January 2019

Collection Development Policy and User Satisfaction in University Libraries in Rivers State, Nigeria

Emmanuel Okwu
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education Rumuolumeni, Port-Harcourt, adikwuservices@yahoo.com

Mercy Echem
Rivers State University Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria, echemmercy@gmail.com

Collection Development Policy and User Satisfaction in University Libraries in Rivers State, Nigeria

Emmanuel Okwu (CLN)
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education
Rumuolumeni, Port-Harcourt. P.M.B 5047
Rivers State, Nigeria. adikwuservices@yahoo.com
+2348035478756

And

Mercy E. Echem (CLN)
Rivers State University
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
echemmercy@gmail.com +2348035771925

Abstract

The main purpose of the study was to examine the influence of Collection Development Policy and User Satisfaction in University Libraries in Rivers State, Nigeria. Three research questions and three research hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The study adopted a descriptive research design using questionnaire as major instrument for eliciting data. The questionnaire titled (CDPIUSUL) was used for this purpose. A total number of 65 staff constituted the population. The population was purposively adopted because of the smaller size, comprising of 33 for Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and 32 for Rivers State University (RSU) respectively. All copies of questionnaire, distributed were completed and returned. Mean and standard deviation was used to answer research questions while independent t-test was used to test the null hypotheses. The study revealed that there is a significant influence of collection development policies on users' satisfaction based on knowledge of collection development policy, availability of current resources and evaluation of collection development policy. Based on the findings, it was recommended that librarians should always make use of the CDP to guide in the selection of relevant materials to ensure users' satisfaction. University authorities should ensure that there is regular evaluation of collections development policies to guide weeding in the libraries and Government should partner with the University management to always donate and acquire current information resources to the libraries in order to enhance users' satisfaction.

Key words: Collection Development, Collection Development Policy, User Satisfaction

Introduction

One of the fundamental functions of any library is to ensure the quality of its collection development. Satisfying users' needs in the academic libraries has been the primary objective of libraries and librarians (Ijiekhuamhen, Aghojare & Omosekejimi, 2015). In order to achieve this, there are standard policies to guide the effective selection of library collection to enhance quality service delivery to users. The American Library Association (ALA) in Adomi 2006 describes collection development policy as the document which defines the scope of a library's existing collections, plans for the continuing development of the resources, identifies collection strengths, and outlines the relationship between selection philosophy and the institution`s goals, general selection criteria, and intellectual freedom.

Collection Development Policy (CDP) aims at consolidating library acquisition practices to result into users' interest to use the library. The library as a service rendering organization is established with various sections or units to ensure the attainment of library objective of getting knowledge to solve information needs. The acquisition section of the library takes charge of purchasing the relevant information resources in the library. It is important that this section in libraries adhere to the policies because it is the blueprint to guide against poor library collections which may result in user's dissatisfaction. Johnson (1994) in Adomi (2006) further stated that "libraries without collection development policies are like business without plan". Ikem (1995), Sambo, Abu-udenyi, Enite and Musa (2014) opines that collection development policy is the vehicle through which the library achieves the goals of its readers' services. Unfortunately, many libraries do not follow this policy in building their collections, perhaps, due to lack of standard and uniformity in the application of this policy among the staff concerned which seems to be the issue. This in turn affects the satisfaction of the information need of the user. The unit is thus, governed by CDP

formulated and implemented by experts in the field of librarianship. The implementation of the library CDP for the realization of users' satisfaction cannot be overemphasized.

Implementation of Collection Development Policy (CDP) is therefore the wheel of progress required for successful execution of library services as well as providing reading materials to enhance educational objectives of the library. Collection development Policy implementation can strategically be used to attain desired results. This according to Okereke (2003) and Uhegbu (2007) can lead to improved system of doing things and consequently enhancing satisfaction particularly in libraries. Applegate in Sivathaasan (2013) defines user satisfaction as "a personal, emotional reaction to a library service or product".

Morris (2004) hints that as a result of policy implementation, libraries improve the intellectual content of school's academic programmes. In the same vein, CDP improves the library's stock of information resources. Libraries as agent of information dissemination must thus be subjected to sound CDP formulation and effective implementation to enhance users' satisfaction with its use. Udofia (1997) notes that library helps in encouraging the development of skills in reading, prompting readers to literary appreciation, providing a source of subject information and intellectual development as stimulating factor in education. This the library does by adopting a develop collection policy to be fully implemented.

The CDP statement of a library as a matter of importance is very strong against lack of standards. There must be a set standard for libraries and their services. These standards must include building, staffing, collections, funding, services and also how to manage them. The necessary professional, technical and other auxiliary staff should be planned for and employed to take care of media and other audio visual equipment to be in the library. CDP ensures equitable access to resources for library users.

American Library Association (1996) gave a comprehensive definition of collection development as a "A term which encompasses a number of activities related to the

development of the library collection, including the determination and coordination of selection policy, assessment of potential user needs and, collection use studies, collection evaluation, identification of collection needs, selection of materials, planning for resource sharing, collection maintenance and weeding". Collection Development is a term used to describe the process of acquiring and adding new information resources to library holdings. This process includes selection, ordering, receiving donations of books as well as direct purchases of needed information resources. Ifidon (2006) posits that library collection is not only a set of books, media and online resources but a reflection of the ever-changing instructional programmes offered in the institutions establishing them and also considering the interest of the library users.

Collections in the library language are the description of types of materials that a library should stock. These materials constitute the print and non-print information resources that are carefully planned for in the collection development policy of the library. These collections are required to fulfil the objectives of acquiring and disseminating information to enhance knowledge. The categorization of knowledge to be taken care of in the library collection development policy are reference, quick service, special, research, light reading and archival document collections. CDP of a library is a careful and well thought-out process of developing a document that sets out the guidelines for systematically building up a library's information resources stock. According to Van Zijl (1998), a CDP is "a statement of general collection building principles which delineates the purpose and content of a collection in term of relevance to both external and internal users".

Ranganathan's five laws have profound implication for collection development policies cited in Aina (2004) allows library personnels to develop proper collection based and provide value added services to users; to provide guidelines for acquisition, withdrawal, resource allocation and long range planning of collection supporting to mission, activities, of

organizations and users interest etc.; that every library, no matter how small, should have a CDP which is really an expanded version of the mission or purpose of the library. The policy can be useful in several ways; Policy provides a point of reference for staff to consult when deciding on whether to acquire, discard, or reject an item. An established policy guideline helps in decision making about the collection. Finally, the policy serves as a source of reinforcement when an item is challenged by a patron. Fourie (2001) also highlighted the purpose for the application of CDP in university libraries as; an internal library document to provide guidance to staff in the selection of resources, to assist with focus on user needs and to aid in the orientation of new staff; a public document to provide information on existing collection strengths and future collecting activity to inform academics and students, the wider academic community, funding bodies and other libraries in the area.

Brophy (2007) agrees that use of public library depends on the services provided or made available in the library. If the services are not adequate for the needs of public library users, it is not likely that the library will be heavily used. Creating access points to library resources by the library encourages the users to visit and use the library more often (Ikenwe & Adegbilero-Iwari, 2014). Igben (1993) argued that for a library to be functional, the services it provides should correspond as closely as possible with the needs of its users. Abagai (2008) opined that, the use of library by users and indeed their satisfaction with library services depends on availability of suitable learning materials, accommodation and competent staff in the library. Ikenwe and Adegbilero-Iwari (2014) further stated that the main objective of any library is to support the community, an objective which is achieved through systematic acquisition and organization of all forms of recorded and undocumented information in all fields pertinent to the goals of the public and making such information available for use.

Librarian's level of knowledge enhances performance. While performance may be used to define what an organization has accomplished with respect to the process, results, relevance and success. Afshan et al. (2012) define performance as the achievement of specific tasks measured against predetermined or identified standards of accuracy, completeness, cost and speed. Employee performance can be manifested in improvement in production, easiness in using the new technology and highly motivated workers.

Collection evaluation is done periodically to ascertain the collection's validity in relation to the library's objectives. According to Ifidon (2006), collection evaluation is done to determine the scope, depth and usefulness of the collection, test the effectiveness, the utility and practical applicability of the written collection development policy, assess the collection's adequacy and hence highlight its inadequacies and strategize to identify areas where weeding is required. Eze and Eze (2006), opine that collection evaluation is necessary to determine from time to time, how well the selection policy is working out. It shows whether the provisions of the policy in terms of the types of materials to be acquired are implemented or not.

In order to create space for the acquisition of more and relevant information resources, library CDP must be subjected to periodic evaluation. This evaluation gives an opportunity for the removal of out-dated, damaged information resources from the library. This process of removing non-relevant information resources from the shelves in the library is called library weeding, which is also subjected to a policy of the library contained in its CDP. The process of library weeding must continually be evaluated in line with the library CDP to ensure the availability of quality information resources in the library and reflect the changing needs of students and other users of the library. By this exercise, satisfaction with the library's information resources will be enhanced. Faruqi (1997) notes that library CDP is

a universal process in the library world, whereby the library staff brings together a variety of materials to meet patron's information needs.

Statement of the Problem

It is regrettable that most libraries in the Nigerian universities are yet to improve on their collections. The absence of a developed collection policy has hindered the acquisition of adequate and relevant information resources in most university libraries. Many of them are still operating without a standard CDP to guide them in their resources acquisition. And when this happens, the libraries find it difficult to perform effectively. It is true that when the libraries lack defined CDP, students and other users of libraries stand to suffer. Some Nigerian university libraries do not have collection development policies, mainly because librarians think that the primary objectives of the libraries are quite clear and that they could be guided by such objectives (Ifidon, 1990).

It is also obvious that there are several benefits derived from developing a sound CDP for the library. Most of our universities are in dire need of a sound CDP to guide library's resources acquisition. These needs create a very big gap to be filled by our eminent scholars. This study was conducted to determine the influence of CDP on users' satisfaction with the use of their libraries in Rivers State.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to examine the influence of CDP on users' satisfaction in universities library in Rivers State. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Examine the difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of knowledge of collection development policy on users' satisfaction in Rivers State.

2. Assess the difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of availability of current resources on users' satisfaction in Rivers State.
3. Determine the difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of the evaluation of CDP on users' satisfaction in Rivers State.

Research Questions

1. What is the difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of knowledge of CDP on users' satisfaction in Rivers State?
2. What is the difference in the response of library staff in in Rivers State University and Ignatus Ajuru University of Education on the influence of availability of current resources on users' satisfaction in Rivers State?
3. What is the difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State and Ignatius Ajuru Universities on the influence of the evaluation of CDP on users' satisfaction in Rivers State?

Research Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of knowledge of collection development policy on users' satisfaction in Rivers State.
2. There is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of availability of current resources on users' satisfaction in Rivers State.

3. There is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of the evaluation of CDP on users' satisfaction in Rivers State.

Methodology

This study was conducted in the two State-owned universities namely Ignatius Ajuru University of Education (IAUE) and Rivers State University (RSU), all in Rivers State, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive research design using questionnaire as major instrument for eliciting data. The questionnaire titled (CDPIUSUL) was used for this purpose. A total number of 65 staff constituted the population. Sixty-five (65) staff of the library in the two universities under study was purposively adopted as sample. Comprised of 33 and 32 for Rivers State University (RSU) and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education respectively. Mean and standard deviation was used to answer research questions while independent t-test was used to test the null hypotheses.

Results

Research Question 1

What is the difference in the response of library staff in Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and Rivers State University on the influence of knowledge of CDP on users' satisfaction in the universities' library?

Table 1: The Result of Mean and Standard Deviation on influence of knowledge of CDP **on users' satisfaction in Rivers State Universities N= 65**

Item on knowledge of Collection Development Policy	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
The guidance of CDP influence users satisfaction	1.94	.768	LI
Little knowledge of CDP influences users satisfaction	1.86	.634	LI
Inadequate knowledge of CDP influences users' satisfaction	3.43	.790	MI
Full knowledge of CDP influences users satisfaction	3.51	.504	MI
Arrangement of CDP influences users satisfaction	3.08	.957	MI
Cluster mean	**2.76**		

Note: LI= little influence, MI= Much influence

The result in Table 1 shows that all four items fall within much influence with mean ranging from 3.08 to 3.51. The cluster mean is 2.76 which indicate that knowledge of CDP has much influence on users' satisfaction. The standard deviation also indicates the range of .504 to .957; this means that the respondents were not divergent in their responses.

Research Question 2

What is the difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of availability of resources on users' satisfaction in the universities' library?

Table 2: The Result of Mean and Standard Deviation on influence of availability of resources on users' satisfaction in Rivers State Universities library N= 65

Items on availability of resources	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
Selection criteria of CDP influences users satisfaction	3.18	.827	MI
Free material of CDP influences users' satisfaction	3.25	.811	MI
Selection procedures of CDP influences users satisfaction	3.32	.562	MI
Weeding influences users' satisfaction	1.43	.918	LI
Donated Resources influences users satisfaction	3.43	.684	MI
Cluster mean	**2.92**		

Note: LI= little influence, MI= Much influence

The result in Table 2 reveals that all four items fall within much influence with mean ranging from 3.32 to 3.43. The cluster mean is 2.92 implying that knowledge of collection development policy has much influence on users' satisfaction. The standard deviation also indicates the range of .562 to .918; this means that the respondents were not divergent in their responses.

Research Question 3

Table 3: The Result of Mean and Standard Deviation on influence of evaluation of CDP on users' satisfaction in Rivers State Universities libraries N= 65

Items on availability of resources	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
Standard policies influences users satisfaction	3.53	.533	MI
Sound CDP influences users satisfaction	3.15	.775	MI
Weak CDP influences users satisfaction	1.38	.490	LI
Quality of resources influences users satisfaction	3.18	.610	MI

Accessibility of resources influences users satisfaction	3.22	.625	MI
Cluster mean	**2.89**		

Note: LI= little influence, MI= Much influence

The result in Table 3 reveals that all four items fall within much influence with mean ranging from 1.38 to 3.53. The cluster mean is 2.89 implying that knowledge of CDP has much influence on users' satisfaction. The standard deviation also indicates the range of .533 to .775; this means that the respondents were not divergent in their responses.

Research Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of education on the influence of knowledge of collection development policy on users' satisfaction in the universities' library.

Table 4: Result of Independent i-test on the response of library staff in Ignatius Ajuru Universities of Education in Rivers State and on the influence of knowledge of collection Development policy on users' satisfaction: N=65

S/N	Statement	t-cal	p- val.	t-crit	Dec.
1.	The guidance of CDP influences users satisfaction	.656	.515	2.01	NS
2.	Little knowledge of CDP influences users' satisfaction	1.832	.073	2.01	NS
3.	Inadequate knowledge of CDP influences users' satisfaction.	3.110	.003	2.01	Sig
4.	Full knowledge CDP influences users' satisfaction.	3.007	.004	2.01	Sig
5.	Arrangement of CDP influences users satisfaction	2.237	.031	2.01	Sig

*Significant; p< .05, t. crit. 2.01 df. 63

The result indicates that the p- values are less than .05 ($p < .05$) with exception of items 1 and 2. This implies that the result is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that, there is a significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State and Ignatius Ajuru Universities library on the influence of

knowledge of collection development policy on users' satisfaction in the universities' library is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is upheld.

Research Hypotheses 2

There is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of education on the influence of availability of information resources on users' satisfaction in Rivers State.

Table 5: Result of Independent i-test on the response of library staff in Rivers State and Ignatius Ajuru Universities of Education on the influence of availability of current resources on users' satisfaction: N=65

S/N	Statement	t-cal	p- value	t-crit	Dec.
1.	Selection criteria of CDP influences satisfaction	4.500	.000	2.01	Sig
2.	Free material of CDP influences user satisfaction	8.218	.000	2.01	Sig
3.	Selection procedures of CDP influences users satisfaction	3.513	.001	2.01	Sig
4.	Weeding influences users satisfaction	.210	.834	2.01	NS
5.	Donated Resources for CDP influences users satisfaction	2.566	.013	2.01	Sig

*Significant; p< .05, t. crit. 2.01, df. 63

The result shows that the p. values are less than .05 ($p < .05$) exception of item 4. This implies that the result is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is a significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of availability of information resources on users' satisfaction in the universities' library is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is upheld.

Research Hypotheses 3

There is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of the evaluation of collection development policy on users' satisfaction in the libraries.

Table 6: Result of Independent i-test on the response of library staff in Rivers State and Ignatius Ajuru Universities of Education on the influence of evaluation of collection development policy on users' satisfaction: N=65

S/N	Statement	t-cal	p- val	t-crit	Dec.
1.	Standard policies influences users satisfaction	2.289	.026	2.01	Sig
2.	Sound CDP influences users satisfaction	6.524	.000	2.01	Sig
3.	Weak CDP influences users satisfaction	.659	.512	2.01	NS
4.	Quality of resources influences users satisfaction	6.829	.000	2.01	Sig
5.	Accessibility of resources influences users' satisfaction	2.877	.006	2.01	Sig

*Significant; p< .05, t. crit. 2.01, df. 63

The result shows that the p. values are less than .05 ($p < .05$) exception of item 3. This implies that the result is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education on the influence of the evaluation of collection development policy on users' satisfaction in the universities' library is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is upheld.

Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis one reveals that there is a significant difference in the response of library staff in Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and Rivers State University on the influence of knowledge of CDP on users' satisfaction in Rivers State Universities.

This finding implies that knowledge of collection development policy can influence users' satisfaction. This is because when the staff knows what CDP means, the implementation will be possible and, users will be satisfied. Librarians level of knowledge of CDP enhances performance. Performance is defined as the outcome or contribution of employees to make them attain goals (Afshan et al. ,2012).

Hypothesis two also reveals that there is no significant difference in the response of library staff in Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and Rivers State University on the influence of availability of information resources based on CDP on users' satisfaction in Rivers State. This is because the availability of information resources based on CDP gives users satisfaction. This finding is supported by the finding of Faruqi (1997) who asserts that library collection development policy ensures the availability of quality information resources in the library and reflects the changing needs of users of the library. By this exercise, satisfaction with the library's information resources is enhanced.

Hypothesis three further reveals that there is a significant difference in the response of library staff in Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and Rivers State University. This implies that evaluation is periodically done to check the strength and weakness of library collections. This finding is supported by the finding of Ifidon (2006), who opines that collection evaluation is done to determine the scope, depth and usefulness of the collection, test the effectiveness, the utility and practical applicability of the written collection development policy, assess the collection's adequacy and hence highlight its inadequacies and strategize to identify areas where weeding is required.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, collection development policies can enhance user's satisfaction, through adequate knowledge of CDP, evaluation of CDP and availability of information resources. It was concluded that there is a significant difference in the response of library staff in Ignatius Ajuru University of Education and Rivers State University on the influence of collection development policy on users' satisfaction in the State universities studied.

Recommendation

1. It was recommended that librarians should always make use of the CDP to guide in the selection of relevant information resources to ensure users satisfaction.
2. The Universities' authority should ensure that there is regular evaluation of collections development policies to guide weeding in the libraries
3. Government should partner with the Universities' management to always donate and acquire current information resources to the libraries in order to enhance users' satisfaction.

References

Abagai, T. (2008). The use of library in a non-residential college. A case Study of Kaduna State College of Education. *Forum Academic Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(1), 104-111.

Adomi, E. E. (2006). Collection Development and Management in context. Warri: Gordick Publisher.

Afshan, S., Sobia, I., Kamran, A. & Nasir, M. (2012). Impact of training on employee performance: a study of telecommunication sector in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(6), 646-661.

Aina, L.O. (2004). *Library and Information science text for Africa*. Ibadan: Third World Information Services Ltd.

American Library Association. (1996). Guidelines for collection development. *Guide for library and information science,* 2(2), 96-101.

Brophy, P. (2007). *The Library in the Twenty-first Century*. London: Facet Publishing.

Eze I.O. & Eze, J.U. (2006). Collection Development in Academic Libraries. In: F.C. Ekere (Editor). *Administration of Academic Libraries: A Book of Readings*. Nsukka: UCO-Academic Publishers Nigeria Limited.29-41.

Faruqi, K. K. (1997). *Development of collection in the libraries*. New Delhi: Anmol Publication.

Fourie, J. A. (2001). *Collection management and development: only study guide for AIS305-P*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Ifidon, S.E. (2006). *Modern Theory and Practice of Collection Development*. Ekpoma: Department of Library and Information Science, Ambrose Alli University.

Ifidon, S.E. (1990). *Collection development in African university libraries: challenges and frustrations*. Bloomington: African Studies Program, Indiana University.

Igben, M.J. (1993). Students' use of selected services in Polytechnic Ibadan Library. *Nigerian Library and Information Science Review,* 11(1&2), 11-17.

Ijiekhuamhen, O.P., Aghojare, B. & Omosekejimi, A.F. (2015). Assess users' satisfaction on academic library performance: a study. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection,* 3(5), 67-77.

Ikem, J. E. (1995). Managing Readers' Services in a period of Financial Scarcity. *Nigerian Library and Information Science Review,* 12(13), 46-69.

Ikenwe, I.J. & Adegbilero-Iwari, I. (2014). Utilization and user satisfaction of public library services in South-West, Nigeria in the 21st Century: a survey. *International Journal of Library Science*, 3(1), 1-6.

Morris, B. (2004). *Administering the school library media centre.4th edition.* Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Okereke, O.O. (2003). *Public policy analysis and decision-making*. Abakaliki: Willy Rose and Appleseed Publishing Company.

Sambo, A.S., Abu-udenyi, H., Enite, A. U. & Musa D.Y. (2014). Collection Development Policy of E-Resources in Nigeria Libraries: Certified Librarians Perception. *Information and Knowledge Management,* 4(9), 25-39.

Sivathaasan, N. (2013). Impact of library collection on user satisfaction: a case study. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(13), 141-146.

Udofia, E.P. (1997). Functional school library: a pre-requisite to effective child education. *Colin Journal of Librarianship*, 1(1), 52-65.

Uhegbu, A.N. (2007). *The information user: Issues and themes. (2nd Ed.)* Okigwe: Whytem Prints.

Van Zijl, C. (1998). The why, what, and how of collection development policies. *S.Afr.J Libr. lnf. Sci.*, 66(3), 99-106.

Zeithaml, V.A. & Binter, M.J. (1996). Service Marketing. New York: The McGraw- Hill Companies.