A Comparative Study on Library Automation among Seshadripuram and Al-Ameen Group of Institutions

Vasantha M. C.[1]; Dr. Adithya Kumari H[2]

Research Scholar, Department of Studies in Library and Information Science
University of Mysore, Mysuru & Librarian, Seshadripuram Institute of Management Studies
Bengaluru[1]; Professor, Department of Studies Library and Information Science
University of Mysore, Mysuru, Karnataka, Indore[2]

vasanthamc@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present paper discusses the status of library automation of Seshadripuram and Al Ameen group of institutions. Both the institutions have their own legacy in the field of education by providing quality education to the society. In the study it is found that both SET and AES group of institution libraries are automated and the status of automation of their library is quite good. They majorly covered administration, cataloging and circulation modules. Libraries of SET institutions are automated their library using Mycampuz library automation software. It shows the uniformity in adopting software within the group of institutions.

KEYWORDS: Library Software, Mycampuz Software, Library Automation, Digital Resources.

INTRODUCTION

Information Communication Technology (ICT) have changed the way of libraries selection, acquire, organize and dissemination of information. Library automation simply defined as use of computer technologies in the library. It indicates mechanization of various daily and repetitive tasks performed by human and it is eased exactness, elasticity and consistency in the service of knowledge Centre. According to Webster's dictionary "Automation is the technique of making an apparatus, a process or a system to operate automatically"

The present study discusses library automation of two major group of institution one is Seshadripuram Educational Trust (SET) group of institutions and another one is Al ameen education society (AES) group of institutions. Both the institutions offer educational programs ranging from kindergarten to doctoral degree. Both organisations have proven their existence in the field of education by providing quality education to the society. Both the institutions produced abundant alumni who have outshined in their fields and brought honors to the society.

LITERATURE MAPPING

Harinarayana (1991) in his study highlights the perceptions of automation and scope of library automation which includes the mechanization of daily in house library operations from collection development to providing service. Jayamma and Krishnamurthy (2015) have emphasized on the scenario of library automation of Bengaluru city college libraries. Chitra and Kumbar (2020) highlighted the scenario of library automation of four districts of Karnataka.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To discover the type of software being used by both SET and AES group of institution.
- To know the current status of library automation in both SET and AES group of institution.
- To find out areas of automation and services provided through software.
- To find out satisfaction level towards in using of library automation software in both SET and AES group of institutions.

SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The present study aims to highlight the current status of libraries of SET and AES group of institutions. As we know both the institution running many institutions across Karnataka state but the present study includes 12 institutions, out of which 4(four) institutions belong Al Ameen Education Society and rest of the 8(eight) institutions belong to Seshadripuram Educational Trust. All the 12 institutions offer higher education and affiliated to different state universities.

METHODOLOGY

In the present study a structured questionnaire used to collect quantitative data from librarians. A total 14 questionnaires were distributed among eight institutions of SET group and six of AES group of institutions. Out of six institutions from AES, 4 librarians responded and that was no response from rest of the two institutions. All the 8 questionnaires sent to SET group of institution librarians and all of them are responded on time. So that the study concluded with 12 respondents and they provided their valuable suggestions for the study. Collected data is analyzed and interpreted using simple percentage (%) and presented in the form of figures and tables.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table -1: Status of Library Automation

The primary objective of the study is to identify the status of library automation among AES and SET group of institutions. For the same we gathered data from respective librarians and presented the same in below table.

Library automated	SET group of institutions (N=8)	AES group of institutions (N=4)
Yes	8 (100%)	4 (100%)
Status of Automation		

Completely automated	05 (62.5%)	04 (100%)
Partially automated	03 (37.5%)	00

It is found that both the group of institutions is using library automation software for library automation. All the librarians of AES group of institutions 4(100%) are fully automated compared to libraries of SET group of institutions. 5(62.5%) of the SET institutions are fully automated and 3(37.5%) libraries of the SET institutions are partially automated. The management of SET institutions takes necessary action to make fully automated library to provide better services to the respective users.

Table – 2: Type of Software

As we know usually three type of software available in the market, viz.. open source, commercial and inhouse developed library software. Below table gives clear picture on the same.

Type of software	SET group of institutions (N=8)	AES group of institutions (N=4)
Open-source software	0 (00%)	1 (25%)
Commercial software	8(100%)	2(50%)
Inhouse developed software	(00%)	1(25%)

It is observed from the table 2, that SET group of institutions 8(100%) libraries are following uniformity by adopting same type or single software for its 8(100%) institutions. In the meantime, AES group of institutions are using different software for its banner institutions. 2(50%) AES institutions are using commercial software followed by 1 (25%) of institutions is using open source and in-house developed software to computerize libraries.

Table – 3: Name and Nature of the Software

Name of the Software	Nature of the software	Frequency N	Organisation
Easy Lib	Clint/server	1(25%)	AES
New Gen Lib	Clint/server	2(50%)	AES
MyCampuz	Web/cloud	8(100%)	SET
Other (inhouse)	Clint/server	1(25%)	AES

Table 3, shows that AES group of institutions are using Clint/server nature of software for their libraries and they are using New Gen Lib software in2(50%) institutions, EasyLib software in 1(25%) institution, followed by in-house developed software in1(25%) institution. SET group of institutions is concerned they maintained uniformity and consistency in adopting and implementation web/cloud based MyCampuz library automation software in all the 8(100%) institutions.

Table – 4: Areas of Library Automation

Areas of automation	No. of AES Institution	No. of SET Institution
Administration and Acquisitions	04(100%)	04(100%)
Cataloguing	04(100%)	08(100%)
Circulation	04(100%)	08(100%)
Serial management	02(50%)	04(50%)
OPAC/Webopac	02(50%)	08(100%)
Digital resources management	01(25%)	03(37.5%)
Visitor management	00	06(75%)

Source: Primary data

It is found from the table 4 that both AES04(100%) and SET08 (100%). institutions are using Administration, Acquisitions, Cataloguing and Circulation modules. Followed by 2/4(50%) institutions from both group used serial management modules. 02(50%) AES group of institutions uses OPAC module and at the same time 08(100%) SET group of institution automated OPAC module. 06(75%) of SET institutions automated visitor management. Out of 8 SET institutions 03(37.5%) libraries started digital resource management using library management software and out of 4 AES institutions 01(25%) started E-resources management using library automation software.

Table -5: Services provided using library automation software

Services provision through LMS	No. of AES Institutions	No. of SET Institutions
OPAC	02(50%)	08(100%)
Reservation	01(25%)	02(25%)
Circulation	04(100%)	08(100%)
Access to digital resources	01(25%)	03(37.5%)
Issues of no due certificate	01(25%)	02(25%)

Source: Primary data

From the table 5 it is found that both SET and AES institutions, i.e., 12(100%) provide circulation services using library software. 2(50%) of AES institutions and 8(100%) of SET institutions provide OPAC services through library automation software. 3(25%) of both SET and AES institutions provide reservation and no due certificate through automation software. And 1(25%) of the AES institutions and 3(37.5%) of SET institutions provide digital services through library automation software.

Table – 6: Competency level of library professionals

Efficiency level of library professionals	No. of AES Institutions N=4	No. of SET Institutions N=8
All are efficient	03(75%)	04(50%)
Majority are efficient	01(25%)	02(25%)
No Opinion	00	01(12.5%)
Majority are not efficient	00	01(12.5%)
All are not efficient	00	00

Source: Primary data

It is found that from table 6 that both AES and SET group of institutions librarians are efficient out of all library staff AES 3(75%) are efficient. Out of 8 SET institutions in 4(50%) libraries all library professionals are efficient. Only 1(12.5%) of the SET library professional is not efficient.

Table -7: satisfaction level of library automation software

Satisfaction Level of LMS	No. of AES Institutions	No. of SET Institutions
Excellent	03(75%)	01(12.5%)
Above average	01(25%)	06(75%)
Average	00	01(12.5%)
Below average	00	00
Extremely poor	00	00

Source: primary data

It is observed from the table 7 the satisfaction level of Mycampuz library automation software in SET group of institutions 06(75%) is above average. Meanwhile AES group of institutions are using different automation software for their library, there satisfaction level of the library software is 03(75%) excellent.

OUTCOMES OF THE STUDY

- It is found from the study that Seshadripuram group of institutions use Mycampuz library automation software for its bannered institutions. Al ameen institutions use different software for its institutions. They use open source, commercial and in-house developed software viz. NewGenLib(NGL), EasyLib and inhouse developed one. Al Ameen Institution uses both open and commercial version of NewGenLib(NGL) software.
- Seshadripuram group of institutions use web-based library automation software for entire institutions but Al Ameen group of institutions uses both client/server and web-based library automation software.
- Both AES and SET group of institutions libraries are using cataloging, circulation and acquisitions modules. All Seshadripuram institution automated Visitor Managament module.
- 1(25%) of AES institutions and 3(37.5%) of SET institutions provide digital resources to respective user.

- Both SET and AES institutions libraries having skilled, efficient manpower to run automated library.
- Both the institution librarians are satisfied with their library automation software.
- Annual Maintenance contract is obtained for commercial software for both SET and AES group of institutions.
- Library software in SET group of institutions and AES group of institutions in-house developed software does not support the library standards like Z39.50 and MARC.
- In SET group of institutions Mycampuz library software and AES group of institutions in-house developed software does not support multilingual process.

SUGGESTIONS

- Still many librarians of AES are not using Digital Resources Management (DRM) module to provide effective service to the users.
- The management of AES should take initiative for maintain uniformity and consistency in adopting LMS within the group of institutions.
- It is suggest that still many of SET and AES group of librarians are not using Digital Resources Management(DRM) module to provide effective service to the users.
- As web based library management software provide Web OPAC, so that give orientation for users to maximum utilization of the same.
- SET librarians should advice the developers of Mycampuz library automation software and in-house developed software of AES group of institutions to include library standards like MARC and Z39.50.
- Librarians of SET institutions should advice the developers of Mycampuz library automation software and in-house developed software of AESgroup of institutions to include multilingual support to allow creating of database other than English language.

CONCLUSION

The status of library automation of both Seshadripuram and Al ameen group of institutions is quite good. Compare to AES, SET management gives more importance for their library. Now library automation means not only maintain physical resource of the library it includes digital resources management and digital information service management so that both the librarians and management must look on this module to automate at the earliest. Library professionals should prepare to meet user requirements. Continues upgradation on activities of library automation will help for improve to meet user upcoming requirements.

REFERENCE

[1] Ajay, K. and S. Gurpreet, (2010). *Status of Library Automation in the Institutions of Higher Studies in Punjab, In Library and Information Scinece Compendium*,1- 11.

[2] Bansode, S. Y., & Periera, S. (2008). *A survey of library automation in college libraries in Goa state, India. Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-7.

[3] Harinarayan, N. S. *Concept of Library Automation. Herald of Library Science*, 1991, 30(3-4), 176-177.

[4] K. V. Jayamma, M. Krishnamurthy. (2015). Automation of College Libraries in Bangalore City: *A Study.*

International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Management Studies, 3 (9),32-40

[5] Naveen, C. L. (2016). *Status and Problems of Library Automation in Govt . First Grade Colleges of Hassan District , Karnataka : a Study*. 5(1), 28–35.

[6] Nayana, J. (2019). A study on library automation status among the aided college libraries in Bengaluru. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, *2019*.

[7] R, T., & Reddy, K. R. (2017). Present Status of Library Automation in Polytechnic Colleges in Karnataka State : a Survey. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, *7*(2), 87–98. www.ijodls.in

[8] Shivakumar, T. C. (2017). Status of Library Automation in Engineering College Libraries in. *International Journal of Information Movement*, *2*(VI), 22–31.

[9] Singh, Y. (n.d.). *Library Automation in Academic Libraries in India : Problems and Prospects Attitude and Initiative of the Management :* 1–6.

[10] Upadhyay, A. (2012). A Review of Status, Problem and Prospects of Library Automation in Engineering Colleges of Jabalpur City. *IOSR Journal of Computer Engineering*, *3*(5), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.9790/0661-0353136

———————————