

A STUDY ON PRESERVATION AND CONSERVATION PRACTICE AND TECHNIQUES AT GFGC'S COLLEGE LIBRARIES IN KARNATAKA

Nirmala C.

Assistant Professor, Library and information science
Government First Grade College, HSR Layout, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Abstract: *The present study was carried out on preservation and conservation practice and techniques Law college libraries in Karnataka affiliated GFGC'S This study evaluates the preservation and conservation techniques, problems faced in preservation and conservation of materials, type of physical damages caused to the library material and types of different disaster the library collection. For this purpose of the researchers prepared a well structured questionnaires and interview schedule as a tool for data collection and same has been distributed, collected, analyzed and presented with useful percentage analysis and suitable table for presentation of data. Results highlighting for the major findings, suggestions and conclusion.*

Key Words: *Law College Libraries; Preservation; Conservation; Karnataka.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

Preservation and conservation practices and techniques is an important aspect of library and information management. A library is a repository of wisdom of great thinkers of the past, present and the future. Any loss to such materials is simply irreplaceable; therefore, preserving this intellectual, cultural heritage becomes not only the academic commitment but also the moral responsibility of the librarians / information scientists, who are in charge of these repositories. Conservation activities include bookbinding, book repairs, conservation treatment and emergency preparedness and response. Damaged materials in need of repair and materials that need binding or protective enclosures are treated in the conservation department. The library houses the document by considering the long-term preservation of the items while still allowing the end user to access the material easily.

Books and other materials suffer damage or deterioration because of several groups of factors, some inherent in the materials and others beyond the control of the library. Library holdings may begin to deteriorate because of the organic materials from which they are made. Each type of material paper, glue, plastic, etc. that goes into the manufacture of a book, recording or optical media has its own combination of physical and chemical properties, and Preservation is the task of minimizing or reducing the physical and chemical deterioration of documents. Conservation is the maintenance of documents in a usable condition through treatment and repairs of individual items to slow the process of decay or to restore them to a usable state. Conservation includes study, diagnosis, preventive care, examination, treatment, documentation using any methods that may prove effective in keeping that property in as close to its original condition as possible and for as long as possible. The conservation actions are carried out for a variety of reasons including aesthetic choices, stabilization, needs for structural integrity or for cultural requirements for intangible continuity.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The main objectives of the study are

- To identify the preservation and conservation techniques in GFGC libraries.
- To find out the type of physical damages caused to the library material.
- To find out the types of different disaster the library collection.

3. METHODOLOGY:

The present study aims to examine the preservation and conservation practices and techniques in law college libraries. The questionnaire method was adopted for the present study to collect the necessary data, keeping in view the objectives of the study. A total 100 questionnaires were distributed among the GFGC libraries librarians to Bangalore University and 96 filled questionnaires were collected back. The rate of response of 96% the collected data has been analyzed.

4. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The present study attempts to know the present conditions of library preservation and conservation of GFGC libraries affiliated to Karnataka State Law University, Bangalore have been considered for the study. The scope of the study is confined to GFGC libraries libraries.

5. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Christopher (2016) study conducted on preservation and conservation of information resources in the Nigerian library: physical or chemical makeup, while preservation explains all the managerial and financial considerations including storage and accommodation provisions, staffing levels, policies, techniques, and methods involved in preserving library and archival materials and the information contained in them; agents of deterioration of information resources in libraries are humidity, disasters, light, water among others, while repairs, fumigation, proper storage, air conditions

Patidar & Soni (2016) investigated conducted to study of the manuscripts collection are important to the human society, researcher, scholar can measure the value of valuable collection, which they are able to access them. highlight different types of indigenous material to preserving the manuscripts.

Sawant (2014) Study conducted on survery using a structured questionnaire was conducted to study on preservation and conservation practices in academic librrreis in Mumbai.the study reveals that there was no written policy on preservation and conservation in nearly all libraries. In addition lack of writtern preservation policy, lack of trained manpower and lack of funding were the main constraints to preservation and conservation practices.

Adekannbi Wahab (2015) investigated conducted to study of the conservation and preservation strategies of academic and special libraries in Nigeria. discussed include the importance of *International Journal of Library and Information Studies*

library materials as sources of information, the different implications of conservation and preservation strategies for library materials, **Qutab, et al. (2014)** examined the study is aimed to investigate the conservation, restoration and preservation state of manuscripts in Pakistan. The study was conducted on 13 selective institutions of Pakistan, holding MS collections. Through interviews and documentary research the conservation and preservation situations were inquired.

6. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS:

Table-1: Gender wise distribution of respondents

S/N	Gender	No. of Responses	Percentage
1	Male	67	69.79
2	Female	29	30.21
Total		96	100.00

The table-1 depicts that total 100 questionnaire were distributed to the target respondents out of which 96 filled questionnaire were returned back, which amounts to 96%. It may be seen from the table that a majority of the respondents numbering 67 (69.79 percent) are Male and the remaining 29(30.21 percent) are Female.

Table-2: Age wise distribution

S/N	Age Range in years	No. of Responses	Percentage
1	<30 Years	20	20.83
2	30 – 35 Years	07	07.29
3	36 – 40 Years	14	14.58
4	41 – 45 Years	28	29.17
5	46 – 50 Years	15	15.63
6	Above 50Years	12	12.50
Total		96	100.00

The table-2 depicts that the age wise break up of Librarians, it can be seen from the table-2 that the respondents in the age group of 41 - 45 years of age range representing 28 (29.17 percentage), followed by the age group of <30 Years age range representing 20 (20.83 percentage), the age group of 46 – 50 Years age range representing 15 (15.63 percentage), 36 – 40 Years age range representing 14 (14.58 percentage), above 50 Years of age range representing 12 (12.50 percentage) and only 30 – 35 Years age range representing 07 (07.29 percent).

Table-3: Designation wise distribution

S/N	Designation	No. of Responses	Percentage
1	Chief Librarian	06	06.25

2	Librarian	65	67.71
3	Asst. Librarian	18	18.75
4	Library Assistant	07	07.29
Total		96	100.00

GFGC libraries librarians have different designation. The Designation wise distribution of librarians of the Law Colleges under study is shown in the table -3 It is observed from the table that nearly 65 (67.71 percent) of the respondents are designated as ‘Law College Librarian’, whereas 18 (18.85 percent) of the respondents are designated as ‘Assistant Librarian’, followed by 07(07.29 percent) of the respondents are ‘Library Assistant’, and 06(06.25 percent) of the respondents are ‘Chief Librarian’.

Table- 4: Experience wise distribution

S/N	Length of Experience	No. of Responses	Percentage
1	5 Years and Below	07	07.29
2	10 Years and Below	19	19.79
3	15 Years and Below	26	27.08
4	20 Years and Above	44	45.83
Total		96	100.00

The length of experience of the GFGC librarians has been summarized in the Table-4 . It is observed from Table-4 that 44(45.83percent) of librarians have 5 Years and Below experience, followed by 26(27.08percent) have ‘15 Years and Below, 19 (19.79percent) have ‘10 Years and Below and 07 (07.29 percent) of librarians have experience of ‘5 Years and Below’.

Table- 5: Types of Colleges wise Distribution

S/N	Types	No. of Responses	Percentage
1	Government	04	04.17
2	Aided	07	07.29
3	Private	85	88.54
Total		96	100.00

Types of college libraries have been summarized in the Table -5. It can be observed from the Table-5 that 85(88.54percent) of respondents are Private-College libraries, followed by 07(07.29 percent) of respondents are ‘Aided College libraries’, and only 04(04.17percent) of respondents are Government Colleges libraries.

Table-6: Building increase preservation problems

S/N	Factors	Responses in percentage (N=96)					Mean	SD	2	P value
		1	2	3	4	5				
1	Proximity of sea	-	-	02 (02.08)	26 (27.08)	68 (70.83)	4.69	0.51	180.250	0.000
2	Proximity of other humid zone	-	03 (03.13)	08 (08.33)	33 (34.38)	52 (54.17)	4.40	0.77	105.354	0.000
3	Proximity of sources of air pollution (e.g. industries, road traffic, etc.)	-	-	01 (01.04)	36 (37.50)	59 (61.46)	4.60	0.51	152.854	0.000
4	Proximity of sliding ground	-	-	22 (22.92)	35 (36.46)	39 (40.63)	4.34	0.75	72.229	0.000

Key: 1 – Very great extent; 2 – Great extent; 3 – Moderate extent; 4 – Little extent; 5 – Not at all

Preservation and conservation of Law college Libraries the survey reveals that the factor ‘Proximity of sea’ ranks first with mean value of 4.69 and SD being 0.51; the chi-square test indicates that there are significant differences ($\chi^2=180.250$; $P<.000$) also the factor ‘Proximity of other humid zone’ with a mean value of 4.40 and SD being 0.77; chi-square test indicates that there are significant differences ($\chi^2=105.354$; $P<.000$) followed by ‘Proximity of sources of air pollution (e.g. industries, road traffic, etc.) with mean value of 4.60 and SD being 0.51; chi-square test indicates that there are significant differences ($\chi^2=152.854$; $P<.000$) similarly ‘Proximity of sliding ground’ is supported by a mean value of 4.34 and SD being 0.75. Chi-square test indicates that there are significant differences ($\chi^2=72.229$; $P<.000$).

Table-7: Types of Equipment in Library Building

Types of Equipment	No. of Responses			
	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Central air-conditioning	05	05.21	91	94.79
Individual air-conditioning per room	04	04.17	92	95.83
Heating	05	05.21	91	94.79
Dehumidifiers	11	11.46	85	88.54
Humidifiers	07	7.29	89	92.71
Window less walls	-	-	96	100.00
Thermal isolation	-	-	96	100.00
Windows with filtering glass	22	22.92	74	77.08
Fire detection system	22	22.92	74	77.08
Binding machine	02	02.08	94	97.92
Lamination machine	-	-	96	100.00
Fan	96	100.00	-	-

The Table-7 also depicts that types of equipment in library building. About 05(05.21 percent) of respondents opined ‘Yes’, towards ‘Central air-conditioning’, and 91(94.79 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’, followed by 04(04.17 percent) of respondents opined ‘Yes’, for ‘Individual air-conditioning per room’, and 92(95.83 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’, 05(05.21 percent) of respondents opined ‘Yes’ towards ‘Heating’, and 91(94.79 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’, 11(11.46 percent) of respondents opined ‘Yes’ for ‘Dehumidifiers’, and 85(88.54 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’, 07(7.29 percent) of respondents opined ‘Yes’ for ‘Humidifiers’, and 89(92.71 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’, 96(100 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’ for ‘Window less walls’ and ‘Thermal isolation’ each, followed by equal response of 22(22.92 percent) of respondents opined ‘Yes’, ‘Windows with filtering glass’, and Fire detection system, About 74(77.08 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’, 02(02.08 percent)) of respondents opined as ‘Yes’ for ‘Binding machine’, and 94(97.92 percent) of respondents opined as ‘No’, 96(100 percent) of respondents opined ‘No’ towards ‘Lamination machine’, and 96(100 percent) of respondents opined as ‘Yes’.

Table-8: Extent of damages caused by different disaster library collection

S/N	Extent of Damages	Responses in percentage (N=96)					Mean	SD	2	P value
		1	2	3	4	5				
1	Natural disasters (earthquake, hurricane, flood, etc.....)	00	12 (12.50)	21 (21.88)	26 (27.08)	37 (38.54)	3.92	1.05	40.97	0.000
2	Fire	00	17 (17.71)	17 (17.71)	18 (18.75)	44 (45.83)	3.93	1.16	51.81	0.000

3	Pollution	00	18 (18.75)	21 (21.88)	27 (28.13)	30 (31.25)	3.72	1.10	28.68	0.000
4	Drought	00	17 (17.71)	15 (15.63)	23 (23.96)	41 (42.71)	3.92	1.13	45.87	0.000
5	Cyclones	00	05 (5.21)	17 (17.71)	26 (27.08)	48 (37.50)	3.96	1.01	75.56	0.000
6	Insects	05 (5.21)	12 (15.63)	17 (17.71)	26 (27.08)	36 (37.50)	3.73	1.25	30.56	0.000
7	Rodents	07 (27.29)	11 (11.46)	13 (13.54)	29 (30.21)	36 (37.50)	3.48	1.34	32.95	0.000
8	High winds	04 (4.17)	13 (13.54)	17 (17.71)	23 (23.96)	39 (40.63)	3.79	1.26	35.45	0.000
9	Bad quality of material (paper, etc.)	09 (9.38)	25 (26.04)	21 (21.88)	15 (15.63)	26 (27.08)	3.83	1.21	10.66	0.030

Key: 1 – Very great extent; 2 – Great extent; 3 – Moderate extent; 4 – Little extent; 5 – Not at all

The extent of damages caused by different disaster library collection has been shown in

Table-8. There are significant differences ($\chi^2=40.97$; $p=.000$) for the - ‘Natural disasters’ has a mean value of 3.92 and SD is 1.05. So also, there are significant differences ($\chi^2=51.81$; $p=.000$) for the ‘Fire’ has a mean score of 3.93 and SD is 1.16. There are significant differences ($\chi^2=28.68$; $p=.000$) for another responsibility, ‘Pollution’, has mean value of 3.72 and SD is 1.10. There are significant differences ($\chi^2=45.87$; $p=.000$) for the purpose ‘Drought’ has a mean value of 3.92 and SD is 1.13. Whereas there are significant differences ($\chi^2=75.56$; $p=.000$) for the, librarian’s responsibility ‘Cyclones’ has a mean score of 3.96 and SD is 1.01. Similarly, There are significant differences ($\chi^2=30.56$; $p=.000$) for the librarian’s responsibility ‘Insects’ has a mean score of 3.73 and SD is 1.25. There are significant differences ($\chi^2=32.95$; $p=.000$) for another librarian’s responsibility ‘Rodents’ has a mean value of 3.48 and SD is 1.34. There are not -significant differences ($\chi^2=35.45$; $p=.000$) for the responsibility - ‘High winds’ has a mean score of 3.79 and SD is 1.26 and there are significant differences ($\chi^2=10.66$; $p=.030$) for the last responsibility ‘Bad quality of material (paper, etc.)’ has a mean value of 3.83 and SD is 1.21.

Table-9: Disinfect the Collection

S/N	Disinfection	No. of Responses			
		Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
1	Disinfect accessions when received	43	44.79	53	55.21
2	Disinfect periodically the stockroom	58	60.42	38	39.58
		$\chi^2 = 4.70, df=1, P=0.030$			

Table-9 depicts that 43(44.79 percent) of respondents opined as ‘Yes’ for ‘Disinfect accessions when received’ and 53(55.21 percent) of respondents opined as ‘No’, followed by 58(60.42 percent) of respondents opined as ‘Yes’ towards ‘Disinfect periodically the stockroom’ and 38(39.58 percent) of respondents opined as ‘No’ for Disinfect the collection.

The χ^2 - test conducted for 1 df at the 5% level significance shows that there is a significant relationship between Disinfect the collection and Type of Responses. ($\chi^2 = 4.70, df=1, P=0.030 < .005$).

7. FINDINGS:

The Major findings of the study are:

- Majority of 67(69.79%) of respondents are Male and the remaining 29(30.21%) are Female.
- The age group of 41 - 45 years of range scores 28 (29.17 %) and the age group of <30 Years range scores represent 20 (20.83 %).
- Majority of 65 (67.71%) of the respondents are designated as 'Law College Librarian', whereas 18 (18.85 %) of the respondents are designated as 'Asst. Librarian'.
- Majority of 44(45.83%) of librarians have 5 Years and Below experience, followed by 26(27.08percent) of respondents have '15 Years and Below.
- Majority of 85(88.54%) of respondents are Private College libraries, followed by 07(07.29 %) of respondents are Aided College libraries',
- The major factor is 'Proximity of other humid zone' with a mean value of 4.40 and SD being 0.77.
- About 22(22.92 percent) of respondents opined as 'Yes' towards windows with filtering glass and fire detection system and 74(77.08 percent) of respondents opined as 'No'.
- The disaster caused due to 'Cyclones' has a mean score of 3.96 and SD is 1.01.
- Majority of 58(60.42 percent) of respondents opined as 'Yes' towards 'Disinfect periodically the stockroom' and 38(39.58 percent) of respondents opined as 'No'.

8. SUGGESTIONS:

The following suggestions can be drawn from following findings:

The Librarians should apply advance preservation and conservation techniques such as lamination, binding, minor repairs of books before getting deteriorated. A good policy on preservation and conservation of print as well as non print materials should be formulated. At least semi professionals or professionals' staffs have to be deputed/recruited for preservation of conservation activities.

9. CONCLUSION:

The present study investigated most of the GFGC libraries which are suffering from Lack of funding, un proper infrastructure facilities, lack of knowledge about preservation and conservation, practices, techniques, untrained manpower skills how to handle the preservation and conservation techniques, no written policy, outdated hard ware and software, administration problems etc. This study provides suggestions on preservation and conservation techniques which can be adopted.

REFERENCES:

1. Adekannbi, J. O., & Wahab, F. W. (2015). Comparative Analysis of the Preservation and Conservation Techniques of Selected Special and Academic Libraries in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, 1-32.
2. Adcock, E.P. (1998). IFLA Principles for the Care and Handling of Library Material. *International Preservation and its Implication for Preservation and Conservation*. Africa Journal of Library Archives and Information Science 6(1) 37-45. Issues No. 1 The Hague. IFLA. Available: <http://www.ifla.org>
4. Alison (2013) Basic Preservation for Library and Archive Collections. London: Preservation Advisory centre retrieved from <http://www.bl.uk/blpac/publicationsleaf.html> on 27th February, 2013.
5. Dashrath Patidar, Ashish Soni (2016). Indigenous material of preserving manuscripts in library. *International Journal of Research in Library Science*, 2(2), 183-187.
6. Eden, P. and Feather, J. (1997). Preservation Policies and Strategies in British Archives and Records Offices: a Survey. Available: <http://ehostvgw4.epnet.com>
7. Onyemaizu O. Christopher (2016). Preservation and Conservation of Information Resources in the Nigerian Library: concepts and Challenges. *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research*, 4(3), 44- 49.
8. Ogunmodede, Thomas A. and Ebijuwa, Adefunke Sarah (2013) Problems of Conservation and Preservation of Library Resources in African Academic Libraries: A Review of Literature. *Greener Journal of Social Sciences* Vol. 3 (1), pp. 050-057, retrieved from [http:// www.gjournals.org](http://www.gjournals.org) on 13 February 2013
9. Mahapatra, P. K. (2003). Preservation in libraries: Perspectives, principals and practices. New Delhi: Ess. Ess.Publications.
10. Miracle Eka (2012) Preservation and Conservation Issues in Selected Private Universities in South-West Nigeria *Library Philosophy and Practice*.
11. Ngulube, P. (2001). Guidelines and Standards for Records Management Education and Training in a model for Anglophone Africa. *Records Management Journal* 11(3): 155- 173.

12. Ngulube, P. (2002). Preservation Reformatting Strategies in Selected Sub Saharan African Archival institutions. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science* 12(2), 117- 132.
13. Saima Qutab, Rubina Bhatti, & Farasat Shafi Ullah, (2014). An Investigation of Conservation & Preservation Practices of Intellectual Heritage in Pakistan. IFLA PAC, Geneva, 13-14
14. Sarika Sawant (2014). A study on Perservation and conservation practices in academic libraries in Mumbai. *Annals of Library and Informtion Studies*. 61, 153-159.
15. Randall, G. (1990). Preliminary Analysis of the Massachusetts Preservation Needs Assessment Survey. Boston: Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioner Walker.
16. <http://www.nlsa.ac.za/index.php/preservation-and-conservation>
17. <http://www.netugc.com/preservation-and-conservation-of-library-materials>