

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

3-6-2018

Collection Development Policies of Electronic Resources in University Libraries in Southeast Nigeria.

Flora Ifeoma Okogwu

Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State Nigeria, floraokogwu@gmail.com

F C. Ekere Department of Library and Information Science University of Nigeria Nsukka

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Collection Development and Management Commons](#)

Okogwu, Flora Ifeoma and Ekere, F C. Department of Library and Information Science University of Nigeria Nsukka, "Collection Development Policies of Electronic Resources in University Libraries in Southeast Nigeria." (2018). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1758.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1758>

Collection Development Policies of Electronic Resources in University Libraries in Southeast Nigeria.

Okogwu, F.I¹ and Ekere F.C²

¹Ebonyi State University Library Abakaliki

²Department of Library and Information Science, University of Nigeria Nsukka

Email:floraokogwu@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper is an empirical study of collection development policy of electronic resources in university libraries in South East Nigeria. The study ascertains the types of policies guiding electronic resources collection development practices; identifies the tools used in making sound electronic resources collection development; and determines the criteria considered in the evaluation of electronic resources of university libraries in South East Nigeria. It employed a descriptive survey design. The population of the study was 86 librarians in collection development, serials and digital library (e-library). All the 86 librarians working in collection development, serials and digital library units (e-library) were used hence the number is manageable. The survey used questionnaire and interview as instruments of data collection. Data collected were tabulated and analyzed using simple statistics of percentages and mean. The result revealed that the university libraries under study adopted traditional policies with 69 respondents representing (80.2%) of the respondents; that the libraries under study used all the five (5) items which include; the use of trial offers by mounting a link to their resources without cost; visits to similar libraries that already have the product and see it in action there; the use of vendor exhibits at conferences; the use of demonstrations from publisher /vendor in the library and demonstrate their resource and the use of reviews provided through electronic resources as tools used in making sound electronic resources. The criteria used by the libraries under study to evaluate their resources which include cost-effectiveness based on the number of searches; relevance of the research on campus and the curriculum of the library users; dissatisfaction with a resource; access criteria on the technical reliability of the content provider; the database can be ranked by acquiring statistics; comparing duplication in various formats or overlap in full-text resources. The study recommended that libraries should formulate and develop electronic resources collection development policy; efforts should be made by libraries to adopt a written electronic resources collection development policy which serves as a guide and for references and continuity among the librarians that are involved in e-resources collection development. Also, electronic resources should be evaluated on a regular basis by considering relevant factors to disclose those electronic resources that are of high and maximum utilization.

Keywords: Collection development; Collection Development Policy; Electronic Resources; Evaluation Criteria; University Libraries.

Introduction

With the emergence of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), digital information and knowledge preoccupy the prints, users' expectations from the library and information sources are different from what is used to be in the past. These changes or development affects library services in all aspect and collection development was not an exception. Collection development has become a very popular term in library and information centers, as a need for an efficient and balanced collection. Collection development serves as a foundation upon which other library services are built. It is the systematic building of a library collection based on meaningful data rather than subjective choice. It is the process of accessing the strength and weaknesses in a collection and then creating the plan to correct the weakness and maintain the strength. The process of collection building includes selection of current as well as retrospective materials and the evaluation of the existing collection observed Kumbar and Hadagali in Igiamoh and Duro (2012).

The introduction of electronic resources has called for a drastic revolution in library collections and management practices of libraries. IFLA, (2012) described electronic resources as those materials that require computer access, whether through a personal computer, mainframe, or handheld mobile devises. They are increasingly important component of collection-building activities of libraries and may be accessed remotely via the internet or locally. With the new development, libraries are now being described as traditional, hybrid, digital or electronic. With the emergence of information and communication technology, traditional libraries (print libraries) are turning into hybrid, digital and many to digital libraries (Yeow-fei, 2012). This is noticeable in the format of their collection which is the adoption of electronic resources. The challenge of the digital era is how to integrate electronic resources with print resources on a

finite or dwindling budget without reducing the services of libraries. The way out is to adopt policy changes. This has to do with the changes in the philosophy of collection development, incorporation of technology-related facilities, increase budgeting to accommodate the hardware and software costs, so that the collection development librarian will have numerous resources to select from observed Golwal and Moltewa (2012) as cited in Sambo, A.S, Abu-udenyi, H. & Enite, A.U. (2014).

Statement of the Problem

The emergence of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has led to information explosion in libraries. There has been an increase in the number of information resources in digital form on daily basis and in different forms. A large number of e-resources collection has become a challenge to libraries as a lot of information are now available to the public without having to visit and use the traditional library. The need for libraries to build their collection with e-resources to the benefit of the libraries as well as the users is of great importance. As such, there is need to transform and adopt policies that will promote the better building of electronic resources.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to examine the collection development policy of electronic resources in university libraries in South East Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study include;

1. ascertain the types of policies guiding electronic resources collection development practices of university libraries in South East Nigeria;

2. identify the tools used in making sound electronic resources collection development in university libraries in South East Nigeria.
3. determine the criteria considered in evaluation of electronic resources of university libraries in South East Nigeria.

Research Question

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the types of policies that guide electronic resources collection development practices in University libraries in South East Nigeria?
2. What are the tools used in making sound electronic resources selection in university libraries in South East Nigeria?
3. What are the criteria considered in evaluating electronic resources in university libraries in South East Nigeria?

Conceptual Clarification

University Library

University library is any library established and owned by a university for the primary purpose of supporting teaching, research and learning activities in the university. Edem, Ani, and Ocheibi (2009) opined that the main purpose of a university library is to support the university in areas of learning, teaching, and research. They further disclosed that the university library is regarded as the "heart" of any academic institution, particularly the university. Igun (2013) affirmed that university libraries are the primary hub in the network of information provision for university students, researchers, lecturers, management and other users. The university library users include

the staff and students of the university-the undergraduate students of both regular, part-time and the postgraduate students and other users from outside of the university community who have the permission to access the university library resources. University libraries are categorized into three types, namely federal university libraries-those established, owned and maintained by the federal government; state university libraries – those established, owned and maintained by the state government; and private university libraries- those approved by NUC that is neither owned nor maintained by the federal or the state government. They are owned by individuals, group of people or religious bodies.

Ka (2005) opined that university libraries play a significant role in supporting research. University libraries do not just store books and journals and offer space for student learning, but they also provide systematically digitized information. Edoka (2000) outlined the functions of the university libraries as thus; to provide information materials required for the academic programmes of the parent institutions; to provide research information resources in consonance with the needs of the faculty and research students; to provide information resources for recreation and for personal self development of users; to provide study accommodation in a useful variety of locations; to provide protection and security for these materials; to co-operate with other libraries as appropriate levels for improved information services; to provide specialized information service to appropriate segments of the wider community. Campbell (2006) argued that academic libraries are complex institutions with multiple roles. They not only provide traditional prints resources but also provide electronic resources to support the teaching, learning and research activities of the university. Edem, Ani, and Ocheibi (2009) observed that for a university library to perform its myriad of functions of supporting the parent body, its

library collections must not only have quality and current books/journals, but also modern information sources in electronic formats, such as e-books, e-journals, internet etc.

Services in the university libraries include the traditional and electronic related services. Adeyemi (1991) and Fabunmi (2004) observed that the traditional library services are offered in form of provision of print materials, loan transactions, physical inter-library loan transactions, manual bibliographic and literature searches, provision of physical reading facilities, binding, photocopying, paper-based current awareness services, manual indexing and abstracting, newspapers clipping, development of reading list, face-to-face reference and information services. While in the university libraries, electronic services are offered with the aid of computers and internet facilities which include: Online Public Access Catalogues (OPACs), automated circulation system, online reservations, provision of access to bibliographic/full text databases, subjects gateways, virtual reference services, online helpdesk, and access to electronic journals, e-books, digitized resources, online instructions, documents delivery, institutional repositories, and other web-based resources observed Elhafiz (2004), Anunobi and Okoye (2008).

University libraries in South East Nigeria are also established to support the research, teaching and learning activities of their parent institutions. With the emergence of information and communication technology, the university libraries in South East are not left out in building their collection with electronic resources to educate and support in the actualization of the aims and objectives of their parent institution.

Electronic Resources

Electronic resources are concepts which evolved as a result of the rapid growth of information and communication technology. It has been described by different authors in different ways. Shukla and Mishra (2011) described the electronic collection as the collection of information which can be accessed only by the use of electronic gadgets. International Federation of Library Association (IFLA) (2012) described electronic resources as those materials that require computer access, whether through a personal computer, mainframe, or handheld mobile devices. They may be accessed remotely via the internet or locally.

Similarly, Mansur (2012) described electronic resources as electronic products that deliver a collection of data, be it text referring to full text databases, e-journals, e-books, image collections, other multimedia products and numerical, graphical or time based, as commercially available title that has been published with a sole aim of being marketed and for information dissemination. These may be delivered on an optical media or via the Internet. Graham (2003) sees electronic resources as the mines of information that are explored through modern Information and Communication Technology (ICT) devices, refined and redesigned and more often stored in the cyberspace in the most concrete and compact form and can be accessed simultaneously from infinite points by a great number of audience. The phrase electronic resources has broadly been defined as, information accessed by a computer, may be used as bibliographic guides to potential sources but, as of yet, they infrequently appear as cited references in their own right. E-resources, therefore, refer to that kind of documents in digital formats which are made available to library users through a computer-based information retrieval system.

In describing the concept of electronic resources, Bavakenthy, Veeran, and Salih (2003) viewed electronic resources as resources in which information are stored electronically and are accessible through electronic systems and networks. 'E-resource' is a broad term that includes a variety of publishing models, including Online Public Access Catalogues (OPACs), CD-ROMs, online databases, e-journals, e-books, internet resources, Print-on-demand (POD), e-mail publishing, wireless publishing, electronic link and web publishing, etc. In this context, the term primarily denotes "any electronic product that delivers the collection of data be it in text, numerical, graphical, or time based, as a commercially available resource". According to Tsakonas and Papatheodorou (2006), electronic information resources are information resources provided in electronic form, and these include resources available on the Internet such as e-books, e-journals, online database, Compact Disk Read Only Memory (CD-ROM) databases and other computer-based electronic networks, among others.

In addition, Reitz (2004) defined electronic resource as "material consisting of data and/or computer program (s) encoded for reading and manipulation by a computer, by the use of a peripheral device directly connected to the computer, such as a Compact Disk Read Only Memory (CD-ROM) drive, or remotely via a network, such as the Internet." According to her, the category includes software applications, electronic texts, bibliographic databases, institutional repositories, websites, e-books, collections of e-journals, etc. Electronic resources not publicly available free of charge usually require licensing and authentication.

According to California State University (CSU), (2005) electronic resources encompasses both full text and abstract/citation; e-journals, both individual and collections; e-books; e-article delivery services etc. It can be accessed remotely via the World Wide Web or delivered locally.

In a related development, Ekwelem, Okafor and Ukwoma (2009) defined electronic resources as

information resources that are available and can be accessed electronically through such computer networked facilities as online library catalogues, the Internet and the World Wide Web, digital libraries and archives, government portals and websites, CD-ROM databases, online academic databases, such as Medline or Commercial databases such as LexisNexis.

Similarly, Tsakonas and Papatheodorou (2006), see electronic information resources as information resources provided in electronic form, and these include resources available on the Internet such as e-books, e-journals, online database, Compact Disk Read Only Memory (CD-ROM) databases and other computer-based electronic networks, among others. Electronic resources according to International Federation of Library Association (IFLA) (2012) are those materials that require computer access, whether through a personal computer, mainframe, or handheld mobile device. They may either be accessed remotely via the Internet or locally. Some of the most frequently encountered types are e-journals, e-books, full-text (aggregated) databases, indexing and abstracting databases, reference databases (biographies, dictionaries, directories, encyclopedias, etc.), numeric and statistical databases, e-images and e-audio/visual resources

Collection development and policy

Collection development has become a very popular term in library and information centers as a need for an efficient and balanced collection. It includes everything that goes into acquiring resources, including selection, ordering, and payment. Collection development serves as a foundation upon which other library services are built. It is the systematic building of a library collection based on meaningful data rather than subjective choice. It is the process of assessing the strength and weaknesses in a collection and then creating plan to correct the weakness and

maintain the strength. The process of collection building includes the selection of current as well as retrospective materials and the evaluation of the existing collection observed Kumbar and Hadagali in Igiamoh and Duro (2012). Zijl (1998) sees collection development as the selection, maintenance, acquisition and evaluation of information sources in libraries. Mosher (1982) observed that collection development is a process that should constitute a rational documented program guided by written policies and protocols and should reflect, in a sense, a contract between library users and staff as to what will be acquired, for whom and at what level. Collection development as defined by Seetharama and Ambuja cited by Igiamoh and Duro (2012) is a communication tool for management, librarians, users and other libraries; a detailed outline of collecting levels; a description of collection development responsibilities; and budgeting tool that helps librarians decide where to place resources. Furthermore, Elaturoti (1995) sees collection development as the process of assessing the strength and weaknesses in a collection and then creating a plan to correct the weakness and maintain the strength.

Gabriel (1995) defined collection development as a term representing the process of systematically building library collections to serve study, teaching, research, recreational, and other needs of library users. According to Mansur (2012), collection development is the selection, acquisition, and processing of library materials in varied formats meant for users' current needs and their future requirements. He further highlighted the process of collection development to include selection and deselection of current and retrospective materials, planning of coherent strategies for continuing acquisition, and evaluation of collections to ascertain how well they serve users needs.

Collection development is a well-planned activity for which a well-defined policy is essential; it is a vital process in creating and building a library collection. It is applicable to all types of a

library (Barik and Shethy in Igiamoh and Duro 2012). International Federation of Library Association (IFLA 2010), Rowley and Black (1996) believe that the aim of collection development is to carry out a library's mission to create a repository or gateway to information for scholars today and to capture the intellectual heritage of the prevailing culture in order to benefit future learners and thinkers. Osburn (1981) opined that the primary objective of collection development in the general library is completeness. While this can never be attained either theoretically or practically yet the usefulness of the primary collection depends upon its being substantially complete and thoroughly representative of the main intellectual interest of mankind. Collection development in libraries means rich and sound collections of systematic, comprehensive, balanced and updated documents to meet the users' information needs.

Adequate collection development policy implies formulation of a collection development policy that will always establish ground rules for planning, budgeting, selecting and acquiring library materials (Vohra, 2003). These documents provide a framework for coordinated collection development programme throughout university libraries. A digital library tries to provide a seamless environment where the co-operative access, filtering, manipulation, generation, and preservation of these documents will be supported by a continuous cycle (Castelli, 2006). Collection development policies also function as a guide to library resources for faculties, library users and other libraries by describing the scope and nature of the collection. In any written collection development policy, the e-resources should be considered alongside printed resources, such as e-journals, books, and databases.

The library's main objective is to select, maintain and provide access to relevant and representative information sources. In order to achieve this, there is the need for every library to have a forward-looking written collection development policy. A policy is a guide to the

successful implementation of a process. Fourie (2001) defines collection development policy (CDP) as the written statement that provides planning and implementation guidelines for most collection building tasks. According to Barik and Sethy (2009), collection development policy is a set of rules or norm adopted for developing the collection or stock in library. A collection development policy is a printed statement of a library's intention for building its collection. A collection development (CD) policy is very valuable as a planning tool for collection development. CD policies are typically formal documents that describe issues such as the scope of the collection, the budget, selection responsibilities, and weeding observed, Johnson (2009). White and Crawford (1997) advocate the use of a CDP, particularly with regard to electronic resources, in order to "guide us in our decisions, to address faculty/student needs and concerns, and to help us plan for future changes." A policy which gives clear but simple guidelines in the selection of material would clearly be of benefit to bibliographers and would lead to them making more consistent and informed decisions observed, Zijl (1998).

Johnson (2009) qualifies libraries without collection development policies like businesses without business plan. In a related development, Carpenter (1984) states that without a collection development policy "a library is engaged only in acquiring, spending money and adding books not in rationally and systematically developing its collection." Pastine (1996) further revealed that the collection development policy provides a focus for the collection and identifies specific subject areas of greater and lesser concentration. Collection development policies (also known as development policy statement, selection policies, collection statements, collection development plans) have proven tools for many collection development librarians in academic libraries.

Furthermore, Gessesse (2000) points out that the activities of librarians should be guided by the written collection development policy. The library collection development policy must be written

or revised to include electronic resources. The importance of collection development policy cannot be over emphasized. Magrill and Hickey (1984) write that a written collection development policy is an important tool for guiding all activities related to planning, budgeting, selecting and acquiring library materials. It is one of the first pieces of evidence in determining whether a library is engaged in true collection development. University libraries are becoming increasingly aware of the benefits of having a strong and constantly updated written collection development policy (Bostic, 1988). Collection development policies provide guidelines in the selection of materials and the allocation of funds. A written policy provides the rationale for the selection of individual items and ensures consistency and balance in the growth of collections.

Similarly, Gardner (1981) suggested that developing a collection development policy has the following advantages; forces staff to think through library goals, and commit themselves to these, helps them to identify the long and short term needs of users, and to establish priorities for allocating funds; helps assure that the library will commit itself to serving all parts of the community, both present, and future; helps set standards for the selection and weeding of materials; informs users, administrators and other libraries of collection scope and facilitates coordination of collection development among institutions; helps minimize personal bias by selectors, and to highlight imbalance in selection criteria; serves as an in service training tool for new staff; helps assure continuity, especially in collections of any size, providing a pattern and framework to ease transition from one librarian to the next; provides a means of staff self evaluation, or for evaluation by outsider; help demonstrate that the library is running a business like operation; provides information to assist in budget allocations; contributes to operational efficiency in terms of routine decisions, which helps junior staff and finally serves as a tool to complaint –handling with regard to inclusions or exclusions.

A written policy provides the rationale for the selection of individual items and ensures consistency and balance in the growth of collections. Electronic collection development policy must be consistent with the mission and an overall collection development plan. At the same time, collection development plans should take into account the electronic resources now available to libraries (Gessesse 2000). CD policies emphasize the mission of a library as an information provider to a specific community and, most importantly, assert support for the freedom of information (Johnson, 2009). It can inform administrators, librarians, faculty, students, and the wider community that are affected by how the library carries out its mission. The policy serves as an internal document to train selectors and explains circumstances under which gift books are accepted. CD policies describe the library's acquisition priorities and funding allocations. This is important because it can explain why, in this age of static budgets and ever-rising costs; certain items were not purchased (Johnson, 2009).

In a related development, Gregory and Hanson (2006) reiterated that the three main purposes of a collection development policy include informing, directing and protecting. They further explained that the purpose of informing is to serve as a communications vehicle for the library's staff, administrators, and various constituencies. The purpose of directing is to serve as a guideline for the selectors to maintain balance in the collection for its users. It also serves as a training document for new collection development librarians. The purpose of protection is to serve as a means of justifying the selection to the users. According to them, it is one of the first pieces of evidence in determining whether a library is engaged in true collection development. Similarly, Atkinson (1986) observed that collection development policies serve three primary functions which include referential, generative and rhetorical functions. Bostic (1988) observed that university libraries are becoming increasingly aware of the benefits of having a strong and

constantly updated written collection development policy. He agrees that collection development policies provide guidelines for the selection of material and the allocation of funds. In spite of the importance of collection development policy, some libraries do not have comprehensive collection development policies.

Despite the above-enumerated purposes or benefits of collection development policy, there are problems surrounding the use of collection development policies (CDPs) in academic libraries. Snow (1996) observed that evaluation of collection, which is one of the cornerstones of a collection development policy (CDP) is difficult, expensive and continuous. The policy usually proves to be inflexible and it is unresponsive to change.

With the emergence of Information and Communication Technology, (ICT) the conventional collection development policies are perceived as having become inadequate in resolving the issues that typically revolve around electronic resources, (Gregory and Hanson, 2009). Following this development, many libraries resorted to the development of a separate collection development policy. This can work well only where the library is to obtain a limited amount of electronic resources. If not an integrated policy becomes more apparent. IFLA (2001) suggested that selection decision concerning electronic information resources should also be made within an explicit collection development policy. This might be a separate policy or an integrated one. Electronic resource collection development policy should include the following items; general statement, the scope of the policy, e-resources to be collected, selection criteria for fee-based ER, selection responsibilities, acquisition process, a procedure for evaluation and licensing.

Research method

This study was carried out using a descriptive survey method. The study covered government owned university libraries in Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo States. They are the University of Nigeria Nsukka, Federal University of Technology Owerri, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Umuahia, Enugu State University of technology, Abia State University, Uturu, Imo State University Owerri, Anambra State University (Chukwuemeka Odimegwu Ojukwu University) and Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki. The study was conducted in four federal government and five state government-owned university libraries.

The research instruments adopted for the study were questionnaire and interview. The instruments were structured to assess relevant information about collection development policy of electronic resources of University Libraries in South East Nigeria. It was validated by three experts and the reliability of the instruments was tested using twenty librarians from a university library that is outside the region of study. The population of the study is 86 librarians of collection development, serials and digital departments of the nine government-owned university libraries out of ten. The questionnaire items were distributed personally by the researchers by visiting the units of the university libraries used for this study to find out the electronic resources policy of the libraries. They were collected by the researchers to ensure maximum return and correctness. Data collected were tabulated and analyzed using simple statistics (mean).

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: What are the types of policies guiding electronic resources collection development in university libraries in South East Nigeria?

The data providing the answer to the above research question are presented in table 1 below.

Table 1: Responses on types of policies guiding electronic resources collection development in the university libraries under study (n=86)

Name of university		Traditional policy		Separate e-resources collection development policy		Integrated policy	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
MOUA	A	6	100.0%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%
	NA	0	.0%	2	33.3%	5	83.3%
NAU	A	7	87.5%	2	25.0%	3	37.5%
	NA	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	5	62.5%
FUTO	A	16	69.6%	9	39.1%	11	47.8%
	NA	7	30.4%	14	60.9%	12	52.2%
UNN	A	14	87.5%	7	43.8%	11	68.8%
	NA	2	12.5%	9	56.3%	5	31.3%
ABSU	A	6	75.0%	5	62.5%	5	62.5%
	NA	2	25.0%	3	37.5%	3	37.5%
ASU	A	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%
	NA	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%
EBSU	A	8	100.0%	3	37.5%	3	37.5%
	NA	0	.0%	5	62.5%	5	62.5%
ESUT	A	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	6	75.0%
	NA	3	37.5%	5	62.5%	2	25.0%
IMSU	A	2	66.7%	0	.0%	2	66.7%
	NA	1	33.3%	3	100.0%	1	33.3%
Total	A	69	80.2%	34	39.5%	47	54.7%
	NA	17	19.8%	52	60.5%	39	45.3%

Key: A-Available, NA-Not Available

Table 1 shows the percentage distribution of the respondents based on types of policies guiding electronic resources collection development practices in University libraries in South East Nigeria. The table shows that traditional policy was mostly used by the libraries with 69 respondents representing (80.2%) indicated the availability of traditional policy, while 17(19.8%) indicated non-availability of traditional policy. 34 respondents representing (39.5%) indicated the availability of separate policy and 52 respondents representing (60.5%) indicated non-availability of a separate policy. Also, 47 respondents representing (54.7%) accepted having an integrated policy and 39 respondents representing (45.3%) indicated not having integrated policy. It can be deduced that traditional policy was mostly observed in university libraries in South East Nigeria.

The interview responses from the nine studied university libraries also revealed that the university libraries adopted traditional policies for both prints and electronic. The libraries under study do not really have a separate policy for electronic resources. They further revealed that this policy is unwritten.

Research Question 2: What are the tools used in making electronic resources selection in University Libraries in South East Nigeria?

The data providing an answer to the above research question are presented in table 2 below.

Table 2: Responses on tools used to make sound electronic resources selection in university libraries under study

		Name of institution									Overall	R
		MOUA	NAU	FUTO	UNN	ABSU	ASU	EBSU	ESUT	IMSU	\bar{x}	
		\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	N=86	
		N=6	N=8	N=23	N=16	N=8	N=6	N=8	N=8	N=3		
1	The use of trial offers by mounting a link to their resources without cost	3.17	3.00	3.26	2.75	3.25	3.33	3.13	3.25	3.00	3.12	1 ST
-	Visits to similar libraries that already have the product and see it in action there.	3.67	3.13	3.13	3.00	3.25	3.00	2.63	3.25	3.33	3.12	2 nd
2	The use of vendor exhibits at conferences.	3.67	3.13	2.87	2.69	3.75	2.50	3.38	3.38	4.00	3.10	3 rd
3	The use of demonstrations from publisher /vendor in the library and demonstrate their resource	2.83	2.50	3.00	3.25	3.25	2.83	2.88	2.88	2.67	2.97	4 th
4	The use of reviews provided through electronic resources	2.67	2.00	2.61	2.25	2.88	2.83	2.75	2.88	2.67	2.57	5 th
5												
Grand Mean		3.20	2.75	2.97	2.78	3.27	2.89	2.95	3.12	3.13	2.97	

Keys: SA-Strongly Agree A- Agree D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

The data presented in table 2 reveals the mean ratings of the responses of the respondents on the five (5) identified items on tools used to make sound e-resources selection in university library had mean values ranging from 2.57 to 3.12 which are all above the cut-off point of 2.50 on a 4 point rating scale. The above findings indicated that the respondents agreed that all the five (5) items in the table are used as tools used to make sound e-resources selection in university libraries in South East Nigeria.

Also, the overall mean showed that the use of trial offers by mounting a link to their resources without cost (mean = 3.12) is ranked highest, while the use of reviews provided through electronic resources (mean =2 .57) is ranked lowest as tools used in sound electronic resources selection in libraries.

The interview responses from the nine university libraries studied also stated that for a sound selection of electronic resources, the service providers are requested to allow the libraries to use the resources without cost. This will enable the libraries see how the electronic resource works and the general contents of the resource to ensure that the information needs of the users (curriculum needs) can be met if eventually, the libraries subscribe to it.

Research Question 3: What are the criteria considered in evaluating electronic resources in university libraries in South East Nigeria?

The data providing answers to the above research question are presented in table 3

Table 3: Responses on what informs decision when evaluating electronic resource for renewal/ cancellation

		Name of institution									Overall
		MOUA	NAU	FUTO	UNN	ABSU	ASU	EBSU	ESUT	IMSU	\bar{x}
		\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	N=86
		N=6	N=8	N=23	N=16	N=8	N=6	N=8	N=8	N=3	
1	Cost effectiveness based on the number of searches per year/	3.50	2.88	3.13	3.19	3.63	2.50	3.13	2.63	2.67	3.08
2	Relevance of the research on campus and the curriculum of the library users	3.00	3.13	3.22	2.88	3.38	3.17	2.63	2.75	3.33	3.05
3	Dissatisfaction with a resource	3.33	3.13	3.00	2.75	3.13	2.33	2.75	3.13	3.33	2.95
4	Access criteria based on the technical reliability of the content provider	3.00	2.38	3.13	3.00	2.75	2.33	3.00	2.63	3.33	2.88
5	The databases can be ranked by acquiring statistics	3.67	3.00	2.61	2.94	2.75	2.33	2.63	2.25	3.33	2.77
6	Comparing duplication in various formats or overlap in full-text resources	2.33	2.75	2.70	2.44	2.75	3.17	2.50	2.00	3.00	2.59
Grand mean		3.14	2.88	2.97	2.87	3.07	2.64	2.77	2.57	3.17	2.89

Keys: SA-Strongly Agree A- Agree D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

The data presented in table 3 reveals that the mean ratings of the responses of the respondents on the six (6) identified items on what informs decision when evaluating e-resource for renewal/

cancellation had mean values ranging from 2.59 to 3.08 which are all above the cut-off point of 2.50 on a 4-point rating scale. The above findings indicated that the respondents agreed that all the six (6) identified items in the table are what informs decision when evaluating an electronic resource for renewal/ cancellation.

Also, the overall mean showed that cost-effectiveness based on the number of searches per year (mean = 3.10) is ranked highest while comparing duplication in various formats or overlap in full-text resources (mean = 2.59) is ranked lowest.

The interview responses from the nine university libraries studied also revealed that ease of access, the relevance of research on the curriculum of the users are considered when evaluating resources for cancellation and or renewal of subscription of electronic resources. Also, the copyright agreements are considered to ensure that they are in agreement with the library's interest. The renewal processes are also looked into to avoid cumbersome processes that may affect the renewal of the subscription. Other considerations are the frequency of publication and price adjustments.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study showed that the university libraries in South East Nigeria under study observed traditional policy. The interview responses from the nine studied university libraries also revealed that the university libraries adopted traditional policies for both prints and electronics. They do not really have a separate policy for electronic resources. They further stressed that this policy is unwritten. The findings revealed that the libraries under study operate traditional policies that are unwritten. This is in agreement with the study carried out by Igiamoh and Duro (2012) that a great number of libraries have an unwritten policy. The interview

responses with the collection development and digital librarians revealed that the university libraries under study have in existence traditional policies that are unwritten.

The study also revealed that the libraries made use of all the (5) items as tools used to make sound electronic resources selection. These items are, the use of trial offers by mounting a link to their resources without cost, visits to similar libraries that already have the product and see it in action there, the use of vendor exhibits at conferences, the use of demonstration from publishers, and the use of reviews provided through electronic resources. In considering the tools that guide the libraries in making sound electronic resources decision, it was obvious that the respondents rated the use of trial offers by mounting a link to their resources without cost highest among other tools, thus the finding of this study corroborated with the study by Yu and Breivold (2008) that enumerated means of evaluating resources for selection to include trail offers, demonstrations, and visits to other libraries.

The study also showed that the libraries under study are informed by all the six (6) items when evaluating electronic resources. These items are, access criteria based on the technical reliability of the content provider, cost-effectiveness based on the number of searches per year, dissatisfaction with a resource, the databases can be ranked by acquiring statistics of usage, relevance of the research on campus and the curriculum of the library users and comparing duplication in various formats or overlap in full-text resources. This finding supported the works of Yu and Breivold (2008) that listed the criteria the selectors should consider when evaluating e-resources for renewal and continuity to include the following, ranking based on quality and usage, access, cost-effectiveness, breadth, audience, and uniqueness of the resources. This finding supported another scholarly work on collection development by Ifidon (1999) which asserted that compiling statistics is one of the commonest methods by which collections are

assessed; that one way in which almost all libraries routinely engage themselves in collection evaluation is the compilation of statistics. The finding of this study is in corroboration with the study by Idiegbeyan-ose and Osazuwa (2014) that revealed some criteria for evaluating e-resources to include authority, cost relevance, coverage, and currency.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researchers concluded that, due to the dynamic nature of electronic resources, it becomes important for libraries to ensure that adequate measures are put in place in the management of electronic resources for effective service delivery in university libraries. The issue of lack of electronic resources policy can be traced to lack of knowledge on the part of the librarians on the need for a policy for an electronic resources.

Based on the findings, this study thus recommends as follow;

- There is the need for libraries to formulate and develop electronic resources collection development policy.
- For effective and balance collection development of electronic resources in university libraries in South East Nigeria, efforts should be made by libraries to adopt a written electronic resources collection development policy which serves as a guide and for references and continuity among the librarians that are involved in e-resources collection development.
- Electronic resources should be evaluated on a regular basis by considering relevant factors to disclose those electronic resources that are of high and maximum utilization. This will encourage cancellation or continuity of existing electronic resources collection development practices.

References

- Anunobi, C. V. & Okoye, I. B. (2008). The role of academic libraries in universal access to print and electronic resources in the developing countries. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, (e-journal) paper 189. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/189>. On October 15, 2012
- Barik, N & Sethy, N. (2009). New trends of collection development by libraries in IT era: A paper presented at the National Convention of ManLIBNET organized by KIIT University, 22nd -24 January.
- Bavakenthy, M., Veeran, M.C.K.& Salih, T.K.M. (2003). *Information Access Management and Exchange in the Technological Age*. New Delhi: Ess Publication.
- Bostic, M. J. (1988). A written collection development policy: to have and not. *Collection Management*, 10(½), 89-99.
- Cabonero, D.A & Mayrena, L.B. (2012). The development of a collection development policy, *Library Philosophy and Practice(e-journal)*. Paper 804.<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/804>.
- California State University. (2005). Principles for CSU acquisition of electronic information resources. Retrieved from. <http://seir.calstate.edu/./principles.doc>.
- Campbell, J. D. (2006). Changing a cultural icon: The academic library as a virtual destination. *Educause Review*, 41(1), 16–31.
- Edem, N, Ani, O & Ocheibi, J.A. (2009). Students' perceived effectiveness in the use of library resources in Nigerian universities. *Educational Research and Review*, 4(6), 322-326. Retrieved from. <http://www.academicjournals.org/ERR>
- Edoka, B.N. (2000). *Introduction to library science*. Onitsha: Palma Publishing.
- Ekwelem, V.O., Okafor, V.N. & Ukwoma, S.C. (2009). Students' use of electronic information sources at the University of Nigeria Nsukka. *African Journal of Library, Archival and Information Science*, 19(2), 89-97. Available at: <http://findarticle.com/p/>
- Elaturoti, E (1995). *Developing library collection media center*. Ibadan: Onibonoge Press.
- Elhafiz, A. I. (2004). Use and User Perception of Electronic Resources in the United Arab Emirates University (UAEU). *Libri*, (54), 18-39.
- Fabunmi. B. (2004). *Planning university libraries for effective customer services in Nigeria*. In Madu, E.C (Ed). *Technology for information management and services: Modern libraries and information centers on delivery countries*. Ibadan: Evi Coleman, pp. 147-155

- Gardner, R.K. (1981). *Library collections: Their origins, selection and development*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Gessesse, K. (2000). Collection development and management in the twenty-first century with special reference to academic libraries: an overview. *Library management*, 21 (7), 365-372
- Golwal, M.D. & Motewar, N. (2012). Library collection development with special reference to digital era. Retrieved from. <http://eijl.weebly.com/uploads/1/8/0/10800505/5.pdf>.
- Graham, S.R. (2003). Historians and electronic resources: A citation analysis, *JAH*. 3(3), 18-24.
- Gregory, V.L. & Hanson, A. (2006). *Selecting and managing electronic resources: A how-to-do-it manual for librarians* (rev.ed.). New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.
- Idiegbeyan-ose, J. & Osazuwa, E. (2014). Evaluation of e-resource in academic libraries. *Jewel Journal of librarianship*, 6(1), 71-77
- Igiamoh, V. E. & Duro, M. (2012). Electronic resources collection development practices in libraries in Nigeria. *Nigerbiblios*, 23(1&2), 84-93.
- Igun, S.E. (2013). Problems encountered by librarians in the utilization of ICTs in Nigerian university libraries. *Nigerian Libraries*, 46 (2), 87-101.
- IFLA. (2012). Key issues for e-resources collection development: a guide for libraries. Retrieved from [http://www.ifla.org/files/acquisition-collection-development/publications/key%20Issues%20for%](http://www.ifla.org/files/acquisition-collection-development/publications/key%20Issues%20for%20)
- Johnson, P. (2009). *Fundamentals of collection development and management*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Ka, W.F. (2005). The role of university libraries in supporting research in Hong Kong: Facing a new challenge. *Campus-Wide Information System*, 22(1), 43-50.
- Kumar, K, Hassain, A & Singh, N. (2008). A survey of collection development practices in Technical Institutes in Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved from. <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/kumar-hassain-singh.html>.
- Kumbar, B. D. & Hadagali, S. A. (2005). Collection development in the electronic environment: challenges before library professionals. AHMEDABAD: 3rd convention PLANNER-2005 Assam Univ. Silchar 10-11Nov., 72-82 Retrieved from <http://ir.inflibnet.ac.in/dxml/bitream/handle/1944/1358/9.pdf?sequence=1????>
- Mansur, S (2012). E-resources collection development in engineering college libraries: a challenge for knowledge center managers. *International Journal of Digital Library*

- Services*, 2(1), 166-177 Retrieved from. http://www.academiaa.ed/11968640/_E-resources_Management_at_the_Engineering_college_library
- Mosher, P.H.(1981). Fighting back: from growth to management in library collection development unpublished paper delivered at the Pilot collection management and development Institute at Stanford University, July 6-10, p4
- Pastine, M. (1996). *Collection development: Past and future*. New York: The Haworth Press
- Reitz, J. M. (2004). *Dictionary for library and information science*. London: Libraries Unlimited.
- Sambo, A.S, Abu-udenyi, H. & Enite, A.U. (2014). Collection development policy of e-resources in Nigeria libraries: Certified Librarians perspective. *Information and Knowledge Management*. 4(9), 25-34. Retrieved from. <http://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/IKM/article/download/15648/16028>
- Shukla, P. & Mishra, R. (2011). Collection development policy in the electronic era. *Asia Pacific Journal of Library and Information Science*, 1 (1), 69-76
- Tsakonas, G. & Papatheodorou, C. (2006). Analyzing and evaluating usefulness and usability in electronic services, *Journal of Information Service*, 32 (5), 400-419. Retrieved from <http://www.jis.sagepub.com/content/32/.../400>. Abstract&sa=
- Vohra, R. (2003). Collection development and management in university libraries in the current electronic information environment. *IASLIC Bulletin*, 48 (4), 224-230.
- Zijl, C.V. (1998). The why, what, and how of collection development policies. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, 66(3), 99-106. Retrieved from. <http://www.sajlis.journals.ac.za/pub/article/view/1438/1336>