



# Evaluation of Collection Development and Management in Selected University Libraries in Ogun State, Nigeria

**Esther Abosede Awojobi**

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Yewa Campus, Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria

**Kikelomo Olubunmi Uthman**

Tai Solarin University of Education Library Ijebu-Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria

Received: 13th June, 2022 - Revised: 14th October, 2022 - Accepted: 27th October, 2022

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gli.v27i2.12>

## Abstract

*Collections of five university libraries in Ogun State, Nigeria were evaluated using SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis. Results showed that the libraries have strengths in having a collection development policy, users' involvement in collection development, balanced, relevant and high-quality collections and up-to-date online databases. Lack of weeding policy and non-participation in the consortium are weaknesses in three libraries, opportunities include the use of other library resources, technology, open access resources, and acquisition through the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (Tetfund) in the government-owned institutions while the high cost of online subscriptions, other information services providers, inadequate funding of collection development in four libraries, reliance on Tetfund, gifts and exchange by public universities constitute threats. Findings further revealed no significant difference between collection development of public and private university libraries ( $t(74) = 0.20, p > 0.05$ ). The study recommends the development of a weeding policy that must be adhered to as well as collaboration amongst libraries.*

**Keywords:** Collection development and management, Collection development policy, Evaluation, SWOT analysis, University Library, Nigeria

## Introduction

One of the goals of university education is to produce knowledgeable citizens. This would be elusive without a functional library as teaching and research depend on them. The university library acquires, organizes, processes, stores and makes available information resources to meet users' needs. Libraries are the intellectual commons where users interact with their environments, physical and virtual to facilitate learning and enhance the creation of new knowledge (Association of College and Research Library, ACRL, 2011). University libraries provide access to traditional print collections (such as books and periodicals) as well as information in cyberspace. The collection of a library thus says a lot about the library in terms of quality and quantity. Evaluation of library collection is imperative to know the state of the stock at a particular time. It also reveals whether the collection is balanced amongst various programs offered by the university thus bringing to the fore how well the library is supporting the mandate of the university. Studies of (Agboola, 2000; Ahiauzu, 1989; Nwosu&Anyanwu,

2015; Okogwu & Ozioko, 2018; Aluko, Youdeoweri, Nnachi, Charles, Bakam, Bosun, Olugbemi, Babalola, Olorunsogo, Casmir & Dada, 2019) have however shown that university libraries are yet to recover from the economic downturn of the 1980s which resulted in shortfalls in library collections. SWOT analysis is imperative to identify appropriate strategies to eliminate these shortfalls.

SWOT analysis is an analytical technique that evaluates organizations (Fine, 2009). It has gained acceptability in establishments other than the library. According to Ayub, Razzaq, Aslam and Iftekhar (2013), the analysis helps in identifying the core competencies of an organization that is, taking advantage of potential strengths to explore opportunities and counteracting threats and diminish identified weaknesses. This study was guided by the Librarians' Registration Council of Nigeria (LRCN), the Association of University Librarians of Nigerian University (AULNU) and the National Universities Commission (NUC) Standards.

### **Statement of Problem**

As a vital subsystem of higher education, university libraries interact within an environment characterized by growing alternative information providers, technology, dwindling budgets, changes in higher education, users' behavior and demanding articulate value (Harris, 2018). The deplorable condition of the library collection is one of the areas that have been reported by researchers (Aluko et al; 2019; Zaid, 2008; Agboola, 2000). Ogbuiyi and Okpe (2014) reported that many academic libraries lack adequate and current materials to meet the requirements for users' programs. This perhaps is a major reason for the decline in library visits by users (Martell, 2008). Library collections and collection development management are one of the areas evaluated by accrediting bodies during accreditation exercises in Nigerian universities. Lack of adequate and current materials has, however, undermined libraries' performance during the exercise by which libraries are adjudged for quality. To address shortfalls in collection development, SWOT analysis is imperative to identify appropriate strategies to eliminate these shortfalls. Understanding the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to collection and collection development in the library will help in the development of appropriate strategies to tackle these problems, particularly in the face of dwindling resources. Nevertheless, extant literature shows that academic libraries rarely engage in SWOT analysis which could help them take advantage of external opportunities, avoid threats, improve on strengths and minimize their weaknesses in the area of collection development. This provides the impetus for the conduct of this research.

### **Objectives of study**

Objectives are to;

1. ascertain the SWOT of collection development in university libraries in Ogun State.
2. compare collection development and management in public and private university libraries in Ogun State.

### **Research Question**

1. What are the SWOTs of collection development and management of university libraries in Ogun State?

### **Hypothesis**

HO: There is no significant difference in the SWOT of collection development in the public and private university libraries in Ogun State.

### **Literature Review**

Libraries are formal organizations that encompass a group of people, resources, services, facilities and activities, all presumably directed toward common objectives. According to Okoro, Omeluzor & Bamidele (2014), standards of university libraries in Nigeria are used to adjudge the university as no university can rise above the status of its library because a university library is expedient to the success of an institution. It has also been established by Lance, Rodney & Hamilton-Pennell (2005) that powerful libraries make powerful learners. The quality and effectiveness of the academic programmes of a university are assessed partly by the quality of the library. Ajibero (2004) affirmed that if during the accreditation exercise the university library is rated below 70%, the programme being accredited irrespective of its rating will not be given full accreditation.

Agboola (2000) divided the history of collection development in Nigerian university libraries into two phases. Phase one falls between 1948 and 1979 when the Nigerian economy was buoyant and university libraries were able to purchase foreign books and journals. The second phase began in 1980 with a scarcity of resources for the acquisition of books and journals. This came about as a result of the economic downturn in the country. During the period, libraries found it difficult to import books and journals due to their exorbitant prices relative to the local income level. Ononogbo (1987) however asserted that the decline in library funding started in real terms in 1975. Ahiauzu (1989) study identified problems facing collection development including gross inadequacy of library resources to meet user's needs, inadequate funding, and reluctance on the part of users to take part in collection development exercises. The study suggested possible solutions to include book budget allocation based on past circulation figures, cooperative acquisition and strengthening gifts and exchange programmes among libraries as a viable survival measure.

Nwosu & Anyanwu (2015) x-rayed collection development activities in five academic libraries in Imo State, Nigeria. The findings of the study showed that the libraries did not have comprehensive collection development policies, there was no coordinating unit for collection development activities, minimal participation in collection development activities by the faculty. The study thus recommended the development of formalized collection development policies, all-encompassing collection development,

increased participation of users in the exercise as well as an increase in staff strength of academic libraries. The research of Okogwu&Ozioko (2018) on challenges of collection development of electronic resources in university libraries in South East Nigeria revealed cost as a major challenge to the acquisition of electronic resources. The study recommended an increase in the university libraries' budget on regular basis, regular training of staff on new skills for electronic collection development and involvement in a consortium for discount and maximization of resources.

Collection evaluation is usually neglected in academic libraries in many countries despite its importance. The doctoral study by Khan (2015) and the study by Ameen (2010) reported that some academic libraries are engaged in increasing the quantity of their collection rather than the quality. Most studies as reported (Khan & Bhatti, 2016) did not show any evidence of carrying out a formal evaluation of collections in academic libraries. Gregory (2011) however ascertained that collection evaluation is not synonymous with weeding. Academic libraries can evaluate specific subject collection for research, accreditation and recognition purposes.

## Methodology

Survey research design was used for this study. The population of the study were university libraries in Ogun State, Nigeria. Selected university libraries are; the Federal University of Agriculture, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Tai Solarin University of Education, Babcock university and Covenant University libraries. All the librarians (85) in the selected libraries were respondents. A mix of interview schedules, questionnaires and observation checklists was used as instruments for data collection. The University Librarians (Library Chief Executive) were interviewed one-on-one; a Questionnaire was used to elucidate information from other librarians while the researcher made use of an observation checklist. A total enumeration of Librarians of the selected libraries was carried out. The result from the interview session was transcribed and expressed in percentage where applicable. Where respondents were asked to identify the SWOT of some items, frequency and percentage values of respondents' agreement for the statements were recorded as such. Questionnaire respondents ticked their level of agreement on statements made on 4 rating levels Likert scale; (1). Strongly Agreed = SA, (2). Agreed = A, (3). Disagreed = D, (4). Strongly Disagree = SD. Data obtained from

the sets of questionnaires were subjected to descriptive statistics namely; frequency counts, mean, standard deviation and percentages to analyse response to the research questions. Agreement to statement in each section was scored; Strongly Agreed = 4, Agreed = 3, Disagreed = 2, Strongly Disagreed = 1. Mean values of respondents' agreement to statements made in each section on 4 rating Mean value of 4 represents major strengths and major opportunities, 3 represents minor strengths and minor opportunities. Mean value of 2 represents minor weaknesses and threats, while the mean value of 1 represents major weaknesses and threats. The structured checklist contained 5 items of observation on library collections. Observations were recorded on 3 points option scale (Meets Expectation = ME, Needs Improvement = NI, Not Observed = NO). The research instruments for the study were developed by the researcher taking into cognisance the Librarians Registration Council of Nigeria (LRCN, 2019), the National Universities Commission (NUC, 2014) and the Association of Universities' Librarians of Nigerian Universities (AULNU, 2016) standards for Academic Libraries. Research hypotheses were tested using T-test (Independent Sample Test) at 0.05 level. Statistical analysis was carried out using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 2015). The names of the libraries were replaced with the library I, library II, library III, library IV and library V in no specific order.

## Results

**Research Question:** What are the SWOTs of collection development and management of university libraries in Ogun State?

Table 1 shows the summary of the University Librarian's response to collection development activities. All the libraries except library III have a collection development policy. The collection development in the library I is divided into resources, users and discipline collection. All universities engage in direct purchase as a means of collection development based on available funds. Library V depends solely on direct purchase based on fund allocation from the University for Collection Development which according to the UL, is sufficient to satisfy their needs. Except for Library V, the other four universities use gifts and exchanges as a means of developing the collection. According to the UL of Library V, most gifts are not relevant, obsolete or outdated. As a result, they are not counted on as a means of collection development. All the government-owned institutions have access to Tetfund for collection development which is not

**Table 1. Response of University Librarians to interview on collection development activities**

S/N	Statement	LIBRARIES				
		I	II	III	IV	V
1.	Written collection development policy	Available	Available	Not available	Available	Available
2.	Means of developing collection	Gifts & exchange Bequest, TETFund intervention, Direct purchase	Gifts & exchange Bequest, TETFund intervention, Direct purchase	Gifts & exchange Bequest, TETFund intervention, Direct purchase	Gifts & exchange Bequest, Direct purchase	Direct purchase
3.	How users' needs are accommodated in collection development	Request by Faculty, 5-10% by students.	Request by Faculty, 5-10% by students.	Request by Faculty	Faculty and suggestions of students.	Faculty recommendation & input from all categories of users.
4.	Means of ensuring balanced, relevance and currency of collection	Involvement of Faculty and students in a recommendation, use of most recent publishers' lists, training for graduating and postgraduate students to generate wish list, use of suggestion box by users	Involvement of Faculty and students in recommendation	Request by Faculty	Involvement of faculty and students in a recommendation, use of suggestion box by users	Phase-by-phase acquisition involving all programmes
5.	E-library content	Ebscohost, Research for Life Programmes, Proquest, Springer nature, TEAL and Open Access Resources	Ebscohost, Research for Life Programmes, Proquest, Taylor & Francis and Open Access Resources	Subscriptions lapsed but Open Access Resources are available for use	Ebscohost, Bio Line, Lexis/Nexis, Research for Life programmes and other Open Access Resources (content majorly open access)	Ebscohost, Research for Life Programmes, Proquest, Springer, Elsevier Science Direct, Elsevier Scopus, Open Access Resources
6.	How the library ensure collection meets user' information needs	Recommendation by Faculty and involvement of students	Recommendation by Faculty and involvement of students	The collection is demand driven	Recommendation by Faculty and involvement of students	Recommendation by Faculty and involvement of students

7.	Weeding Policy	Do not have	Available as part of collection development policy	Do not have	Available	Not available
8.	How often weeding is done	Not done often; there is no weeding activity in the past 4 years	Every 5 years	Not done	Annually/ as soon as new edition comes	Weeding not done

**Table 2. SWOT quadrant for UL interview on collection development**

SWOT	LIBRARIES				
	I	II	III	IV	V
Internal Factors	<b>STRENGTHS</b>				
1. Collection development policy guiding the process	√	√	-	√	√
2. Involvement of faculties as well as students in collection development	√	√	√	√	√
3. The balanced, relevant and current collection	√	√	-	√	√
4. Rich electronic databases	√	√	-	√	√
5. Rich local and foreign collection		√	√	√	√
6. Partnerships (collaboration/ consortia membership)	√	√	√	√	
7. Acquisition through purchase	√	√	√	√	√
8. Weeding at regular intervals of 5 years except for courses like history	-	√	-	-	-
9. Using other libraries' resources					
10. Open access resources	√	√	√	√	√
11. The ability of the UL to politely reject irrelevant donations	-	-	-	√	-
12. WebOPAC	-		-	-	√
13. Constant supply of electricity	-	-	-	√	√
14. Adequate funding	-	-	-	-	√
15. Regular internet access	-	-	-	√	√
	<b>WEAKNESSES</b>				
1. Lack of collection development policy	-	-	√	-	-
2. No weeding policy	√		√		√
3. Inadequate Funding		√		√	
4. Reliance on Tetfund and gifts	√	√	√	-	-
5. inability to renew subscription as at when due	-	-	√	-	-

<b>OPPORTUNITIES</b>						
External Factors	1. Using other library resources	√	√	√	-	-
	2. Open access resources	√	√	√	√	√
	3. Networking	√	√	√	√	√
	4. International linkage with Oregon state university	√	-	-	-	-
<b>THREATS</b>						
	1. Cost of online database	√	√	√	√	-
	2. Inadequate funding	√	√	√	√	-
	3. Other information providers		√	√	√	-
	4. Use of non-reputable sites by library users	-	-	-	√	-
	5. Gifts and exchange		√	√		

enjoyed by the private universities. Tetfund is the main source of funding at library III. A bequest is a means of collection development at the library I, II and IV. To accommodate users' needs, relevance and currency, all institutions involve the faculty in collection development. For the same reasons, libraries I and II involve 5-10% of the students via the use of a suggestion box, library III involves students subject to the availability of funds while library V involves all categories of users and individuals. One of the major strengths of library IV is the ability of the UL to reject irrelevant and obsolete gifts politely.

Table 2 presents the SWOT quadrant. There was no area of (100%) common strengths for the five universities in collection development. However, 4 (80%) have common strengths in the use of collection development policy, involvement of staff and students in collection development, rich electronic databases, balance, relevant and current collections, the exception being library III. Also, there was no common weakness or threat to the five university libraries in this study while open access resources are a common area of opportunity for all the universities. Inadequate funding for collection development was regarded as a weakness by 2 (40%) institutions (libraries II and IV) or a threat by 2 (40%) institutions (library I and III). Funding was adequate and was strength at library V. Cost of online databases was a threat to all institutions except library V. In the two state-owned institutions, the ULs saw gifts and exchanges as threats to collection development. Other information services providers which users preferred to the library were regarded as a threat to collection development by 3 (60%) institutions (library II, III, and IV). Other areas of SWOT for collection development specific to each of

the libraries were also presented in Table 2.

Table 3 shows the analysis of the assessment of collection development and management by librarians in the study area. At Library I, respondents gave a high rating for collection development and management in their library with a mean of 3.20. All responses with mean scores of 3.0 and above can be regarded as strengths or opportunities depending on whether they are internally mediated or externally mediated factors. Results also revealed that librarians rated; users are always involved in book recommendations (Mean = 2.04, SD = 0.51); my library has a weeding policy (Mean = 2.09, SD = 0.63) which can be interpreted as a weakness to collection development.

At Library II, an overall mean of 3.17 suggests a positive assessment of collection development and management by the librarians. Mean scores below 3.0, in the following areas, are suggestive of low strengths to collection development; users' involvement in book recommendation; the library has a weeding policy; the library is part of a consortium.

Response from Library III Librarians revealed an overall mean of 2.58 which is low for strength/opportunity. Mean scores above 3.00 suggestive of strength/opportunity were only recorded for; collection development is the joint responsibility of the Faculty and librarians; this implies users' needs are put into consideration before acquisition. The library acquires through purchase; gifts and exchange; bequests and Tetfund intervention.

At Library IV, collection development and management were positively rated by the librarians with an overall mean of 3.01, with a trend towards strength/opportunity. From the results, mean scores below 3.00 were obtained for; 3 – 5 years of currency

Table 3. Assessment of collection development by librarians in Ogun State

		LIBRARIES																								
		I					II					III					IV					V				
S/N	Statement	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD
1.	My library has a written collection development policy	7 (30.4)	15 (65.2)	1 (4.3)	-	3.26 ±0.54	8 (61.5)	4 (30.8)	1 (7.7)	-	3.54 ±0.66	-	-	6 (75.0)	2 (25.0)	1.75 ±0.46	5 (31.5)	9 (56.3)	2 (12.5)	-	3.19 ±0.66	11 (68.7)	5 (31.3)	-	-	3.68 ±0.48
2.	Users are always involved in book recommendation	2 (8.7)	7 (30.4)	4 (17.4)	10 (43.5)	2.04 ±1.07	4 (30.8)	4 (30.8)	5 (38.5)	-	2.94 ±0.86	-	-	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	2.88 ±0.35	2 (12.5)	5 (31.3)	4 (25.0)	5 (31.3)	2.25 ±1.06	6 (37.5)	6 (37.5)	4 (25.0)	-	3.13 ±0.81
3.	Collection development is a joint responsibility of the Faculty and librarians	3 (13.0)	20 (87.0)	-	-	3.13 ±0.34	7 (53.8)	6 (46.2)	-	-	3.54 ±0.34	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	-	-	3.38 ±0.52	5 (31.3)	10 (62.5)	1 (6.3)	-	3.25 ±0.58	8 (50.0)	7 (43.7)	-	1 (6.3)	3.44 ±0.63
4.	Users needs are put into consideration before acquisition	3 (13.0)	19 (82.6)	1 (4.4)	-	3.09 ±0.42	8 (61.8)	5 (38.5)	-	-	3.62 ±0.51	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	-	-	3.38 ±0.52	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	-	-	3.38 ±0.58	11 (68.7)	5 (31.3)	-	-	3.68 ±0.43
5.	In terms of currency, most of the materials in the library were published 3-5years ago	5 (21.7)	18 (78.3)	-	-	3.21 ±0.34	-	6 (46.2)	5 (38.5)	2 (15.4)	2.31 ±0.78	-	-	5 (62.5)	3 (37.5)	1.63 ±0.52	4 (25.0)	7 (43.8)	5 (31.3)	-	2.94 ±0.77	5 (31.3)	7 (43.8)	4 (25.0)	-	3.06 ±0.77
6.	Library collections are of high quality	8 (34.8)	15 (65.2)	-	-	3.34 ±0.49	7 (53.8)	5 (38.5)	1 (7.7)	-	3.46 ±0.66	1 (12.5)	2 (25.0)	4 (50.0)	1 (12.5)	2.38 ±0.52	5 (31.3)	10 (62.5)	1 (6.3)	-	3.25 ±0.58	12 (75.0)	3 (18.8)	1 (6.3)	-	3.69 ±0.60
7.	Library collections are balanced among programmes in the university	7 (30.4)	16 (69.6)	-	-	3.30 ±0.47	6 (46.2)	5 (38.5)	2 (15.4)	-	3.31 ±0.75	-	3 (37.5)	4 (50.0)	1 (12.5)	2.25 ±0.71	4 (25.0)	12 (75.5)	-	-	3.25 ±0.45	11 (68.7)	5 (31.3)	-	-	3.69 ±0.48
8.	My library is rich in foreign collections	6 (26.1)	17 (73.9)	-	-	3.26 ±0.45	3 (23.1)	8 (61.5)	1 (7.7)	1 (7.7)	3.00 ±0.82	-	2 (25.0)	6 (75.0)	-	2.25 ±0.46	4 (25.0)	11 (68.7)	1 (6.3)	-	3.19 ±0.54	13 (81.3)	-	3 (18.8)	-	3.81 ±0.40
9.	My library is rich in local collections	6 (26.1)	17 (73.9)	-	-	3.26 ±0.45	4 (30.8)	8 (61.5)	1 (7.7)	-	3.26 ±0.60	1 (12.5)	2 (25.0)	5 (62.5)	-	2.50 ±0.76	4 (25.0)	10 (62.5)	2 (12.5)	-	3.13 ±0.62	10 (62.5)	3 (18.8)	2 (12.5)	1 (6.3)	3.31 ±1.13

		LIBRARIES																								
		I					II					III					IV					V				
S/N	Statement	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD	SA F (%)	A F (%)	D F (%)	SD F (%)	$\bar{X}$ ±SD
10.	Library materials are weeded on periodic basis	4 (17.4)	16 (69.6)	3 (13.0)	-	3.04 ±0.56	-	4 (30.8)	7 (53.8)	2 (15.4)	2.15 ±0.77	-	2 (25.0)	3 (37.5)	3 (37.5)	1.88 ±0.83	3 (18.8)	10 (62.5)	3 (18.8)	-	3.00 ±0.63	2 (12.5)	4 (25.0)	7 (43.8)	3 (18.8)	2.31 ±0.95
11.	My library has weeding policy	3 (13.0)	5 (21.7)	6 (26.1)	9 (39.1)	2.09 ±1.08	2 (15.4)	7 (53.8)	2 (15.4)	2 (15.4)	2.69 ±0.95	-	-	5 (62.5)	3 (37.5)	1.63 ±0.52	3 (18.8)	9 (56.3)	4 (25.0)	-	2.94 ±0.68	2 (12.5)	6 (37.5)	7 (43.8)	1 (6.3)	2.56 ±0.81
12.	My library is part of a consortium	5 (21.7)	13 (56.5)	5 (21.7)	-	3.00 ±0.67	2 (15.4)	5 (38.5)	3 (23.1)	3 (23.1)	2.46 ±1.05	-	-	3 (37.5)	5 (62.5)	1.38 ±0.52	3 (18.8)	7 (43.8)	5 (31.3)	1 (6.3)	2.75 ±0.86	2 (12.5)	2 (12.5)	10 (62.5)	2 (12.5)	2.25 ±0.86
13.	My library online databases or e-collections are up-to-date	11 (47.8)	12 (52.2)	-	-	3.48 ±0.51	10 (76.9)	2 (15.4)	-	1 (7.7)	3.62 ±0.87	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)	6 (75.0)	-	2.38 ±0.74	4 (25.0)	9 (56.3)	3 (18.8)	-	3.06 ±0.68	10 (62.5)	5 (31.3)	1 (6.3)	-	3.56 ±0.63
14.	My library acquire through Purchase	17 (73.9)	6 (26.1)	-	-	3.74 ±0.45	13 (100)	-	-	-	4.00 0.00	5 (62.5)	3 (37.5)	-	-	3.63 ±0.52	13 (81.3)	3 (18.8)	-	-	3.81 0.40	15 (93.7)	1 (6.3)	-	-	3.94 0.25
15.	My library acquire through Gift and Exchange	16 (69.6)	7 (30.4)	-	-	3.70 ±0.47	7 (53.8)	5 (38.5)	1 (7.7)	-	3.46 ±0.66	4 (50.0)	4 (50.0)	-	-	3.50 ±0.53	12 (75.0)	4 (25.0)	-	-	3.75 ±0.45	5 (31.3)	8 (50.0)	2 (12.5)	1 (6.3)	3.06 ±0.35
16.	My library acquire through Bequest	16 (69.6)	7 (30.4)	-	-	3.70 ±0.47	5 (38.5)	4 (30.8)	4 (30.8)	-	3.07 ±0.86	4 (50.0)	4 (50.0)	-	-	3.50 ±0.53	6 (37.5)	4 (25.0)	6 (37.5)	-	3.00 ±0.89	2 (12.5)	2 (12.5)	9 (56.3)	3 (18.8)	2.10 ±0.91
17.	My library acquire through Tefund intervention	17 (73.9)	6 (26.1)	-	-	3.74 ±0.45	10 (76.9)	1 (7.7)	-	2 (15.4)	3.46 ±1.13	6 (75.0)	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)	-	3.63 ±0.74	-	-	1 (6.3)	15 (93.8)	1.06 ±2.25	-	-	-	16 (100)	1.00 ±0.00
		<b>Overall Mean = 3.20</b>					<b>Overall Mean = 3.17</b>					<b>Overall Mean = 2.58</b>					<b>Overall Mean = 3.01</b>					<b>Overall Mean = 3.02</b>				

of publications; the library has a weeding policy; the library is part of a consortium towards low strength. This university is a privately owned institution, and the abysmally low mean rating (Mean = 1.06, SD = 0.25) for acquisition through Tefund intervention is understandable as they do not benefit from Tefund intervention.

The result of the analysis of the assessment of collection development and management by Library V Librarians reveals that respondents gave a high rating

for collection development and management in their library with a mean of 3.02. All responses with mean scores of 3.0 and above can be regarded as strengths or opportunities depending on whether they are internally mediated or externally mediated factors. Results also revealed that librarians rated; library materials are weeded on a periodical basis; the library is part of a consortium. The latter responses had mean values less than 3.00 and therefore tended towards weaknesses or threats. All respondents strongly disagreed to

acquisition through Tetfund intervention (Mean = 1.00, SD = 0.00). Library V like Library IV is privately owned and does not enjoy Tetfund sponsorship which is a Federal Government of Nigeria intervention facility for educational institutions.

Table 4 shows the SWOT of collection development and management based on the response of librarians in the study area. Based on the result, all the libraries have strengths of collection development being joint responsibility of the faculty and librarians, consideration of users' needs before the acquisition, and acquisition through purchase. Four of the libraries have strengths in the currency of materials, quality of library collections, balanced collection among programmes in the university, richness in foreign collections, richness in local collections, to date online databases for e-collections. Opinions of library I and II librarians, however, negate that of their ULs on the issue of periodic weeding while at libraries III, IV and V, librarians' opinions validate the response of their ULs. Open access resources appear as strengths, opportunities and threats. This has implications for libraries; open access resources are positive external factors and as such are opportunities. Where it appears as a strength is an indication that the library concerned is seizing the opportunity to enhance library collections while the library sees it as a threat are either ignorant of the benefits it portends or does not have the necessary resources to take advantage of it. Overall, library I, IV and V have the highest number of strengths, followed by libraries II and III. The highest number of weaknesses is in library III, followed by library II, I and V, then library IV. Library I have the highest number of opportunities, followed by libraries III, II, IV and I respectively. In areas examined for collection development, threats are more pronounced in library III, followed by IV and V, then library I. Overall, the libraries in Ogun State have more strengths and opportunities than weaknesses and threats in terms of collection development.

Compared with the SWOT based on ULs assessments (Tables 2 and 4), Library I librarians' assessment of strengths, weaknesses, and threats to collection development is similar to that of the UL except in the area of users' involvement in book recommendation and periodic weeding. Opportunities for collection development are however greater as evaluated by the UL than other librarians. This may not be unconnected with the fact that the UL relates more with the external environment on behalf of the library. While the UL of library II rated funding as a

weakness in collection development, other librarians mentioned non-involvement in the consortium. They agree in virtually all other areas except funding. Similarly, librarians at library III SWOT on collection development agrees with the UL except for the UL's assessment of funding as a weakness. Submissions of ULs on funding can be relied upon since they are the chief financial officer of the library. Additional areas of weaknesses according to library III librarians are inadequate foreign collections, currency, and quality of collections while non-use of other libraries by their students and non-involvement in consortium/partnership are additional weaknesses to collection development mentioned by library V librarians. It can therefore be concluded that librarians and the ULs are in agreement with each other on what constitutes SWOT of collection development in the libraries studied.

Table 5 shows the observation checklist of the libraries used in this study. The library collection at the library I met expectations in terms of quality and quantity. Being a university of agriculture, collections are majorly on agriculture. Online databases were also up to date. The library however needs improvement in the area of currency. Library II collections met expectations in terms of quality and quantity. Online databases were also up to date. The library however needs improvement in the area of currency and stocking of local collections. The library needs all-around improvement in collection development and management at Library III. The library collection met expectations and online databases were also up to date at library IV. The library however needs improvement in the area of currency. It should be noted however that in all the libraries, it was observed that collections are most recent for programmes just presented for accreditation and those being prepared for the exercise. Library I and IV are making the best of opportunities provided by open access resources. Though, others made use of open access resources but not to the extent of its use at Library I and IV. In terms of subscription to online databases, library II subscribed to more databases than others.

Table 6 presents the summary of the SWOT common to university libraries in Ogun State in the area of collection development and management.

Table 7 shows the result of data analysis for mean rating comparing the SWOT of public and private universities in terms of collection development. The result showed that there was no significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) difference in the SWOT of collection development



between the government-owned university libraries and private university libraries.

### Discussion

Four of the five universities in this study have written collection development policies. This satisfies the requirement of LRCN (2019) for a defined collection management and AULNU (2016)

requirement for an acquisition policy. The finding of the present study is contrary to the reported absence of a comprehensive collection development policy by Nwosu and Ayanwu (2015) in all five academic libraries x-rayed for collection development function in Imo State, Nigeria. As observed in this study, one out of five libraries evaluated did not have a collection development policy; Khan (2015) has

**Table 4. SWOT of the libraries in collection development as identified by other librarians**

SWOT	LIBRARIES				
	I	II	III	IV	V
<b>Internal Factors</b>					
<b>STRENGTH</b>					
Written collection development policy	√	√		√	√
Involvement of faculties in collection development	√	√	√	√	√
Balance, the relevant and current collection	√	√		√	
Rich local and foreign collections	√	√		√	√
Rich local collections			√		
Periodic weeding of library materials	√	-		√	
Partnerships (collaboration/consortia membership)	√	-		√	
Up-to-date online databases	√	√			√
Acquisition through purchase, gifts & exchange,	√	√		√	√
Users are always involved in book recommendation	-	√	√	√	√
Currency of publication (Published 3-5 years ago)	-	√			√
Weeding policy and periodic weeding of library materials	-	√		√	
Open access resources			√		
High-quality materials balanced amongst programmes in the university					√
<b>WEAKNESSES</b>					
Users are always involved in book recommendation	√				
Weeding policy	√				
Involvement in consortium and collaboration	-	√			
Lack of written collection policy			√		
Currency of publication (Published 3-5 years ago)			√		
Quality of library collection			√		
Balanced collection amongst programmes in the university			√		
Lack of weeding policy			√		√
Periodic weeding of library materials			√		√

External Factors	OPPORTUNITIES					
	Using other library resources	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Acquisition through TETFund, bequest, gifts and exchange	✓				✓	
Open access resources	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other information services providers						✓
Partnership			✓	✓	✓	
THREATS						
Cost of online database	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other information services providers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Reliance on gift and exchange		✓	✓			

**Table 5. Observation checklist on collection development and management of university libraries**

S/N	ITEM	I			II			III			IV			V			
		ME	NI	NO	ME	NI	NO	ME	NI	NO	ME	NI	NO	ME	NI	NO	
1.	Most of the materials in the library were published 3-5 years ago		✓			✓			✓			✓					✓
2.	Library collections are of high quality	✓			✓			✓			✓						✓
3.	The library is rich in foreign collections	✓			✓			✓			✓						✓
4.	The library is rich in local collections	✓				✓		✓			✓						✓
5.	Online databases for e-collections are up-to-date	✓			✓			✓			✓						✓

**Legend: Meets Expectation = ME, Needs Improvement = NI, Not Observed = NO, \* No observations were made for ethical reasons**

also found that some academic libraries do not have the such document. The possession of a written collection development policy has not been a subject of consideration in most studies on SWOT analysis in academic libraries. All libraries evaluated in this study involved faculties and users in collection development. LRCN (2019) standard also requires that collection should be a joint responsibility of the Faculty and Librarians and users should be involved in selection. Khan and Bhatti (2016) opined that one of the factors that influence collection development is users' needs. Nwosu and Anyanwu (2015) recommended increased participation of users in collection development. The extent of involvement of the Faculty and users has not been studied in most SWOTs evaluations of collection

development. Balanced, relevant and high-quality collections across programmes are LRCN (2019) standard requirements that are satisfied by libraries in this study. Online databases for electronic collections and up-to-date online databases are strengths for universities in this study. This is in line with the observed increased use of web-based information communication technologies by libraries as reported by Martin, Murugiah & Nandhini (2016). In a SWOT analysis of four universities in the Kerala district of India by Kumar (2012), only two (Mahatma Gandhi University Library and Cochin University of Science and Technology Library) have electronic collections as a strength. All libraries in this study acquire library materials through purchase as required by LRCN

**Table 6. SWOTs of collection development of university libraries in Ogun State**

<b>Internal Factors</b>	<b>Strengths</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collection development policy guiding the process of collection development</li> <li>2. Involvement of Faculty and users' in collection development</li> <li>3. Consideration of users' needs before acquisition</li> <li>4. Balanced, relevant and high-quality collections across programmes</li> <li>5. Rich local and foreign collections</li> <li>6. Rich online databases for electronic collections</li> <li>7. Acquisition through purchase</li> <li>8. Up-to-date online databases</li> </ol>	<b>Weaknesses</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No weeding policy in three institutions</li> <li>2. Nonparticipation in the consortium by three institutions</li> <li>3. The currency of most publications is not within 3 to 5 years</li> <li>4. Periodic weeding of library materials (in three universities)</li> </ol>
<b>External Factors</b>	<b>Opportunities</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Using other library resources</li> <li>2. Technology</li> <li>3. Open access resources</li> <li>4. Acquisition through bequests, gifts and exchange</li> <li>5. Acquisition through TETFund in the government-owned institutions</li> </ol>	<b>Threats</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High cost of online subscriptions</li> <li>2. Other information services provider</li> <li>3. Inadequate funding of collection development in four institutions</li> <li>4. Reliance on TETFund, gifts and exchange</li> </ol>

Source: Field survey

### ***Analysis of Research Hypotheses***

**HO1: There is no significant difference in the SWOT of collection development in the public and private university libraries in Ogun State.**

**Table 7. Test of significant difference in the SWOT of collection development between public and private universities in Ogun State**

	Ownership	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means		
<b>Collection Development</b>	Public	44	3.0722	.57507	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Private	32	3.0460	.55176	.200	74	.842 NS

(2019).

The SWOT quadrant in Table 6, shows a lack of weeding policy and periodical weeding of library materials as weaknesses in collection development and management in this study. This finding is in tandem with the lack of a definite weed-out policy in all four Kerala district university libraries studied by Kumar (2012) which the author reported leads to the

prevalence of old and obsolete materials. This is also closely related to the currency of publication which was an observed weakness in collection development in this study. Kahn (2015) noted that the reason for not carrying out weeding or conducting weeding on a limited scale in university libraries has been the absence of weeding policies, opposition from faculty and administration, lack of budget and lack of human

resources. Reasons for not weeding as gathered in this study include the age of university and avoidance of empty shelves. Not participating in the consortium is a weakness in collection development for most of the libraries in this study. The consortium approach helps university libraries to jointly build a balanced collection and have access to electronic information sources. The high cost of subscription rates to online databases was a threat to collection development from the result of this research. This is in agreement with the report of the cost being the major challenge to electronic resources collection development in university libraries in South East, Nigeria by Okogwu and Ozioko (2018). These authors recommended consortium formation as a solution to the challenges of collection development to maximize the profitable use of resources and enhance subscription discounts. The funding and economic situation of the country was observed as a threat to collection development by all except one of the private universities. The problems of inadequate funding and the economic situation of the country and the antecedent negative effect on university library collection development started in the 1980s (Agboola, 2000). University funding and the economic situation of the country have not improved since then. TETFUND funding of collection development in the government-owned institution from the results of this research was classified as an opportunity but reliance on it turns it into a threat. It is an opportunity because the fund improves the universities library collection in agreement with the study of Osinulu and Daramola (2017). However, it becomes a threat because the universities rely heavily on it and therefore refuse to commit funds to collection development. Gifts and exchanges follow the same trend. Bequest, gift and exchange are opportunities for collection development; LRCN (2019) also recommended bequest, gift and exchange as means of collection development.

This study formulated a hypothesis to compare the SWOT of public and private universities in Ogun State in terms of Collection development and management and the null hypothesis of no significant difference was upheld. Research comparing public and private universities in Nigeria have included the area of administration (Obadara, 2012) and staff matters (Bello, Ogundipe and Eze, 2017). These researches have reported significant differences between public and private universities in areas of resource availability, resource utilization and student performance among others. These findings are pointers to the likelihood of differences in these areas which is contrary to

the findings of SWOT of collection development concerning public and private university libraries in Ogun State.

### **Conclusion**

Involvement of faculties and students in collection development, and balanced, relevant and high-quality collection are the major strengths of the universities in collection development and management. The major opportunities for collection development are in the use of other libraries' resources and open-access resources. The major weaknesses of collection development and management are concerning weeding and currency of publications. The cost of online subscriptions and other information service providers are the major threats to collection development and management.

The SWOTs of each of the university libraries can be harnessed. Interlibrary loan and consortium formation can also be explored. Overall, conformity with standards (LRCN, AULNU and NUC) is above average, but there is great room for improvement. To achieve the desired improvement, there are roles to be played by the university administration, university libraries, and the government, LRCN, AULNU and NUC.

Finally, findings in this study showed that there are no significant differences in the SWOT of collection development and management between public and private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. It can be safely projected that the quality of learning and research will not be different between public and private universities in the study area given the strategic role of the library in this respect.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made;

Approaches such as the involvement of alumni and sourcing for grants (locally and internationally) should be exploited in improving collections. The development of weeding policy is desirable and strict adherence to it is recommended for improved collection development and management. A major threat to the acquisition of online resources is the cost of the subscription. Collaboration among libraries in purchasing and resource sharing could be a means of eliminating this threat. International partnerships with associations such as the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), American Library Association (ALA) etc. can also be explored in this respect. Every library on a periodical basis should embark on a SWOT analysis of their

library collections and the findings used to design strategic plans that would move the library forward.

## References

- Adedibu, L.O. (2006). Collection development policy: The case of the University of Ilorin Library. *Journal of Nigerian Library Association*, 39 (2)11-14
- Adeoye, M. O. & Popoola, S. O. (2011). Teaching effectiveness, availability, accessibility and use of library and information resources among teaching staff of schools of nursing in Osun and Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved May. 29, 2021 from [www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/adeoye-popoola.htm](http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/adeoye-popoola.htm)
- Adesina, A. S. (2019). An assessment of acquisition and collection development activities in academic libraries: A study of Joseph Ayo Babalola University Ikeji – Arakeji, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 2696. Retrieved June, 2021 from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2696>
- Agboola, A.T. (2000). Five decades of Nigerian university libraries: A review. *Libri*, 50, 280–289.
- Ahiauza, B.E. (1989). The problem of collection development in a depressed economy: What future for the library in Nigeria. *African Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 7(1&2):31-40. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/280105312> on 15th May 2019.
- Aina, L. O. (2004). *Library and information science text for Africa*. Lagos, Nigeria. Third Information Service Limited.
- Ajibero, M. I. (2004). Donor support and sustainability: The experience of university libraries in Nigeria. Proceedings of Standing Conference of African University Librarians of West Africa (SCAULWA) 2003 Conference, Erata Hotel, Accra, Ghana.
- Aluko, O., Youdeowei, T., Nnachi, E., Charles, J., Bakam, A., Bosun, T., Olubemi, A., Babalola, A., Olorunsogo, D., Carsmir, O. & Dada, P. (2019, May 6). State of public varsity libraries worrisome, says ASUU president. *Punch Newspaper*, p. 2.
- Ameen, K (2010). The culture of collection evaluation in Pakistan. *Library philosophy and practice paper 455*. Retrieved from [digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent](http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent) on 25th May 2019.
- Association of College and Research Libraries (2011). *Standards for libraries in higher education*. Chicago, Illinois.
- Association of University Librarians of Nigerian Universities (2016). *A compendium of the Association of University Librarians of Nigerian Universities (AULNU) and Nigerian university libraries*. Balarabe, A.A., Anunobi, C., Nkiko, C. & Idiodi, E.O (Ed.). Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited.
- Ayub, A., Razzaq, A., Aslam, M. A. & Iftekhhar, H. (2013). A conceptual framework of evaluating SWOT Analysis as the mediator in strategic marketing planning through marketing intelligence. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 91-98. Retrieved from <http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx> on 30th November 2017.
- Bello, A. O., Ogundipe, O. & Eze, S. C (2017). Employee job satisfaction in Nigeria tertiary institution: Comparative study of academic staff in public and private universities. *Global Journal of Human Resources Management*, 5 (4): 33-46.
- Fine, L (2009). The SWOT Analysis: Using your strength to overcome weakness, using opportunities to overcome threats. Retrieved from [www.lawrencefine.com](http://www.lawrencefine.com) on 21st June, 2015.
- Gregory, V. L. (2011). *Collection development and management for 21st-century library collections: an interdiction*. New York, London: Neal-Schuman Publishers.
- Hazidah, N. A. & Edzan, N. N. (2012). The SWOT ANALYSIS: Marketing and promotional strategies used at the University of Malaya library. In: *International Conference on GenNEXT Libraries*, 8-10 October 2012. Retrieved from <http://eprints.um.edu.my/5031/> on 23rd July 2014.
- Ifidon, B. (1995). Recent development in Nigerian university academic libraries: The effects of accreditation on university library Book stock. *Libri*, 45(3/4), 186-198.
- Khan, G. (2015). *Collection management in the university libraries: policies, procedures and users' satisfaction*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. The Islamic University of Bahawalpur
- Khan, S. A. & Bhatti, R. (2014). Professional issues and challenges confronted by the Pakistan library association in the development of librarianship in Pakistan. In: Kowatta, P.S (Ed). *Comparative and international librarianship* (pp. 75-100). New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.

- Khan, G. & Bhatti, R. (2016). An analysis of collection development in the university libraries of Pakistan. *Collection Building*, 35 (1), 22-34. doi: 1108/cb-07-2015-0012.
- Kumar, S. P. K. (2012). University libraries in Kerala: SWOT analysis for marketing. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, Paper 787. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/787> on 15th September 2015
- Lance, K., Rodney, M. J. & Hamilton-Pennel, C. (2005). Powerful Libraries make powerful learners: The Illinois study. Illinois: Illinois School Library Media Association. Retrieved from <http://www.islma.org> on 4th September 2014. 55pp.
- Librarians' Registration Council of Nigeria (2019). Standards and guidelines for academic libraries in Nigeria. Librarians' Registration Council of Nigeria. Retrieved from [www.lrcn.gov.ng](http://www.lrcn.gov.ng) on 27th December 2019
- Martell, C. (2008). The Absent User: Physical use of academic library collections and services continues to Decline from 1995-2006. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(5), 400-407.
- Martin, S, Murugiah, P. & Nandhini, K. (2016). Web-based library services – An overview. *International Journal of Library Science and Information Management*, 2(3), 79-85. Retrieved from [www.ijlsim.in](http://www.ijlsim.in) on 31st March 2019.
- National Universities Commission (2014). Benchmark/Minimum academic standard. Retrieved from <http://nuc.ng> on 14th July 2018
- Nwosu, C. C & Udo-Anyanwu, A. J (2015). Collection development in Imo state Nigerian: Status analysis and way forward. *International journal of advanced and library and information science* 3(1):126-135. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net> on 30th June 2019.
- Obadara, O. E. (2012). Comparative analysis of public and private universities administration in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 32 (3): 357-363.
- Ogbuyi, S. U. & Okpe, I. J. (2013). Evaluation of library materials usage and services in private universities in Nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2(8), 33-41.
- Okogwu, F. I & Ozioko, R. E. (2018). Challenges of collection of electronic resources in university libraries in southeast Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal) paper 1880* retrieved from <http://25thdigitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1880> on 30th June 2019.
- Okoro, C. C., Omeluzor, S. U. & Bamidele, I. A. (2014). Effect of brain drain (human capital flight) of librarians on service delivery in some selected Nigerian universities. *SAGE Open*, July-September 2014:1-11. doi: 10.1177/2158244014541131. Retrieved from <http://www.uk.sagepub.com/>.
- Ononogbo, R.U. (1987). User satisfaction in a depressed economy: Strategies for Nigeria university libraries. *Proceeding of the national seminar on strategies for survival by Nigerian academics on research libraries during austere times*. Ibadan, 9-11 November 1987, Nigerian Association of Agricultural Librarians and Documentalist, 101-107.
- Osinulu, L. F. & Daramola, C. F. (2017). Government intervention in the funding of Nigerian university libraries: An appraisal of the role of the TERTIARY Education Trust Fund (TETFund). *AGOGO: Journal of Humanities*, 3: 41 – 47. Retrieved from <https://journals.ouuagoiwoye.edu.ng> on 30th December 2018
- Statistical Package for Social Sciences (2015). *Statistical package for social sciences, version 24*. IBM SPSS Statistics.
- Ugah, A.D. (2007). A SWOT analysis of the university library of Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, pp 1-7. Retrieved from <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/> on 23rd October 2014.
- Veeramani, M. & Vinayagamoorthy, P. (2010). A study on the marketing techniques for academic Libraries in Kuwait. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 1(1), 77-83. Retrieved on 12th October 2015 from <http://www.soceagra.com>.

---

**Corresponding Author**

Esther Abosede Awojobi  
 awojobi.esther@ouuagoiwoye.edu.ng