various aspects of
the acts among the LIS professionals depends upon the gender, domain and category of institution in which they are employed.

iv. The LIS professionals have less awareness on Tamil Nadu Transparency in Tenders Act when compared to other acts pertaining to public libraries, IPRs and information technology and right to information.

v. The professionals have experienced number of barriers both professional barriers and organisational barriers in acquiring awareness on information acts.

vi. The professionals have experienced the ‘lack of information literacy programmes’ as one of the barriers in acquiring awareness on acts and they need the conduct of such programmes.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS

i. Professional associations should organise programmes on various information acts pertaining to LIS profession.

ii. The LIS schools established under universities and autonomous colleges should upgrade their curriculum and syllabus according the day to day need of the LIS professionals. The curriculum should cover sufficient information regarding to the acts. Modification of the curriculum in LIS schools becomes a mandatory of the day.
iii. Intellectual Property Rights has been included in the curriculum for MBA, engineering and technology etc in some universities. It seems that no universities and colleges have incorporated the acts in the curriculum for LIS course. It should be included in the curriculum.

iv. LIS professionals may be permitted to attend programmes such as conferences, seminars etc for enriching their knowledge on the current trends in the profession.

5.5 DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The following are the directions for further research.

1. The depth study may be extended to the particular domain of the institutions.
2. The study may be extended to other professionals too such as doctors, engineers etc.
3. Study may be extended to Research and Development institutions.
4. The study on awareness on the acts may be extended to the state and national level.

5.6 CONCLUSION

In the modern day, the intellectual works are confronted and exploited by the variety of technological innovations with diversified storage and retrieval techniques. The changing trends do not get adequate benefits for the intellectual works. There is an enough scope for unauthorised use of
intellectual works in the application of innovations in products, process and services.

There needs a measure which has to take care of the contradictory activities of the users of information. The emergence of information super highway in the recent years wider the implications of protection and dissemination of intellectual works within a frame work of acts. In view of the globalisation there is an urgent need to evolve a common approach in updating of acts and laws to the environment. The mere amending the acts may not be fruitful unless it reaches the user community. Therefore, it seems there is an essentiality in identifying the means for making a awareness among the user community on the various acts. A sort of harmonized global approach is required for updating, amending, enforcing the concepts and laws. Consistently such amendments and acts necessitate to stress heavily on moral rights and their enforcements in the digital environment.