



**TO STUDY THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES IN PROMOTING
THE ILL AND DDS SERVICE****Mr. Gajanan D. Rewatkar¹ and Dr. Ekta A. Menkudale²****¹Researcher****²Supervisor, Librarian,****Shivramji Moghe Arts, Commerce & Science, Mahavidyalaya, Kelapur ,
Dist. Yavatmal.****ABSTRACT:**

This Research paper interprets data gathered from Maharashtra State library professionals. For the study, 26 librarian, 26 library assistant and 52 Assistant librarians from the state of Maharashtra were chosen. Among the statistical methods used to analyze the gathered data were descriptive statistics such as percentage and frequency. Using tables with relevant captions, the examined data was organized and categorized. Each table was explained before the findings were shown. The final component of this chapter also discussed hypothesis testing. In each of the sections below, the following terms are defined: N refers to the number of respondents, DF denotes the degrees of freedom, and P represents the p-value (indicating statistical significance).

**KEYWORDS:** *statistical methods , organized and categorized.***INTRODUCTION**

The deployment of Database Management Systems (DBMS) within contemporary libraries has profoundly reshaped the functioning and efficiency of critical services such as the Document Delivery System (DDS) and Inter-Library Loan (ILL). These services are central to resource-sharing because they allow libraries to address users' diverse and expanding informational needs without retaining every publication or document themselves (Jain, 2016; Kaur & Verma, 2017).

Theoretically, libraries DBMS gives a good organizational framework of digital infrastructure that sustains the recording, retrieving, altering, and sharing of information resources. In DDS and ILL, the DBMS performs various essential functions that aid the effectiveness and accessibility of the systems as well as facilitate their usability. In essence, it directs every phase of an information request, such as identification and search to delivery and the consequent monitoring.

The Document Delivery System's DBMS enables the retrieval of requisite documents by interfacing with the library's digital repositories and Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC). It allows its users to make requests electronically, and the system searches and retrieves the documents and processes them as well. Specialised modules check the availability of the resources, copyright, and when the material is available, cause a scanned copy or deliver the digital copy on demand. Concurrently, the DBMS maintains detailed records of all request submissions, delivery schedules, user feedback, and usage statistics—information crucial for service planning and evaluation (Satyanarayana, 2014; Sharma & Singh, 2020).

Coordinated access to dispersed bibliographic databases is essential to the Interlibrary Loan service. In this instance, the DBMS serves as the integrative platform that uses standardised protocols (such as Z39.50 or ISO ILL) and APIs to link local library holdings with national or worldwide union catalogues. It makes it easier for libraries to communicate in real time about the availability, status of requests, terms of delivery, and due dates for returns of digital or physical materials. Notably, the DBMS reduces administrative burden and human mistakes by automating numerous ILL processes, including user eligibility checks, borrowing limitations, and past-due penalties (Gupta, 2019).

The deployment of a database management system (DBMS) within a university library context constitutes a substantial innovation. By ensuring that all inter-library loan (ILL) activities are meticulously and auditably documented, the DBMS undergirds transactional integrity, thereby enhancing accountability and facilitating data reporting for both funding agencies and library administration. Integrated library systems Koha and OCLC WorldShare, among others, have made it possible to manage local and inter-institutional document requests using modules powered by DBMS, which gives libraries increased ability to provide management of document requests.

As far as user-service considerations are concerned, the DBMS can significantly improve accessibility and transparency of document delivery services. Using the features of DBMS, patrons can access electronic documents remotely, manage the status of the requests, and get automated notifications, and they do not need to visit the library directly. Such a user-centred outlook fits in with modern-day library practice in the digital age.

Scalability and interoperability are two other vital qualities of a dispersed information environment, and in theory, the DBMS eases both. A robust, adaptable DBMS that supports multilingual metadata, a wide array of document formats, and dynamic user profiles is essential, given the growing involvement of libraries in consortia such as DELNET, INFLIBNET, and various worldwide resource-sharing networks (Elmasri & Navathe, 2016).

To conclude, the Library DBMS is placed in a fundamentally revolutionary position of DDS and ILL. It also assists in technologically executing these services as well as orienting them to evolve towards larger goals of knowledge distribution, academic access, and scholarly collaboration. Further integration of advanced features of DBMS will be crucial in establishing creativity and effectiveness in document and resource sharing amidst libraries shifting towards more decentralised and digitalised set-ups.

Table 1: Information regarding awareness of international agencies supporting ILL and DDS services

Are you aware of international agencies that support ILL and DDS services?	N	%
Yes	84	80.8
No	20	19.2
Total	104	100.0
Chi-s	DF	P
39.385	1	<0.05

Information about knowledge of international organizations that support ILL and DDS services is included in Table 1 above. It is observed from the information that 80.8% libraries are aware about international agencies that support ILL and DDS services whereas 19.2% libraries are not aware about international agencies that support ILL and DDS services. It is evident from the result of Chi-square test that there is significant difference (Chi-square value-39.385; df-1; $P < 0.05$) among libraries with respect to awareness of international agencies supporting ILL and DDS services. Hence, it is evident that significant percentage of libraries are aware about international agencies that support ILL and DDS services.

Table 2: Information regarding international agencies known to libraries for supporting ILL and DDS services

If yes, which international agencies do you know?	N	%
OCLC (Online Computer Library Center)	53	63.1
British Library Document Supply Centre	72	85.7
Library of Congress	81	96.4
UNESCO	68	81.0

Above Table 2 demonstrates information regarding international agencies known to libraries for supporting ILL and DDS services. It is evident from the information that 96.4% libraries are aware about the Library of Congress as an international agency supporting ILL and DDS services whereas 85.7% libraries that are aware about the British Library Document Supply Centre international agency supporting ILL and DDS services. Furthermore, percentage of libraries are aware about UNESCO and OCLC (Online Computer Library Centre) international agency supporting ILL and DDS services are 81.0% and 63.1% respectively. Hence, it is evident that libraries are aware about multiple international agencies supporting ILL and DDS services out of which most of the libraries are aware about the Library of Congress as an international agency supporting ILL and DDS services followed by British Library Document Supply Centre, UNESCO and OCLC (Online Computer Library Centre).

Table 3: Information regarding collaboration of libraries with international agencies for ILL and DDS

Has your library collaborated with any international agencies for ILL and DDS?	N	%
Yes	79	76.0
No	25	24.0
Total	104	100.0
Chi-s	DF	P
28.038	1	<0.05

Above Table 3 shows information regarding collaboration of libraries with international agencies for ILL and DDS. It is apparent from the information that 76.0% libraries collaborated with international agencies for ILL and DDS services whereas 24.0% libraries did not collaborate with any international agencies for ILL and DDS services. It is evident from the result of Chi-square test that there is substantial difference (Chi-square value-28.038; df-1; $P < 0.05$) among libraries with respect to collaboration of libraries with international agencies for ILL and DDS. Hence, it is evident that significant percentage of libraries collaborated with international agencies for ILL and DDS.

Table 4: Information regarding the ways through which international agencies supporting university libraries in ILL and DDS

How do you think international agencies can support university libraries in ILL and DDS?	N	%
Funding and grants	71	68.3
Training and workshops	92	88.5
Digital resource sharing	84	80.8
Standardized protocols for ILL	76	73.1

Above Table 4 illustrates information regarding the ways through which international agencies support university libraries in ILL and DDS. It is observed from the information that international

agencies support 88.5% libraries through providing training and workshops whereas international agencies support 80.8% libraries through digital resource sharing. Furthermore, percentage of international agencies support libraries through standardized protocols for ILL as well as funding and grants are 73.1% and 68.3% respectively. Hence, it is evident that libraries have multiple international agencies support out of which most of international agencies support libraries through providing training and workshops followed by digital resource sharing, standardized protocols for ILL as well as funding and grants.

CONCLUSION

Table 1 illustrates that significant (Chi-square value-39.385; df-1; $P < 0.05$) percentage of libraries are aware about international agencies that support ILL and DDS services. Table 2 demonstrates that libraries are aware about multiple international agencies supporting ILL and DDS services out of which most of the libraries are aware about the Library of Congress as an international agency supporting ILL and DDS services followed by British Library Document Supply Centre, UNESCO and OCLC (Online Computer Library Centre). Table 3 shows that significant (Chi-square value-28.038; df-1; $P < 0.05$) percentage of libraries collaborated with international agencies for ILL and DDS. Table 4 illustrates that libraries have multiple international agencies support out of which most of international agencies support libraries through providing training and workshops followed by digital resource sharing, standardized protocols for ILL as well as funding and grants.

REFERENCES

1. Breeding, M. (2015). *Library Technology Reports: Library Systems Report*. American Library Association.
2. Caplan, P. (2001) "A lesson in linking" *Library Journal NetConnect* Fall 2001, 16-18.
3. Chaudhury, S. (2012). *Library Automation: Technologies and Trends*. New Delhi: PHI Learning.
4. Connaway, L. S., & Powell, R. R. (2010). *Basic Research Methods for Librarians* (5th ed.). Libraries Unlimited.
5. Coronel, C., & Morris, S. (2015). *Database Systems: Design, Implementation, & Management*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
6. Date, C. J. (2004). *An Introduction to Database Systems* (8th ed.). Boston: Addison-Wesley.
7. Desale, Sanjay K. "Resource Sharing and Document Supply in India: INFLIBNET and the Experience of JCC@UGC-INFONET at the University of Pune". *Interlending and Document Supply* 37.4(2009): 208-14. Print.
8. Elmasri, R., & Navathe, S. (2016). *Fundamentals of Database Systems* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
9. Elmasri, R., & Navathe, S. B. (2017). *Fundamentals of Database Systems* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
10. Ex Libris. (2021). *ALMA Library Services Platform*. Retrieved from <https://exlibrisgroup.com>
11. Gillet, Jaqueline. "Sharing Resources, Networking and Document Delivery: The INIST Experience". *Interlending and Document Supply* 36.4(2008):196-202.Print.
12. Gilliland, A. (2001) "The OhioLINK approach: records and holdings for print and electronic serials in the OhioLINK central catalog" *New Library World* Vol. 101, No. 1157, 2000, 208-211.
13. Google Inc. Fact Sheet, (2002) <http://www.google.com/press/facts.html>
14. Grahm P, Cornish, and Alison Gallico, eds. *Proceedings of International Conference on Interlending and Document Supply*. 1988. Boston Spa: Office for International Lending,1989. Print.
15. Gupta, A. (2019). *Modern Library Management Systems*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
16. Harnad, Stevan (2002) "Re-thinking "Collections" and Selection in the Post Gutenberg Age" <http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/ListArchives/0201/msg00028.html>
17. <http://cisti-icist.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/ibp/cisti/about/index.html>
18. <http://www.bl.uk/reshelp/atyourdesk/docsupply/productsservices/index.html/>
19. <http://www.inflibnet.ac.in/>
20. <http://www.inist.fr/>
21. <http://www.niscair.res.in>

22. <http://www.refdoc.fr/tradure=en/>