



národní
úložiště
šedé
literatury

In-transit practices among multi-campus university libraries in Turkey

Cuhadar, Sami; Cimen, Ertugrul; Turan, Abdullah
2019

Dostupný z <http://www.nusl.cz/ntk/nusl-403524>

Dílo je chráněno podle autorského zákona č. 121/2000 Sb.

Licence Creative Commons Uveďte původ-Neužívejte komerčně-Nezpracovávejte 4.0

Tento dokument byl stažen z Národního úložiště šedé literatury (NUŠL).

Datum stažení: 02.05.2024

Další dokumenty můžete najít prostřednictvím vyhledávacího rozhraní nusl.cz.

In-transit Practices Among Multi-campus University Libraries in Turkey

Sami Cuhadar

Istanbul Bilgi University Library Director, Istanbul, Turkey

E-mail: sami.cuhadar@bilgi.edu.tr

Ertugrul Cimen

MEF University Library Director, Istanbul, Turkey

E-mail: cimene@mef.edu.tr

Abdullah Turan

Istanbul Bilgi University, Library, Reference Team Manager, Istanbul, Turkey

E-mail: abdullah.turan@bilgi.edu.tr



Copyright © 2019 by Sami Cuhadar, Ertugrul Cimen, and Abdullah Turan.

This work is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Abstract:

Library in-transit services provided between various campuses of a university are important, helping to ensure user satisfaction, effective allocation of library budgets, optimum use of resources, and effective use of library spaces.

In this study, 179 universities operating in Turkey were identified and selected for assessment. The methods which libraries at these universities employ to deliver information resources to users at other campuses as well as their in-transit practices are explained in detail. The paper presents the findings of a survey that was conducted at the selected university libraries in order to assess the current state and the impact of resource sharing via the in-transit method on library budgets, library spaces, and user satisfaction. The in-transit practice of Istanbul Bilgi University (BİLGİ) Library, which has a well-established in-transit policy and which keeps detailed statistics, was also used as a case study to analyse in-transit statistics and survey findings and to provide suggestions for future improvement.

Design/methodology/approach: *This study employed a historical and explanatory approach; statistical methods are used to analyse the results of the survey. An important outcome of the study was that it documented the current status of in-transit practices at academic universities in Turkey. The authors utilized their professional experiences in developing resource sharing and in-transit services within a university library context in Turkey in order to design the survey.*

Objectives: *This research paper might be useful for any university librarians interested in resource sharing, effective use of library budgets, library collections, and library spaces, especially in*

developing countries. The paper also provides academic libraries with a set of guidelines for establishing an in-transit service.

Originality/value: *This paper is the first study of in-transit services provided between Turkish university libraries. It also addresses the opportunities and challenges that arise when establishing or improving in-transit services. The results of the study will be of use to university libraries, researchers, and library professionals working in the field.*

Keywords: Campus Delivery, Resource Sharing, Document Supply, “In-transit” Services, Inter-Campus Delivery, University Libraries Turkey

Introduction

Academic libraries began sharing information resources and experiences with one another almost as soon as they were established and today, sharing of print and electronic library resources is one of the most common services all types of libraries provide. Cooperation and resource sharing are increasingly critical for libraries due to changing user needs, diversification of types of users, technological developments, and—most importantly—limited funding for library collections.

Resource sharing between academic libraries in the United States has a history of more than a century, with the first interlibrary resource sharing services (ILL) beginning in 1898 when a librarian at the University of California (UC) announced that UC was ready to send resources to requesting libraries (Weber, 1976).

ILL services have remained as an important service for academic libraries since that time. The U.S. Library of Congress developed an official policy for lending materials to other national libraries in 1909 (Stuart-Strubbs, 1975). The American Library Association (ALA) declared its first “Code of Practice for Inter-Library Loans” in 1919. (Frederiksen & Bean, 2012) Even though there were some challenges, international library cooperation increased in the 1920s and 1930s. With the support of the United Nations Cooperation Committee and the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) until 1934, almost 40 countries around the world participated in systematic international resource allocation (Miguel, 2007). In 1936, IFLA established rules for coming together and developed an international standards-based lending system based on a uniform regulation rule using standardized forms for the first time (Wehefritz, 1974). In 1939, the IFLA code and form were accepted by 19 countries (Ryward, 1994). In 1951, the University of California, with a 1968 revision of the form, created a four-pages carbon format form that was broadly adopted and used by U.S. libraries (Frederiksen and Bean, 2012). Forms sent by teletype or fax by regular mail and letter were eventually shortened and modified to meet the network requirements for bibliographic utility and transmission. In the early 1960s, ALA designed a photocopy request form which was revised in 1976 to include significant alterations to U.S. copyright law and technological innovations. While paper-based document delivery has changed with the enlargement of bibliographic tools and networks, document distribution systems based on advances in conduction technologies have also changed (Frederiksen & Bean., 2012). Although the formats and the methods of resource sharing have changed, the principle of resource sharing remains as one of the most important areas of cooperation for academic libraries. Electronic collections of academic libraries have grown rapidly, which has encouraged librarians and software experts to develop creative applications such as secure

electronic document sharing. While the use of electronic resources has increased and access to these resources has become easier, the sharing of print materials remains important.

Even though North America, Europe, Canada, Australia, Japan, and South Korea have been adapting easily to technological developments and focusing on creative solutions, the Internet access rate is 49% in some Asian and many African countries, which represents 72% (5,562,011,506) of the world's population (Internet World Stats, 2019). This means that, according to these statistics, 43% of the population does not yet have Internet access, which means almost half of the world's population has to rely on traditional (print-based) resource sharing methods.

Resource sharing activities, except for a few initiatives and minimal attempts at creating standards and policies, did not begin in Turkey until 2006. Until then, initiatives did not go further than guidelines or drafts of policies. The "Collaboration Working Group," established by the Anatolian University Libraries Consortium (ANKOS) in 2006 focused on resource sharing and document delivery activities among academic libraries in Turkey. First, a guide for academic resource sharing was prepared, and then the Interlibrary Collaboration Tracking System (KITS) was developed. KITS allowed academic libraries to submit their loan requests via an online platform created by the Collaboration Group (Cimen et al., 2010). Resource sharing activities have accelerated with the launch of the KITS platform by academic libraries since 2008. From 2008 to 2019, approximately 200,000 print and electronic resources were shared through the KITS platform (KITS, 2019).

ILL often refers to the lending of books to other libraries and tracking of books received from other libraries. The term "document supply" usually means providing copies of documents such as journal articles not expected to be returned after use. Many ILL management systems include document supply modules; however, document supply can also be provided using well-known standalone products such as Ariel, Prospero, and Odyssey (Gavel, 2015).

Developments in the field of secure electronic resource sharing are closely monitored by Turkish librarians. OCLC's WorldShare module, used by more than 200 academic libraries around the world, RapidILL, RapidX, ILLiad, and Odyssey are some popular applications in the area of resource sharing (Delaney & Richins, 2012). In 2013, the ANKOS Collaboration Working Group added a "secure electronic resource sharing module" to the KITS platform and the use of the KITS platform increased significantly with the introduction of the new module (Cimen et al., 2014).

In-Transit Services

There are many initiatives, services, policies, and procedures aimed at increasing access to library collections through interlibrary resource sharing and document supply services. In-transit services between central and branch libraries is well documented in the literature; for example, King and Pendleton's 2009 study on a campus courier service for delivery of books and journals. According to this study, the Ohio State University Library has been delivering materials from their central library to faculty members' offices and to users with disabilities since 1976 (King & Pendleton, 2009). Today, due to the ease of access to information, users now expect quick access to print and all other formats of information (Griffiths & Brophy, 2005). Because of such changing user expectations, libraries continue to look for better ways to increase access to their collections.

In-transit services are library services offered at academic institutions operating on more than one campus in order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness, to maximize use of collections budgets, to save time and space, and to increase user satisfaction. In-transit services are generally carried out by libraries' resource sharing and document supply departments. Rather than generating independent policies for in-transit service, as was the case for OhioLink (OhioLINK, 2008), implementation guidelines and policies are included in general resource sharing and document supply policies.

Academic libraries have been pioneering resource sharing activities in Turkey. In this context, there are several publications on resource sharing and document delivery services in Turkey published both at national and international level including Cimen et al. (2010), Cimen (2012), Yörü (2012), Cimen et al. (2014), and Guran & Kaya (2017). On the other hand, there is a lack of literature about in-transit services and activities provided between different campuses at a single institution.

This study addresses and evaluates all aspects of in-transit services in Turkey and is the first and the most comprehensive study of its kind in this area.

Higher education and in-transit services in Turkey

There are 207 universities, including 129 state and 78 “foundation universities”¹ in Turkey as of May 2019. 176 of them were founded between 1933-2015, and 31 of them were created between 2016-2019. As shown in Table 1, universities in Turkey have a total of 7,740,502 students and 166,221 academic staff, meaning there are 7,740,502 potential academic library users (Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi, 2019).

Table 1: Total number of students and faculty members

Type	Number
PhD students	96,199
Faculty members	166,225
Master's students	394,174
Associate diploma students	2,829,430
Undergraduate students	4,420,699
Total	7,906,727

According to 2018 data from the Turkish Statistical Institute, there are 598 university libraries in Turkey with 17,600,015 items in their collections (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, 2019). When the total number of books is divided by the number of students and academics, there are 2.2 books per use and it can be said that the number of publications per user is low. In this context, the effective use and sharing of resources becomes more important due to the low number of resources.

In Turkey, higher education activities are provided in the provinces and districts. The majority of the undergraduate programs are offered on campuses in provinces, while associate diploma programs generally take place on campuses in districts. For example, there are 167 programs at Çukurova University: 82 undergraduate programs and 85 associate

¹ Foundation University: In addition to state universities in Turkey, there are also “foundation universities” that are non-profit, fee-paying institutions (Saglam, 2013).

diploma programs. While 11 of the undergraduate programs provide education on campuses in the districts, 16 of the associate diploma programs are provided on campuses in the districts. To provides another example: Karadeniz Technical University has 67 undergraduate and 28 associate diploma programs. 11 of these undergraduate programs and 16 of these associate diploma programs are taught on campuses in the districts (Yükseköğretim Program Atlası, 2019).

The majority of university students study on central campuses located in provinces. On the other hand, a significant number of students attend classes at the campuses in districts. However, most of the university libraries are located only on central campuses. The resources offered to students at central campuses should also be provided to users in other districts, at least through an in-transit service. In this context, a survey was designed to initially identify the universities that operate with more than one campus and to discover if their campuses have libraries. It also aims to gain insight into the impact of in-transit services on library budgets, use of physical space, and user satisfaction as well as librarians' opinions and suggestions regarding in-transit services.

Before sending the survey to university libraries, contact email addresses and the year of each library's foundation were obtained from the Higher Education Council (YÖK) web page. There are 207 universities in Turkey as of May 2019. 176 of these universities were established between 1933-2015 and 31 universities were established (6 in 2016, 4 in 2017, 20 in 2018, and 1 in 2019) between 2016-2019 (YÖK Akademik, 2019). These 31 universities are excluded from this study since they do not have any alumni. Therefore, this study included 176 institutions as potential survey participants.

A web link and instructions for completing the survey were sent by email to these 176 university libraries. 106 university libraries from 176 universities responded to the survey, so the participation rate for the survey was 60.2%. In the remainder of the study, 106 institutions were taken into consideration while analysing the survey data. In-transit services of Istanbul Bilgi University were also examined and the effects of these services on library budget, physical space, and user satisfaction were examined in detail.

Data Evaluation

The survey had 14 questions, 11 of which were multiple choice and 3 of which were open-ended (see Appendix 1). The survey results were analysed using SurveyMonkey and Microsoft Excel and the outcome of the analysis is presented below in detail.

The first and the second questions asked for the name of the participating institution and type of university. Out of the 106 universities surveyed, 64 were state institutions and 42 were foundation universities.

The third question asked about the number of campuses (including provinces and districts) in which the university conducts teaching and research activities. If a university had only one campus, they skipped question 13. The numbers of university campuses owned by universities are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Numbers of university campuses





Figure 1 shows that 19% of the universities conducted teaching and research activities in one campus. 81% of the universities had more than one campus. The number of universities with 2-5 campuses was 55%.

The fourth question was directed to universities with multiple campuses and the number of libraries they have. Results are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Number of libraries in universities



As shown in Figure 2, 18% of universities had one library, 62% of universities had 2 to 5 libraries, 11% of universities had 6 to 10 libraries; 4% of universities had 2 to 5 libraries, and


5% of universities had more than 16 libraries. According to this data, universities which have more than one campus appear to have more than one library.

The fifth question of the survey attempted to determine whether in-transit services are provided between multi-campus university libraries. 53% of participants stated that there was no in-transit service between campuses while 47% stated that there was in-transit service between campuses.

The sixth question of the survey asked how many libraries of universities conduct in-transit activities. According to the responses of survey participants, 145 libraries of 40 universities provide in-transit services.

In the seventh question, the types of materials transferred between libraries as part of in-transit services were determined. These are shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Types of materials transferred between libraries



As shown in Figure 3, 49% of the materials sent via in-transit services were books and 26% were journals/articles. In addition to these, 23% of in-transit transactions were for non-book materials.

It is important to deliver requested materials via in-transit services to users as soon as possible. In this context, the eighth question of the survey asked about the frequencies of inter-campus resource delivery within the scope of in-transit services and the results are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Frequency of material transfers between campuses





Figure 4 shows that 47% of the respondents stated that they were transferring materials at frequencies different from the ones specified in the survey. When the details are examined, 85% of this group stated that when a request occurs, the requested item is sent. The time interval between shipments varied from once every other day to once every other week.

8

The ninth question of the survey considered how materials were sent via in-transit services to other libraries and the results are shown in Figure 5.


Figure 5: The means of item transfer between campuses



As shown in Figure 5, 8% of materials were sent by post/courier and 83% by university vehicles.

It is important to provide the status of library resources sent via in-transit services to the users correctly, to inform them and let them know where the materials are currently located. In this context, the tenth question of the survey examined the communications methods used during in-transit operations and the results are shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Communication systems used during resource transfer between campuses



As shown in Figure 6, 48% used library automation systems and 36% used email for facilitating in-transit service transactions. Specific software was used less often for this service.

In order to develop a service in libraries, it is useful to allocate a specific budget for the service. In this context, the eleventh question of the survey asked if institutions implementing in-transit service have a special budget for this service. 94% of participants stated that there was no special budget in the library for in-transit services, while 6% stated that there was a special budget.

The twelfth question of the survey examined which user groups benefit from in-transit services and the results are shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7: User groups benefiting from in-transit services




Figure 7 shows that all types of library users benefited from in-transit services. Faculty members accounted for the greatest proportion of usage (23%), while associate diploma students accounted for the least (13%). Doctoral, master, and undergraduate students accounted for 16% each, as did administration staff.

The thirteenth question of the survey asked librarians for their opinions about in-transit services and the results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Opinions about in-transit services

	I have no idea	I definitely do not agree	I partially agree	I agree	I definitely agree
In-transit services have a positive impact on the library budget	5.7%	12.5%	21.6%	42.0%	18.2%
In-transit services have a positive impact on user satisfaction	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	44.3%	48.9%
In-transit services have a positive impact on the efficient use of physical spaces in the library	1.1%	6.8%	20.5%	43.2%	28.4%
In-transit services prevent the purchase of multiples copies of books	1.1%	3.4%	19.3%	53.4%	22.7%
In-transit services have a positive impact on the efficient use of the library personnel time (spent on cataloguing, classification and technical services)	1.1%	9.1%	19.3%	47.7%	22.7%

As seen in Table 2, 82% of participants stated that in-transit services have a positive impact on library budgets. 100% of participants stated such services have a positive effect on user satisfaction. 92% of the participants stated that in-transit services have a positive impact on the efficient use of physical spaces in the library, 95% noted such services prevent the purchase of multiple copies of books, and 90% reported a positive impact on the efficient use of the library personnel time spent on cataloguing, classification, and technical services.

The fourteenth and final question of the survey were open-ended to examine opinions and suggestions regarding in-transit services. 29 participants answered this question. 59% of respondents gave appreciation for such a study and wrote that they wanted to see the results. 13% stated that books should be purchased for each campus library with multiple copies, instead of in-transit services. 28% stated that there should be standards regarding in-transit services and that such services could increase the sense of belonging of students to the university. Participants also expressed their opinions about the deficiencies of in-transit services (budget, personnel, and in-transit system).

General statistical data related to in-transit services at the level of university libraries in Turkey is presented for the first time in this study. Significant results were gathered regarding library budgets, user satisfaction, efficient use of physical spaces, and efficient use of library staff time for in-transit services. In order to further examine such services and support our analysis with numerical data, BİLGİ Library's in-transit service was also included because of their long-term experience in providing in-transit services and access to application data from the institution.

The Case of Istanbul Bilgi University Library

Istanbul Bilgi University was founded as a private, non-profit institution in 1996 and has four campuses. Istanbul Bilgi University currently has approximately 20,000 students, 7 faculties, 3 institutes, 4 schools, and more than 150 programs (İstanbul Bilgi University, 2019).

Istanbul Bilgi University, with 3 libraries and 15 study halls, offers an extensive system of academic support for university degree programs, research, and teaching. The library collection consists of 170,000 print resources, 445,000 electronic books, 62,500 e-journals, 125 databases, and other academic materials. The Library is a member of the Anatolian University Library Consortium, the European Bureau of Library, the Information and Documentation Associations, the International Association of Law Libraries, the Turkish Librarians' Association, the University and Research Librarians' Association (UNAK), and the UNAK Turkish Platform of Law Librarians (İstanbul Bilgi University Library, 2019).

In-transit services at Istanbul Bilgi University Libraries


Since the first day it was established, BİLGİ Library has been providing materials that are not in its collection to its users using ILL at national and international levels. This service is important in terms of satisfying the information needs of the users notably because of:

- Increasing numbers of campuses of Istanbul Bilgi University
- Frequent moving of departments to different campuses
- Campuses located in different districts
- Similar disciplines (such as Law and International Relations) located on different campuses
- Targeting the efficient use of the library budget
- Effective use of restricted library spaces
- Planning for meeting book and other item requests from users in a short time,
- Aiming to increase user satisfaction
- Efficient use of the collection

In-transit services were launched between BİLGİ Libraries in 2006 due to reasons mentioned above. A literature search was conducted on in-transit services before implementing them at BİLGİ Libraries. Necessary modifications to the library automation system were made regarding how to perform in-transit services (such as viewing the status of a borrowed item in the online catalog during the in-transit period), updating the library policy, and establishing workflows.

Istanbul Bilgi University has 3 different campuses. The distance between campuses is approximately 7 km and a free shuttle service is provided regularly for students and staff (İstanbul Bilgi University, 2019). Students can choose courses offered at different campuses, take classes at different campuses on the same day, and benefit from different campus libraries. Therefore, BİLGİ Library provides in-transit services to faculty members, master's students, PhD students and administrative staff (İstanbul Bilgi University Library, 2019). Figure 8 shows the workflow of library in-transit services.

Figure 8: İstanbul Bilgi University Library in-transit services workflow



BİLGİ Library users may access the library web page (<http://library.bilgi.edu.tr/>) and search the online catalog about the items they seek. After that, they may borrow the resources directly or may request them by using in-transit services. If the user requests an item from another campus, the bibliographic information of the resource is sent to the library's email address (kutuphane@bilgi.edu.tr) in order to have it delivered via in-transit services. After the request is received by a librarian, the relevant materials are attached, as being borrowed, to the user's account and sent to the campus library with the following message:

Dear [user]

The book you requested has been checked out to your account and will be delivered to Dolapdere Library. When the book arrives at the library, you will be informed.

Best regards,
Reference Librarian
Kuştepe Campus Library

After the item arrives at the receiving library, the following message is sent to the user by librarians:

Dear [user],

The book that you requested from Kuştepe Library for delivery at Dolapdere Library has arrived. You may pick up the book from the Circulation Desk at Dolapdere Library.

Best regards,
Reference Librarian
Dolapdere Campus Library

13


Users who receive this message come to the library and borrow the item. Users may return the item to any campus library. In-transit service deliveries are available between campuses at least 3 times a day.

The impact of in-transit services on user satisfaction at BİLGİ Library was evaluated using email comments and face-to-face interviews at the library. In this context, the library has had much positive feedback from users about in-transit services.

Establishing the library's in-transit services did not require any additional staff, budget, or cargo expenses. The library only purchased 10 book carrying cases in order to protect materials while being sent across campuses. Library resource deliveries have been part of the internal cargo system at the university that enables the transfer of documents between campuses.

In order to evaluate the impact of in-transit services at BİLGİ Library in terms of budgets, physical space, and collections, we analysed data obtained from the library automation system between 2009 and 2018 (10 years). Figure 9 shows the types and number of materials sent by in-transit services.


Figure 9: Istanbul Bilgi University Library in-transit statistics by item type



As shown in Figure 9, 35,414 items were delivered to users through in-transit services among 3 libraries during the 10-year period. 85% of the delivered materials were books, 12% were DVDs, 3% were journals, video cassettes, CD-ROMs, music CDs, VCDs, and other items. In-transit services have had a positive contribution to the efficient use of library spaces. When BİLGİ Library's in-transit data is evaluated, it is seen that an area of approximately 100 square meters would be needed for 35,414 items. A shelf at BİLGİ library measures 95 cm x 66 cm x 207 cm and holds approximately 300 books. By offering in-transit services, the library saves 100 square meters and 120 double-sided bookshelves.

Istanbul Bilgi University has 3 libraries on the Santralistanbul, Kuştepe, and Dolapdere campuses. The libraries at the Kuştepe and Dolapdere campuses are called the Kuştepe Library and the Dolapdere Library, while the library on the Santralistanbul campus is called the Latif Mutlu Library. The number of items sent between the three libraries within 10 years is shown in Figure 10.

Figure 10: Istanbul Bilgi University Library in-transit statistics between campus libraries



As shown in Figure 10, 36% (12,709) of the 35,414 items were sent from the Kuştepe Library to the Latif Mutlu Library; 23% (8,123) from the Latif Mutlu Library to the Kuştepe Library; 14% (4,866) from Dolapdere Library to Kuştepe Library; 13% (4,699) from Kuştepe Library to Dolapdere Library; 7% (2,544) from Dolapdere Library to the Latif Mutlu Library; and 7% (2,473) from the Latif Mutlu Library to Dolapdere Library.

Another benefit of in-transit services to libraries is preventing the same item from being re-purchased for multiple libraries. In order to evaluate BİLGİ Library data in this context, the distribution of materials sent between libraries according to the Library of Congress classification (LCC) system is examined and shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Istanbul Bilgi University Library in-transit statistics by subject

Subject	In-transit item	Percentage (%)
P - Language and Literature	10,800	30.50%
H - Social Sciences	7,546	21.31%
D - World History and History of Europe, Asia, Africa, etc.	4,462	12.60%
B - Philosophy. Psychology. Religion	3,121	8.81%
J - Political Science	2,803	7.91%
N - Fine Arts	990	2.80%
G - Geography, Anthropology, and Recreation	833	2.35%
R - Medicine	813	2.30%
M - Music	741	2.09%
Q - Science	652	1.84%
K - Law	581	1.64%
L - Education	526	1.49%
T - Technology	484	1.37%
C - Auxiliary Sciences of History	346	0.98%
A - General Works	170	0.48%
E - History of America	169	0.48%
Z - Bibliography, Library Science	157	0.44%
U - Military Science	88	0.25%
S - Agriculture	67	0.19%
F - Local History of the Americas	60	0.17%
V - Naval Science	5	0.01%
Total	35,414	100.00%

In the LCC system, the letter “P” indicates the publications in the “Language and Literature” field. As shown in Table 3, the resources in the field of Language and Literature are the most requested materials across all campuses. The second most requested subject is Social Sciences, and the third is World History. Law and Political Science are used by disciplines close to each other and are also sent to other campuses.

Another advantage of the in-transit services to libraries is to ensure the efficient use of library budgets by preventing re-acquisition of the same items for multiple campuses. In-transit data for BİLGİ Library is examined and presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Istanbul Bilgi University Library in-transit statistics by total value

Item type	Number of in-transit materials in Turkish	Value of in-transit materials in Turkish	Number of in-transit materials in English	Value of in-transit materials in English	Grand total value
Book	9,098	\$ 90.980,00	20,735	\$ 1.285.570,00	\$ 1.376.550,00
DVD	495	\$ 7.425,00	3,847	\$ 57.705,00	\$ 65.130,00
Journal	326	\$ 16.300,00	41	\$ 20.500,00	\$ 36.800,00
Video cassette	33	\$ 165,00	129	\$ 1.290,00	\$ 1.455,00
CD ROM	24	\$ 240,00	143	\$ 2.145,00	\$ 2.385,00
Music CD	6	\$ 60,00	187	\$ 2.805,00	\$ 2.865,00
Other	177	\$ 520,00	173	\$ 4.042,00	\$ 4.562,00
TOTAL	10,159	\$ 115,690,00	25,255	\$ 1.374.057,00	\$ 1.489.747,00

Since the language of instruction at İstanbul Bilgi University is mainly English, most of the materials in the library are in English. As shown in Table 4, most of the items sent by in-transit services were also in English. Due to in-transit services, a library budget savings of 1,489,747 USD was achieved. In addition, in-transit services seem to contribute to the efficient and effective use of physical space, budget, and staff time at BİLGİ Library and this service did not incur additional costs such as additional staff or access to BİLGİ Library.

Conclusion & Recommendations

Resource sharing among libraries has an important role in meeting the needs of library users. An item that cannot be found in one library can be supplied under the auspices of resource sharing between libraries at the national or international level. Transferring some materials onto electronic platforms and producing them electronically has not reduced the importance of resource sharing; thus, information sharing services continue in different forms.

Resource sharing has an important place in increasing user satisfaction as well as in the efficient use of the library budgets and facilities.

Universities with multiple campuses, as a standard service, provide their users with materials from other universities under interlibrary loan programs. This study identified multi-campus universities in Turkey and determined the contributions of the in-transit services to libraries in terms of physical space, user satisfaction, budgets, and staff efficiency, with the following results:

- 81% of the 106 universities which participated in this study had more than one campus.
- 53% of multi-campus universities had no in-transit services between their campuses.
- 75% of universities that had in-transit services between campuses delivered books as well as journals/articles.
- 47% of in-transit deliveries did not occur according to a regular timeframe and were sent only on an “upon request” basis.
- 83% of items delivered to other campus libraries with in-transit services were sent via vehicles belonging to the university.
- In general, existing library automation systems are used for in-transit services and therefore, no extra budget allocations were needed.

- Libraries provided in-transit services to all their users, if they provided such services.

The opinions of library staff that participated in the survey were evaluated in regard to efficient use of library budgets, user satisfaction, physical space, and library staff satisfaction, in addition to BİLGİ Library in-transit statistics, and the following results were observed:

- 82% of libraries that participated in the survey expressed that in-transit services contribute positively to library budgets. 10-year in-transit data from BİLGİ Library showed that the service made it possible to achieve a savings of 1,489,747 USD. According to these results, it can be said that in-transit services contributed positively to the university library budget.
- All participants (100%) thought that the in-transit services had/would have a positive impact on user satisfaction.
- 92% of participants thought that in-transit services help libraries use physical space efficiently. 95% said that such services prevent the purchase of multiple copies of the same item. According to data collected from BİLGİ Library, 100 square meters of space was saved by avoiding multi-copy purchases over a 10-year period.
- 90% of survey participants stated that in-transit services helped/would help the library staff use their time efficiently. With the in-transit service of BİLGİ Library, 35,414 items were sent between 3 libraries over 10 years. If multiple copies of these resources had been purchased, more staff time would have been reserved for operations such as purchasing, cataloging, and classification.

In summary, this survey found that in-transit services in Turkey are useful for university libraries in terms of user satisfaction, budgets, physical space, and efficient use of library staff time. Researchers and students also save time by requesting materials from any campus through in-transit services.

This study heightens the awareness about in-transit services at university libraries and serves as a model for the other studies in this area. BİLGİ Library's process flowchart and the analysis of data derived from BİLGİ can be useful for libraries initiating in-transit services for the first time. Additionally, BİLGİ Library's know-how and a decade of experience in providing in-transit services can be leveraged by libraries at the national and regional level upon request. Finally, this article may be useful for all academic librarians and researchers concerned with in-transit services, library management, collection management and resource sharing, especially in developing countries.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to express their thanks to Gulcin Cribb and Stephanie Krueger for their valuable help and contribution during the proofreading of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Cimen, E., Celikbas, S., Tuglu, A. & Celikbas, Z. (2010). KITS: A national system for document supply in Turkey. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 38(1), 58–66.
DOI:10.1108/02641611011025398
- Cimen, E. (2012). Future of resource sharing in Turkey: Can open-access be an alternative? *Interlending & Document Supply*, 40(3), 144-149.
DOI:10.1108/02641611211258217
- Cimen, E., Celikbas, S., Tuglu, A. & Celikbas, Z. (2014). *New module for secure electronic resource sharing in Turkey*. Paper presented at the 80th IFLA Conference and Assembly: Document Delivery and Resource Sharing Section, Lyon, France.
- Delaney, T. G. & Richins, M. (2012). RapidILL: An enhanced, low cost and low impact solution to interlending. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 40(1), 12-18.
DOI:10.1108/02641611211214233
- Frederiksen, L., Bean M., Nance, H. (2012). *Global Resource Sharing*. Oxford, UK: Chandos Publishing.
- Gavel, Y. (2015). Bringing the national interlending system into the local document supply process – a Swedish case study. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 43(2), 104-109.
DOI:10.1108/ILDS-12-2014-0060
- Griffiths, J. R. & Brophy, P. (2005). Student searching behavior and the Web: Use of academic resources and Google. *Library Trends*, 53(4), 539–554.
- Guran, B. Ö., & Kaya, H. (2017). *Kütüphaneler Arası Ödünç Verme Hizmetinin Akademik Kütüphanelerde Koleksiyon Yönetimine Etkisi: Kadriye Zaim Kütüphanesi Örneği*. ÜNAK 2017 Akademik Kütüphanelerde Kaynak Yönetimi Sempozyumu, Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from: https://bluesyemre.files.wordpress.com/2018/07/unak_2017_bildiriler-son.pdf
- Internet World Stats (2019). *Internet World Stats*. Retrieved from: <https://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>
- İstanbul Bilgi University Library (2019). *İstanbul Bilgi University Library, "General Information"*. Retrieved from: https://library.bilgi.edu.tr/general_info.html
- İstanbul Bilgi University (2019). *İstanbul Bilgi University Shuttle*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bilgi.edu.tr/en/life-at-bilgi/transportation/shuttle/>
- İstanbul Bilgi University (2019). *İstanbul Bilgi University, History*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bilgi.edu.tr/en/university/about/history/>
- King, P. & Pendleton, A. J. (2009). The Campus courier service: Campus delivery of books and journals at Auburn University. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery &*

Electronic Reserve, 317-323.

DOI:10.1080/10723030903285437

KITS (2019). *KITS Statistics*. Retrieved from: <http://kits.ankos.gen.tr/html/statistics.php>

Miguel, T.M. (2007). Exchanging books in Western Europe: a brief history of international interlibrary loan *International Journal of Legal Information*, 35, (3). 498-513.

OhioLINK (2008). *OhioLINK Patron Initiated Inter-Institutional Circulation Policies as revised January 2008*. Retrieved from: https://www.ohiolink.edu/content/ohiolink_patron_initiated_inter_institutional_circulation_policies_revised_january_2008

Ryward, W. B. (1994). Library Associations, International. In W. A. Wiegand & D. G. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Library History*, (pp. 342-347). New York: Garland Press.

Saglam, G. (2013). Quality enhancement in Turkish higher education. In: R. Land & G. Gordon (Eds.) *Enhancing quality in higher education: International perspectives*, (pp. 189-200). New York: Routledge.

Stuart-Sturbs, B. (1975). An Historical Look at Resource Sharing. *Library Trends*, 23(4), 649-664.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2019). *Kütüphane İstatistikleri 2018*. Retrieved from: <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=30595>

Weber, D. C. (1976). A century of cooperative programs among academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 38(206), 205–221.

Wehefritz, V. (1974). *International Loan Services and Union Catalogues*. Mainz, Germany: Vittorio Kolstermann.

YÖK Akademik (2019). *YÖK akademik*. Retrieved from: <https://akademik.yok.gov.tr/AkademikArama/>

Yörü, H.A. (2012). Türkiye'de Kütüphanelerarası İşbirliğinin Kısa Tarihçesi ve Günümüz Uygulamaları (Brief History of Interlibrary Cooperation in Turkey and Today's Applications). *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, 26(1), (2012), 154-168. Retrieved from: <http://tk.org.tr/index.php/TK/article/viewFile/327/319>

Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi (2019). *Yükseköğretim Bilgi Yönetim Sistemi*. Retrieved from: <https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/>

Yükseköğretim Program Atlası (2019). *YÖK lisans ve ön lisans atlası*. Retrieved from: <https://yokatlas.yok.gov.tr/index.php>

APPENDIX ONE: SURVEY QUESTIONS ABOUT IN-TRANSIT SERVICES AMONG MULTI- CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES

Library users across multi-campus universities can request books or non-book resources from other campuses and may choose to return them to any other campus library of their choice. Such services are either briefly coined as “in-transit” or are more explicitly named as “inter-campus book/resource transfer.”

This survey, which will initially identify the universities that operate in more than one campus and whether their campuses have libraries, aims to gain insight into the impact of in-transit services on library budgets, the use of physical space, and user satisfaction as well as gather information about opinions and suggestions librarians have for such services.

Survey findings will be anonymously included in a research paper that will be presented at the international IFLA -ILDS (Interlending and Document Supply) conference organized by the IFLA Document Delivery and Resource Sharing (DDRS) Section in the Czech city of Prague (October 9-11, 2019). Participating institutions will be granted access to survey findings upon request.

We would like to thank you in advance for your valuable contribution and feedback.

Sami ÇUHADAR, Ertuğrul ÇİMEN, Abdullah TURAN

- 1.) Please state the name of your institution.
- 2.) Please state the category of your institution.
() State University () Foundation (non-profit private) University
- 3.) What is the number of campuses (including provinces and districts) at which that your university conducts teaching and research activities? If your answer is 1, you may quit answering the questionnaire. Thank you for your participation in the survey. Number of campuses: -----
- 4.) How many of your teaching and research campuses (including provinces and districts) at your university have a library? Number of libraries:
- 5-) Do you provide your library users with book/materials transfer services between your university's teaching & research campuses (including provinces and districts)? If your answer is no, please skip to Question 13.
() Yes () No
- 6.) If your answer is “Yes”: Please state the number of libraries that conduct interlibrary book/material transfer (in-transit) activities.
- 7.) Please select the types of items that are transferred between libraries as part of interlibrary book/material transfer (in-transit) services.
() Books () Non-book resources () Periodicals/articles () Other
- 8.) How often do you transfer books/materials (in-transit) between campuses?
() More than once a day () Once a day () Once every other day () Once a week
() Once every other week () Other
- 9-. What are the means of book/material transfer between campuses?
() By post or courier () By university vehicle () By library vehicle () Other

- 10-. Which systems below do you use for book/material transfer between campuses?
☐ Library automation system ☐ Your own application ☐ Email ☐ Other
- 11.) Are there any items in the library budget that are designated for inter-campus book/material transfers (in-transit)?
☐ Yes ☐ No
- 12-. Which user groups benefit from inter-campus book/material transfer (in-transit) services?
☐ Faculty members ☐ PhD students ☐ Master's students
☐ Undergraduate students ☐ Associate diploma students ☐ Administrative staff
- 13.) Please state the number that best describes your opinion regarding interlibrary book/material transfer (in-transit) services with 1 for "I have no idea", 2 for "I definitely do not agree", 3 for "I partially agree", 4 for "I agree" and 5 for "I definitely agree".

	1	2	3	4	5
In-transit services have a positive impact on the library budget.					
In-transit services have a positive impact on user satisfaction.					
In-transit services have a positive impact on the efficient use of physical spaces in the library.					
In-transit services prevent the purchase of multiple copies of books.					
In-transit services have a positive impact on the efficient use of the library personnel time spent on cataloguing, classification, and technical services.					

- 14-) If you have any additional comments or suggestions, please state them below.

.....

