Assessing academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of collection development policy in Nigeria

Buhari Yakubu[1,2]; M.K. Yanti Idaya[2*] and S. Samsul Farid[2]
[1]Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University Lapai,
Niger State, NIGERIA.
[2]Department of Library and Information Science,
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,
Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, MALAYSIA.
buhariy@ibbu.edu.ng; *yanti@um.edu.my (corresponding author);
samsulfarid@um.edu.my
ORCID: B.Yukubu: 0000-0001-9461-2144
M.K. Yanti Idaya: 0000-0002-7642-469X
S. Samsul Farid: 0000-0003-3759-5653

ABSTRACT
Despite the importance of collection development policy (CDP) in developing library collection, little has been written about the awareness and knowledge of those who are responsible for formulating, maintaining, and updating this policy, especially in Nigeria where collection development challenges seem to be rampant. Therefore, this study assesses Nigerian academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP and also determines whether academic librarians' educational level and working experience influence their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. The study employed a quantitative methodology using a survey research design. One hundred and thirty-six (I36) academic librarians were recruited from three selected academic libraries in the Northwestern zone of Nigeria using a random sampling method. A survey questionnaire developed based on the IFLA (2001) guideline for collection development policy was used to collect the data. Descriptive and Spearman correlational analyses were used to analyze the data. The findings of the study revealed that academic librarians had a high level of awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. The findings also revealed that academic librarians' educational level influenced their awareness on the importance (p = .000) and knowledge of CDP (p = .009). However, academic librarians' working experience did not influence their awareness on the importance (p = .100) and knowledge of CDP (p = .307). This study has contributed to the management of academic libraries by providing useful information on the importance and knowledge of CDP among academic librarians in Nigeria. The study suggests that various educational programs are necessary to continue to improve the awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP among library professionals in Nigeria.

Keywords: *Collection development policy; Collection management; Library collection; Academic librarianship; Education and training.*

INTRODUCTION

Collection development policy (CDP) is an essential working tool for effective collection development activities as it helps in selecting, planning, developing, and evaluating library

collections (IFLA Acquisition and Collection Development Section 2001). Literature in the field of librarianship almost without exception support that libraries formulate and maintain functional CDP. The reason ranges from clarification or guidance to an indication of the judicial allocation of budget (Hollingum 2013; Johnson 2018), or simply help to achieve objectives of the library (Fought, Gahn and Mills 2014). Kanwal (2006) pointed out that the evolving environment has increased the importance of CDP in the collection development process. Haider (2007) added that through the adoption of CDP, several collection development issues could be minimized.

Similarly, preliminary investigation revealed that academic libraries in developed countries are increasingly formulating and updating their CDPs to meet their current collection development challenges and to provide adequate and quality collections. For instance, a study conducted by Douglas (2011) described how the University of Maryland library revised its 10-year-old CDP to reflect current collection development practices, provide guidance for future challenges and adapt to changes in publishing trends, budgeting, and information need of users. Other studies conducted by Pickett et al. (2011) and Fought et al. (2014) described how Tennessee Health Science University Library and Texas University Library updated their CDP to increase the visibility of the library, rationalization of resources, promote library collection and services, create resources awareness, and demonstrate the value of the library to the university management and other relevant stakeholders.

However, despite its importance in developing library collection, academic libraries in some developing countries, such as in Nigeria, are still operating without CDP and those with the policy have not dedicated enough time and effort to update or implement it (Adekanmbi 2007; Chaputula and Kanyundo 2014; Ghalib 2014; Nwosu and Udo-Anyanwu 2015). This shows that collections in the libraries are developed without a proper plan. Studies have revealed that most of the essential elements of collection development activities are done haphazardly due to the lack of written guidelines to guide the overall collection development activities (Chaputula and Kanyundo 2014; Ghalib 2014; Nwosu and Udo-Anyanwu 2015). Also, studies have reported that the libraries are unable to provide collections that represent the research activities of the academic community (Adekanmbi 2007; Nwosu and Udo-Anyanwu 2015). Moreover, in the absence of CDP, librarians responsible for collection development activities tend to be excessive in some areas by neglecting others, thereby leading to collection disparity (Umar and Bakare 2018).

Therefore, academic libraries in developing countries must be innovative and learn from the successes of their counterparts in the developed world. They must not remain behind as their students are expected to compete globally. In other words, they must formulate or update their CDP to meet collection development challenges facing their libraries. However, the question is how this could be possible if those responsible are not aware of the importance of the policy, or if they do not have the required knowledge and skills to construct the policy. Previous studies conducted on this subject indicate a need for a more deliberate effort in training librarians to be more proficient in CDP. The studies suggest that librarians must not only be made aware of the importance of CDP but must also be equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary for constructing the policy (Adekanmbi 2007; Castrucci, Leider and Sellers 2015; Kanwal 2006). It is believed that if librarians are aware of the importance of CDP, and if they have the required knowledge and skills to construct the policy, they would be more likely to formulate, update and use it in their libraries.

In Nigeria, relatively little is known about the academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. While there is a plethora of scholarly work espousing the benefits of and need for CDP (Chaputula and Kanyundo 2014; Fought et al. 2014), there have been no studies that examine the librarians' awareness on the importance of CDP. Also, several empirical studies have discussed the process of constructing the CDP (Levenson 2019), but how this process is understood by the librarians is not reported in the literature. Additionally, studies from other professions had indicated that education level and working experience contribute to the awareness on the importance and knowledge of a policy (Chua et al. 2018; Kunaviktikul et al. 2010; Spitzer and Golander 2001), but the influence of these factors on the awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP is still unknown.

Therefore, the current study demonstrates Nigerian academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP, and whether their educational level and working experience influence their awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP. This understanding will be an indicator of the extent to which the teaching of CDP ought to be emphasized in library school's curriculum in Nigeria. In addition, it will affirm the need for ongoing professional development for the academic librarians in Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Collection Development Policy

The phrase collection development policy (CDP) is often used synonymously with other phrases such as collection development plan, collection management plan, and collection management policy (Evans 2000). Some scholars also considered CDP as exchangeable terms with selection policy or acquisition policy and defined them as such. However, CDP is much wider in scope than selection policy or acquisition policy as it encompasses both the selection and acquisition policies as well as policies regarding evaluation, weeding, and discarding of materials (Evans 2000; Johnson 2018; Patel 2016). CDP has been defined differently by different scholars, associations, and practitioners using different perspectives. For instance, Corrall and Roberts (2012) defined CDP as an official statement about the decisions taken by a library regarding the duties it performs or the services it provides. Some scholars defined it as a written statement of rules and regulations guiding the selection, acquisition, evaluation, weeding, and accepting or rejecting of gifts (Demas and Miller 2012; Fombad and Mutula 2003; Johnson 2018).

CDPs are developed by individual libraries to clarify their collection development activities. It is, therefore, difficult to mention precisely the content of the policy since the nature of every library is different. However, certain key issues are usually considered for inclusion in the formulation of CDP. These include a clear mission statement of the library and that of the parent institution (Silber 1999; van Zijl 1998), a description of the purpose of the policy (Levenson 2019), a description of the users' community, and a description of the library collection (IFLA Acquisition and Collection Development Section 2001; Silber 1999). Other elements include the description of the person or unit responsible for the selection of the materials along with the selection criteria, techniques or procedure of evaluating the library collection (IFLA Acquisition and Collection Development Section 2001), as well as the collaborative collection development programs in which the library is involved (Johnson 2018). In addition, the policy should include the description of the budgetary overview of the library along with the special sources of funds such as grants or donations

(Vignau and Meneses 2005), policy implementation process (Levenson 2019), policy approval management (Silber 1999).

In writing a CDP, these elements may be combined or divided, increase, or reduce as deemed necessary to the circumstances of a particular library. Also, due to the issues surrounding collection development activities in terms of decreasing budget allocation, cost of materials, the complexity of electronic resources as well as legal issues arising from copyright, it is important to discuss some of the main reasons why libraries should have a functional CDP.

Reasons for a Written Collection Development Policy

There are innumerable reasons why CDPs should be formulated and used in developing and maintaining library collections. For this study, the emphasis would be on five main reasons; namely selection, planning/budgeting, protection, communication, and collaboration. The primary purpose of having a written CDP is to provide guidelines for the selection and deselection of library materials (Chaputula and Kanyundo 2014; Khan and Bhatti 2016). CDP also outlines the criteria and steps to follow when selecting and deselecting materials which ensure more control and consistency in the selection process. Another reason for writing up a CDP is to provide a solid groundwork for future planning thereby assisting in determining priorities when financial resources are limited (IFLA Acquisition and Collection Development Section 2001; Pfohl 2018). It helps in setting a limit that ensures effective utilization of the limited resources (Chaputula and Kanyundo 2014). Besides selection and planning, CDP provides an avenue for deciding on the formats and price of the materials (Mishra and Ngurtinkhuma 2015). Also, CDP protects libraries against unnecessary challenges regarding the inclusion or exclusion of certain materials and facilitates communication among library stakeholders (Fought et al. 2014; Gulnaz and Fatima 2019; Hollingum 2013). The policy provides vital information to library staff responsible for developing the collection, to library users who want to know why certain materials are or are not acquired, and to funding bodies who provide funds for the acquisition of the collection. Lastly, CDP facilitates interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing (Johnson 2018). It describes the roles and responsibilities of the cooperative libraries (Demas and Miller 2012; Pexton 2015).

Therefore, having a written guideline or criteria to follow would bring many benefits to the library and explain a great deal to everyone that has a say in how collection development activity is carried out. It will also guaranty that the materials acquired are relevant to library clientele, thereby ensuring that the materials are used effectively. For this reason, it is important to review whether librarians who are responsible for formulating, maintaining, and updating this policy are aware of the importance of CDP or have the required knowledge to construct the policy.

Awareness of the Importance and Knowledge of CDP

The major objective of collection development policy guidelines developed by the International Federation of Library Association and Institutions (IFLA), as well as that of the American Library Association, is to improve the awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP (ALA 1996; IFLA 2001). However, recent studies indicated that the knowledge of CDP has still been lacking among library professionals, especially in some developing countries. Studies conducted by Kanwal (2006) and Ghalib (2014) in university libraries of Pakistan found that the majority of the respondents were aware of the importance of the use of CDP, but in the literal sense, they did not prepare such a document due to lack of basic knowledge and skills to formulate the policies. Lack of or

limited knowledge of CDP does not seem to be confined to only librarians in university libraries of Pakistan but similar situations are reported about librarians in Botswana (Adekanmbi 2007) and South Africa (Adriaanse 2015). Sambo and colleagues also surveyed the perception of Nigerian certified librarians on e-collection policy and found that many libraries did not have such a document. The researchers speculate one reason for this is the lack of knowledge and skills of librarians on collection management (Sambo et al. 2014). Several other studies conducted on this topic indicated a need for a more deliberate effort in training librarians to be more proficient in CDP (Adriaanse 2015; Ghalib 2014; Kanwal 2006; Nwosu and Udo-Anyanwu 2015). It was also indicated that librarians must not only be made aware of the importance of the use of CDP but must also be equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary for formulating and updating the policy (Adekanmbi 2007; Castrucci et al. 2015).

Given the importance of CDP in the day-to-day collection development activities and professional librarianship, it speaks poorly for our profession that so many librarians enter the workforce without a proper grounding in CDP, an important document that governs the overall collection development activities. Therefore, reviewing the factors that could contribute to the awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP is necessary.

Importance of Education and Training on CDP
Educational level is assumed to have some bearing on one's awareness and knowledge of a given subject. The most popular assumption is that the more education and training one has in a subject, the more awareness and knowledge one will have on that subject. This assumption has been supported by several empirical studies that have looked at the awareness and knowledge level of policy in various professions. For instance, in the information profession, educational level was found to be significantly correlated with the awareness and compliance of information security policy (Farooq et al. 2015; Chua et al. 2018; Öğütçü, Testik and Chouseinoglou 2016). These studies indicated that respondents with higher educational levels had better knowledge and awareness of information security policies than those with a lower educational level. Also, in the health profession, a large of studies has indicated the influence of education on the awareness and knowledge of patient safety management policy (Choi, Lee and Lee 2010; Kim et al. 2013; Park, Kang and Lee 2012; Swart, Pretorius and Klopper 2015). The studies found that respondents who were educated on patient safety management were more aware of patient safety management policy than those who were not. That is to say, the awareness and practice of patient safety management policy could be improved by providing respondents with continued and repeated education on patient safety. Furthermore, several other studies have demonstrated that education and training significantly increased awareness, knowledge, and possible engagement in policy development (Byrd et al. 2012; Primomo 2007; Primomo and Björling 2013; Rains and Carroll 2000).

Based on the above literature, it can be inferred that educational level has a significant influence on the awareness and knowledge of a policy. The more education one has received, especially in relation to a policy, the more they are likely to be aware and knowledgeable about the policy. In other words, exposing people to policy-related training would significantly increase their awareness, knowledge, and possible engagement in policy development/implementation. However, the influence of educational level on the awareness and knowledge of collection development policy (CDP) is relatively unexplored. Therefore, this study hypothesized that academic librarians with higher educational levels (qualification) in the field of librarianship are more likely to have more awareness on the

importance and knowledge of CDP as they are more likely to have taken more CDP courses. The following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Academic librarians' educational level influences their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP.

Importance of Experience on the Awareness and Knowledge of CDP

Working experience means any experience one has gained while working in a particular area (Alenezi, Abdul Karim and Veloo 2010). Working experience is assumed to have some bearing on one's awareness and knowledge of a given subject. The assumption is that the more experience one has about a subject, the more awareness, and knowledge one will have about it. This assumption has also been supported by several empirical studies that have looked at the awareness and knowledge of policy in various professions. For instance, awareness on the importance of patient safety management policy was found to be positively correlated with the health workers' working experience (Jang, Song and Kang 2017; Kim et al. 2013). The studies revealed that respondents who had worked for more years were found to be more aware of patient safety management policy. Another study conducted by Tilden and Tilden (1985) using Benner's experience and inexperienced framework for clinical practice (Benner and Benner 1984), found that experience was a determinant of knowledge of health policy development. Several other studies conducted in the nursing profession have shown how work experience significantly influenced the knowledge of health policy development (Bobay, Gentile and Hagle 2009; Kunaviktikul et al. 2010; Spitzer and Golander 2001). The authors stressed that the ease with which respondents participated in health policy development was an indicator of their experience with health policy issues. Spitzer and Golander (2001) noted that greater experience provides opportunities to acquire more knowledge, expertise, and skills in policy development. However, Ericsson and Lehmann (1996) argued that "work experience in itself is not an indicator of one's knowledge in a given area, as what is important is the deliberate practice one is engaged in while working in a given domain".

Based on the above literature, it can be inferred that working experience has a significant influence on the awareness and knowledge of a policy. The more experience one has, especially in relation to a policy, the more awareness and knowledge he has about it. However, the influence of working experience on the awareness and knowledge of collection development policy (CDP) is relatively unexplored. Therefore, this study hypothesized that academic librarians with more working experience in libraries are more likely to have more awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP as they are more likely to be exposed to more CDP training, workshops, conferences, seminars, etc. organized by their libraries. The following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: Academic librarians' working experience influences their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP.

OBJECTIVES AND METHOD

The objective of this study was (a) to assess Nigerian academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP; and (b) to determine whether academic librarians' educational level and working experience influence their awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP. To achieve the objectives of the study, three research questions are posed:

(a) What is the extent of the Nigerian academic librarians' awareness on the importance of collection development policy?
(b) What is the extent of the Nigerian academic librarians' knowledge of collection development policy?
(c) Do academic librarians' educational level and working experience influence their awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP?

This study uses a quantitative survey research design to assess the awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP among academic librarians in Nigeria. The population of the study comprised 270 academic librarians from three selected federal universities in the North-Western Zone, Nigeria. The academic librarians were chosen because they were in a better position to provide relevant information required to actualize this study. Similarly, the three universities were selected because they were the largest conventional universities in the region where the demand for information resources is high and where the collection development process is more complicated. Random sampling was used to choose the required sample of the study because the study was interested in the academic librarians with their educational level and working experience, not necessarily the institution they came from. The sample size was 136 out of 207 based on Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) population and sample table (confidence level =95%, the margin of error =2.5%). Another 30 were added to compensate for the possible non-responses, making the sample 166.

A paper-based questionnaire was used to collect the data (see Appendix). The questionnaire was chosen because it is more economical and less time-consuming when collecting data from a large population. The questionnaire was developed based on the IFLA (2001) guideline for collection development policy. IFLA guideline was chosen because it has been widely used for training and preparing CDPs for libraries. Other guidelines were not considered due to the limitation of time and cost. The IFLA guideline is majorly divided into two categories; reasons for having a CDP and elements of CDP. The first category was used to measure the respondents' awareness on the importance of CDP, while the second category was used to measure the respondents' knowledge of CDP. Therefore, two questionnaire scales (i.e. awareness on the importance and knowledge of the CDP) were adopted.

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of twenty-two (22) items anchored on five Likert-scale measurements: 1= Not at all aware; 2= Slightly aware; 3= Somewhat aware, 4= Moderately aware; 5= Extremely aware (Hodonu-Wusu, Noorhidawati and Abrizah 2020). The other part consisted of nineteen (19) items anchored on five Likert-scale measurements: 1= Not at all Knowledgeable; 2= Slightly Knowledgeable; 3= Somewhat Knowledgeable; 4= Moderately Knowledgeable 5= Highly knowledgeable (Cox 2014). Demographic items were also included in the survey questionnaire to elicit the demographic information of the respondents (gender, age, institution, educational level, and working experience).

The instrument validity was checked through the face and content validity. To establish content validity, the questionnaire items were adopted from the IFLA 2001 guidelines for collection development policy and matched with the related literature. Likewise, the instrument was given to experts in the field of librarianship for face validity. These experts were chosen based on their experience and they include two researchers from the department of library and information science and two practicing librarians. As for the reliability, a pilot study involving thirty (30) academic librarians from two selected federal

universities in Nigeria was conducted using convenience sampling. The pilot was conducted to ascertain the appropriateness of the instrument with the level of the respondents. The data from the pilot were collected, coded, and analyzed. The internal consistency of the measurement scale was measured using Cronbach's alpha value. As stated by Chua (2013), Cronbach's alpha is the most commonly used in determining the reliability of a research instrument. DeVellis (2017) recommended that the ideal Cronbach's alpha coefficient should be above .70 (>.70). Therefore, the results for Cronbach's alpha coefficient test displayed that all the variables scored above the recommended level of 0.70. The Cronbach's alpha value for awareness on the importance was .862 while the value for knowledge was .922, which indicated high internal consistency (reliability).

The permission to collect data was solicited from the University Librarians at the respective academic institution. After obtaining the institutions' approval, the questionnaires with a cover letter that explains the purpose, voluntariness, and confidentiality of responses, were distributed to 166 academic librarians. A total of 136 of the questionnaires were returned making up a 100 percent response rate (Table 1)

Table 1: Survey Response Rate

Total Population	207
Sample size	136
Oversample size	166
Completed survey	136
Response rate	100%

The data derived from the responses were analyzed using SPSS 23. Descriptive and Spearman correlational analyses were carried out. To determine academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP as called for research questions 1 and 2, responses to the items of parts 1 and 2 of the instrument were summed, and mean scores were calculated. The mean values were ranked from high to low. An overall mean score of 3.00 or above was regarded as a high level of awareness or knowledge of CDP (academic librarians were aware of the importance and knowledgeable about CDP) while those below 3.00 were labeled as low level of awareness or knowledge of CDP (academic librarians were not aware of the importance and knowledgeable about CDP).

Also, to determine the influence of the independent variables (educational level and working experience) on the dependent variables (awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP) as called for research question 3, the normality of the data was first checked using Kolmogorov-Smirnov, and the Shapiro-Wilk test. For Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk test, the data is said to be approximately normally distributed if the significant value is greater than .05 (P >.05), but the data is said not to be approximately normally distributed if the significant value is less than .05 (P <.05) (Chua 2013). Based on this assumption, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Shapiro-Wilk test for the two variables (awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP) were significant (P <.05) indicating that the data was not normally distributed. As such, a Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to determine the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables. In other words, the Spearman correlation coefficient was used to determine the influence of educational level and working experience on academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP.

RESULTS

General Characteristics of the Respondents

Of the respondents who completed this survey, 104 (76.5%) were males and 32 (23.5%) were females. The respondents' age shows that 55 (40.4%) were between 31- 40 years, and 15 (11.1%) were below 30 years of age. Educational level was also solicited showing that 73 (53.7%) had a master's degree, 47 (34.5%) had a bachelor's degree, and 16 (11.8%) were Ph.D. holders. With regards to total work experience, 80 (58.8%) had worked less than 10 years, 30 (22.1%) had worked 11 to 20 years, and 26 (19.1%) had worked more than 21 years (Table 2).

Table 2: Demographic Profiles of the Respondents (Total N = 136)

Variables	Categories	N (%)
Gender	Male	104 (76.5)
	Female	32 (23.5)
Age	Below 30 years	15 (11.1)
	31 - 40 years	55 (40.4)
	41 - 50 years	42 (30.9)
	51 and above	22 (17.6)
Educational Level	Bachelor's degree	47 (34.5)
	Master's Degree	73 (53.7)
	PhD	16 (11.8)
Working Experience	Below 10 years	80 (58.8)
	11 – 20 years	30 (22.1)
	21 to above	26 (19.1)

Academic Librarians' Awareness on the Importance of CDP

Table 3 presents the mean score of the view of academic librarians as to their awareness on the importance of CDP. As a group, academic librarians had a high level of awareness of the importance of CDP with an overall mean score of 4.47 of the twenty-two (22) questions. In addition, the mean response for all items was above 3.00, indicating that the respondents had a high level of awareness of the importance of each item in the survey. The items with the highest level of awareness include helping the library to handle challenges from funding agencies regarding the selection and rejection of certain materials, 4.60; outlining the criteria and steps to follow in selecting print and non-print materials, 4.60; and providing a sound foundation for future planning. While those with the least level of awareness include reducing the personal bias or influence of a single selector, 4.26; ensuring fair allocation of resources among different subjects and formats of materials, 4.34; and helping library to reject unwanted gifts politely but firmly, 4.35.

Academic Librarians' Knowledge of CDP

Table 4 presents the mean score of academic librarians' views regarding their knowledge level of CDP. As a group, academic librarians had a high level of knowledge of CDP with an overall mean score of 3.65 of the nineteen (19) questions. In addition, the mean response for all items in the survey was above 3.00, indicating that the respondents had a high level of knowledge of each item in the survey. The items with the highest level of knowledge include a description of the scope of the library collection, 3.86; description of the overall objectives of the library and that of the parent institution, 3.79, and description of the number and types of users served, 3.78. Those with the least level of knowledge include a

description of cooperative programs library is involved, 3.45; description of the policy approval statement by senior management, 3.51; and description of library collection priorities or collection intensity level, 3.57.

Table 3: Academic Librarians' Awareness on the Importance of CDP

Item statements	NAAA	SA	SWA	MA	EA	Mean
CDP helps library to handle challenges from funding agencies	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.7%)	6 (4.4%)	27 (19.9%)	98 (72.0%)	4.60
CDP outlines criteria for selecting print and non-print materials	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (7.4%)	29 (21.3%)	97 (71.3%)	4.60
CDP provides a sound foundation for future planning	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.7%)	8 (5.9%)	26 (19.1%)	9 (71.3%)	4.58
CDP helps library to handle challenges from users about the selection and rejection of materials	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.5%)	8 (5.9%)	36 (26.5%)	90 (66.2%)	4.57
CDP demonstrates to funding bodies what libraries do with their funds	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.5%)	7 (5.1%)	35 (25.7%)	91 (66.9%)	4.57
CDP facilitates local cooperation and networking	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.7%)	44 (32.4%)	86 (63.2%)	4.57
CDP facilitates communication between library and funding agencies	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.9%)	3 (2.2%)	44 (32.4%)	85 (62.5%)	4.54
CDP facilitates collaborative collection development	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	11 (8.1%)	38 (27.9%)	86 (63.2)	4.54
CDP facilitates global or international cooperation and networking	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.2%)	7 (5.1%)	42 (30.9%)	84 (61.8%)	4.52
CDP ensures continuity in selection process even with change in fund and staff	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.7%)	11 (8.1%)	33 (24.3%)	87 (64.0%)	4.49
CDP allows selection decisions to be justified and evaluated	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.7%)	11 (8.1%)	32 (23.5%)	88 (64.7%)	4.49
CDP helps library to reject sectarian or potential offensive materials	0 (0.0%)	7 (5.1%)	9 (6.6%)	30 (22.1%)	90 (66.2%)	4.49
CDP facilitates communication between library and users	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.5%)	10 (7.4%)	40 (29.4)	83 (61.0%)	4.49
CDP demonstrates to users what they can expect in terms of collections and services	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.5%)	13 (9.6%)	40 (29.4%)	81 (59.6%)	4.47
CDP demonstrates to users what libraries do with their funds	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.2%)	15 (11.0)	40 (29.4%)	77 (56.6%)	4.39
CDP saves library budget by describing the reasons for acquisition of each material	0 (0.0%)	6 (4.4%)	14 (10.3)	37 (27.2%)	79 (58.1%)	4.39
CDP outlines criteria for weeding of materials	2 (1.5%)	7 (5.1%)	12 (8.8%)	31 (22.8%)	84 (61.8%)	4.38
CDP helps library to determine priorities when financial resource is limited	1 (0.7%)	6 (4.4%)	7 (5.1%)	48 (35.3%)	74 (54.4%)	4.38
CDP helps to describe library principles on intellectual freedom	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	24 (17.6%)	35 (25.7%)	76 (55.9%)	4.37
CDP helps to politely reject unwanted gifts	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	17 (12.5%)	34 (25.0%)	78 (57.4%)	4.35
CDP provides bases for fair allocation of resources	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.7%)	10 (7.4%)	55 (40.4%)	66 (48.5%)	4.34
CDP reduces personal bias or influence of a single selector	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.9%)	15 (11.0%)	58 (42.6%)	59 (43.4%)	4.26
Overall mean						**4.47**

*1= Not at all aware (NAAA); 2= Slightly aware (SA); 3= Somewhat Aware (SWA); 4= Moderately aware (MA); 5= Extremely aware (EA).

Table 4: Academic Librarians' Knowledge of CDP

Item statements	NAAK	SK	SWK	MK	HK	Mean
CDP describes the scope of library collection	10 (7.4%)	15 (11.0%)	16 (11.8%)	38 (27.9)	57 (41.9%)	3.86
CDP describe the overall objective of the library and that of the parent institution	14 (10%)	12 (8.8%)	10 (7.4%)	52 (38%)	48 (35.3%)	3.79
CDP describe the number and types of users served	10 (7.4%)	12 (8.8%)	23 (16.9%)	44 (32.4%)	47 (34.6%)	3.78
CDP describe the purpose of the policy	13 (9.6%)	14 (10.3%)	19 (14.0%)	42 (30.9%)	48 (35.3%)	3.72
CDP describe the criteria for selection of the library materials	16 (11.8%)	14 (10.3%)	12 (8.8%)	45 (33.1)	49 (36.0)	3.71
CDP describes the unit or person responsible for selecting library materials	14 (10.3)	16 (11.8%)	11 (8.1%)	52 (38.2)	43 (31.6)	3.69
CDP describes methods for evaluating the strength and weaknesses of the collection	16 (11.8)	15 (11.0%)	13 (9.6%)	44 (32.4)	48 (35.3)	3.68
CDP describes the timetable for review of the overall policy	15 (11.0%)	16 (11.8%)	18 (13.2%)	37 (27.2%)	50 (36.8%)	3.67
CDP describes the library principles on intellectual freedom or copyright	13 (9.6%)	12 (8.8%)	21 (15.4%)	52 (38.2%)	38 (27.9%)	3.66
CDP describes the budget library will spend on various materials	12 (8.8%)	17 (12.5%)	18 (13.2%)	48 (35.3%)	41 (30.1%)	3.65
CDP describes the criteria for weeding and disposal of unwanted materials	13 (9.6%)	18 (13.2%)	12 (8.8%)	54 (39.7%)	39 (28.7%)	3.65
CDP describes the timetable for evaluation of library materials	16 (11.8%)	14 (10.3%)	16 (11.8%)	48 (35.3%)	42 (30.9%)	3.63
CDP describes the subjects of library materials using a classification scheme	14 (10.3%)	23 (16.9%)	9 (6.6%)	46 (33.8%)	44 (32.4%)	3.61
CDP describes the policy implementation process or procedure	14 (10.3%)	18 (13.2%)	16 (11.8%)	48 (35.3%)	40 (29.4%)	3.60
CDP describes the special sources of funds such as grants or donations	14 (10.3%)	18 (13.2%)	17 (12.5%)	49 (36.0%)	38 (27.9%)	3.58
CDP describes the criteria for acceptance or rejection of gift and donation	15 (11.0%)	14 (10.3%)	23 (16.9%)	46 (33.8%)	38 (27.9%)	3.57
CDP describes the library collection priorities or collection intensity level	15 (11.0%)	17 (12.5%)	18 (13.2%)	47 (34.6%)	39 (28.7%)	3.57
CDP describes policy approval statement by senior management	13 (9.6%)	18 (13.2%)	27 (19.9%)	42 (30.9%)	36 (26.5%)	3.51
CDP describes the cooperative programs library is involved	15 (11.0%)	14 (10.3%)	37 (27.2%)	35 (25.7%)	35 (25.7%)	3.45
Overall mean						**3.65**

*1= Not at all knowledgeable (NAAK); 2= Slightly knowledgeable (SK); 3= Somewhat knowledgeable (SWK); 4= moderately knowledgeable (MK); 5= Highly knowledgeable (HK).

Importance of Education and Experience on CDP Awareness and Knowledge

Spearman's correlational test was employed to answer research question 3 and to test the two (2) alternative hypotheses. "Spearman's rho correlational test is a nonparametric test that states the relationship between variables when the distribution of the data is not normal and when both variables are in ordinal scale which is arranged according to scale" (Chua 2013). The reason for conducting this nonparametric test was due to the abnormality of the dependent variables (awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP) on the independent variables (educational level and working experience). The Spearman's rho correlational test was used to determine whether academic librarians' educational level and working experience have a significant influence on their awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP. 0.05 was used as a significant level of which determined the decision to accept (< .05) or reject the formulated hypothesis.

The result for Spearman correlation analysis (Table 5) showed that academic librarians' educational level had a significant influence on their awareness on the importance (r = .298**, p = .000) and knowledge of CDP (r = .202**, p = .009). This means that academic librarians' educational level contributes to their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. Based on this result, the study accepts hypothesis 1 (H1). Also, the Spearman correlation analysis indicated that academic librarians' working experience had no influence on their awareness on the importance (r = .111, p = .100) and knowledge of CDP (r = -.044, p = .307). This means that academic librarians' working experience does not contribute to their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. Based on this result, the study rejected hypothesis 2 (H2).

Table 5: Influence of Education and Experience on the CDP Awareness and Knowledge

Spearman's rho		Awareness of CDP	Knowledge of CDP
Educational level	Spearman correlation	.298**	r = .202**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	p = .009
	N	136	N = 136
Working experience	Spearman correlation	r = .111	r = -.044
	Sig. (1-tailed)	p = .100	p = .307
	N	136	N = 136

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study have highlighted several important issues. First, the finding found that academic librarians had a high level of awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP. These findings suggest that academic librarians in Nigeria were aware of the importance of the use of CDP in developing library collections and had a basic knowledge of the elements needed for CDP. The finding contradicts previous studies (Adriaanse 2015; Ghalib 2014; Kanwal 2006; Sambo et al. 2014), where the respondents perceived CDP as important but were limited regarding their knowledge. The high level of knowledge in this study could be a result of the academic librarians' high level of awareness of the importance of this topic. Empirical studies have supported that one who is aware of the importance of something would seek and therefore, have a greater knowledge of it than someone who is not (Hamilton 1983; Rothe 2009). Also, academic librarians' educational level might have played a role in their knowledge of CDP, with more than half of the respondents having a master's degree. Therefore, various educational programs and interventions are necessary to continue to improve the awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP among library professionals in Nigeria.

Second, the correlational findings showed that academic librarians' educational level had a significant influence on their awareness on the importance (p = .000) and knowledge of CDP (p = .009). These findings suggest that the more education academic librarians have, especially in relation to CDP, the more awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP they are likely to have. In other words, providing academic librarians with more educational training on CDP will increase their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. The findings were consistent with previous studies (Chua et al. 2018; Farooq et al. 2015; Öğütçü et al. 2016) where educational level had a positive influence on the awareness of information security policies. The findings were also consistent with

studies conducted in the health profession (Byrd et al. 2012; Primomo 2007; Primomo and Björling 2013; Rains and Carroll 2000), where the educational level had a positive relationship with the awareness, knowledge, and possible engagement in health policy development. Therefore, academic librarians should be encouraged to further their education through incentives, such as tuition fees waivers and flexible work schedules to accommodate the school. Library schools should also establish more collection development courses that focus more on CDP in order to continue to improve the awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP among library professionals in Nigeria.

Third, the correlational findings also indicated that academic librarians' working experience did not influence their awareness on the importance ($p = .100$) and knowledge of CDP ($p = .307$). This finding suggests that the duration academic librarians worked in the library did not influence their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. The findings contradicted studies in the health profession (Jang et al. 2017; Kim et al. 2013), where work experience had a positive impact on the awareness on patient safety management policy. The findings also contradict several other studies where work experience significantly influenced the knowledge of health policy development (Kunaviktikul et al. 2010; Spitzer and Golander 2001). This could be possible that as academic librarians work in the library over the years, they rarely or never engaged in CDP training. This is supported by Ericsson and Lehmann (1996) that the duration one has worked in a particular area is not in itself an indication of one's awareness or knowledge of the area, however, what is important is the training one engaged in while working in the area. That is to say, if the academic librarians are not taught or trained on CDP, their level of awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP is likely to remain the same. Therefore, continuing education is necessary to continue to improve the awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP among academic librarians in Nigeria. This continuing education could be in the form of conferences, workshops and seminars regarding CDP.

CONCLUSIONS

This study was conducted to assess Nigerian academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP and to determine whether academic librarians' educational level and working experience influence their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. The findings of the study revealed that academic librarians had a high level of awareness of the importance and knowledge of CDP. This means that academic librarians were aware of the importance of the use of CDP and were knowledgeable about the elements necessary for CDP. Also, the finding revealed that academic librarians' educational level influenced their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP. However, academic librarians' working experience did not influence their awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP.

This finding contributes significantly to the existing literature by providing useful and reliable information on the awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP among academic librarians in Nigeria. The finding is also important to academic library management to make informed decisions associated with CDP training. It is expected that such training would not only result in greater awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP but also in formulating and sustaining functional CDPs which could help to provide the solution to the collection development challenges facing academic libraries in Nigeria. Also, library schools would benefit from this study by providing more collection development courses that would give more focus on collection development policy.

Although the results are important to the literature, management of academic libraries and library schools, this study was limited in sample size. Replicating this study with multiple respondents in the participating libraries, including other federal libraries, state or private libraries would help in validating the findings of this study. Also, a comparative study would allow a comparison between Nigerian academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of CDP with that of academic librarians in other countries. Further research is also needed to determine if there were differences in responses among the institutions which could be attributed to the more concerted effort made by each library in educating librarians, especially in relation to CDP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Adekanmbi, A.R. 2007. Availability and use of collection development policies in colleges of education libraries, Botswana. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, Vol. 17, no. 1: 45-52.

Adriaanse, M.A. 2015. *The responsiveness of collection development to community needs in the City of Cape Town Library and Information Service*. (Master's Thesis), University of the Western Cape, Cape Town.

American Library Association (ALA). 1996. *Guide for written collection policy statements (2nd Ed.)*, Chicago: ALA.

Alenezi, A.R., Abdul Karim, A.M. and Veloo, A. 2010. An empirical investigation into the role of enjoyment, computer anxiety, computer self-efficacy and internet experience in influencing the students' intention to use e-learning: a case study from Saudi Arabian governmental universities. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, Vol. 9, no.4: 22-34.

Benner, P. and Benner, P.E. 1984. *From novice to expert: excellence and power in clinical nursing practice, volume 100* (20th Ed.), Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Bobay, K., Gentile, D.L. and Hagle, M.E. 2009. The relationship of nurses' professional characteristics to levels of clinical nursing expertise. *Applied Nursing Research*, Vol. 22, no. 1: 48-53. Available at: doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2007.03.005.

Byrd, M.E., Costello, J., Gremel, K., Schwager, J., Blanchette, L. and Malloy, T.E. 2012. Political astuteness of baccalaureate nursing students following an active learning experience in health policy. *Public Health Nursing*, Vol. 29, no. 5: 433-443.

Castrucci, B.C., Leider, J.P. and Sellers, K. 2015. Perceptions regarding importance and skill at policy development among public health staff. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice*, Vol. 21, Suppl 6: S141-S150.

Chaputula, A.H. and Kanyundo, A.J. 2014. Collection development policy: how its absence has affected collection development practices at Mzuzu University Library. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, Vol. 46, no. 4: 317-325.

Choi, J.H., Lee, K.M. and Lee, M.A. 2010. Relationship between hospital nurses' perceived patient safety culture and their safety care activities. *Journal of Korean Academy of Fundamentals of Nursing*, Vol. 17, no. 1: 64.

Chua, H.N., Wong, S.F., Low, Y.C. and Chang, Y.H. 2018. Impact of employees' demographic characteristics on the awareness and compliance of information security policy in organizations. *Telematics and Informatics*, Vol. 35, no. 6: 1770-1780. Available at: doi: 10.1016/j.tele.2018.05.005.

Chua, Y.P. 2013. *Mastering research statistics,* Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Mc Graw Hill Education.

Corrall, S. and Roberts, A. 2012. Information resource development and "collection" in the digital age: conceptual frameworks and new definitions for the network world. In *Changes in the electronic resources: Information and digitization*, 20 – 22 June 2012, Zadar, Croatia. Available at: http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/25171/1/ Corrall_%26_Roberts_%282012%29.pdf.

Cox, E.C. 2014. *An assessment of college students' knowledge of the importance and awareness of family health history.* (Master's Thesis), Howard University, Washington D. C.

Demas, S. and Miller, M.E. 2012. Rethinking collection management plans: shaping collective collections for the 21st century. *Collection Management*, Vol. 37, no. 3-4: 168-187. Available at: doi: 10.1080/01462679.2012.685415.

DeVellis, R.F. 2017. *Scale development: theory and applications* (4th Ed.), Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Douglas, C.S. 2011. Revising a collection development policy in a rapidly changing environment. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, Vol. 8, no. 1: 15-21.

Ericsson, K.A. and Lehmann, A.C. 1996. Expert and exceptional performance: evidence of maximal adaptation to task constraints. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 47, no. 1: 273-305. Available at: doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.273.

Evans, G.E. 2000. *Developing library and information center collection* (4th Ed.), Library and Information Science Text Series. Englewood, NJ: Libraries Unlimited.

Farooq, A., Isoaho, J., Virtanen, S. and Isoaho, J. 2015. Observations on genderwise differences among university students in information security awareness. *International Journal of Information Security and Privacy (IJISP)*, Vol. 9, no. 2: 60-74. Available at: doi: 10.4018/IJISP.2015040104.

Fombad, M. and Mutula, S.M. 2003. Collection development practices at the University of Botswana Library (UBL). *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, Vol. 8, no. 1: 65-76. Available at: https://mjlis.um.edu.my/index.php/ MJLIS/article/view/6846.

Fought, R.L., Gahn, P. and Mills, Y. 2014. Promoting the library through the collection development policy: a case study. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, Vol. 11, no. 4: 169-178. Available at: doi: 10.1080/15424065.2014.969031.

Ghalib, K. 2014. *Collection management in the university libraries: policies, procedures and users' satisfaction.* (PhD diss.), The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan.

Gulnaz and Fatima, N. 2019. Collection development practice in Indian Institute of Technology libraries of Eastern India: a study. *Collection and Curation*, Vol. 38, no. 2: 25-31. Available at: doi: 10.1108/CC-08-2018-0015.

Haider, S.I. 2007. The library scenario and management problems in Pakistan libraries. *Library Administration and Management*, Vol. 21, no. 4: 172-177.

Hamilton, J.P. III. 1983. *Some relationships among knowledge, locus of control, perceived importance, and perceived personal responsibility regarding environmental problems*. (PhD diss.), The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania.

Hodonu-Wusu, J.O., Noorhidawati, A. and Abrizah, A. 2020. Malaysian researchers on open data: the first national survey on awareness, practices and attitudes. *Malaysian Journal of Library and Information Science*, Vol. 25, no. 2: 1-20.

Hollingum, J. 2013. Collection development policies in law firm libraries: Do we need them? *Legal Information Management*, Vol. 13, no. 1: 62-65. Available at: doi: 10.1017/S147266961300011X.

IFLA Acquisition and Collection Development Section. 2001. *Guidelines for a collection development policy using the Conspectus Model* (pp. 1-11), United Kingdom: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). Available at: https://repository.ifla.org/handle/123456789/52.

Jang, H.E., Song, Y.S. and Kang, H.Y. 2017. Nurses' perception of patient safety culture and safety control in patient safety management activities. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 23, no. 4: 450-459. Available at: doi: 10.11111/jkana.2017.23.4.450.

Johnson, P. 2018. *Fundamentals of collection development and management* (4th Ed.), Chicago: American Library Association.

Kanwal, A. 2006. University libraries in Pakistan and status of collection management policy: views of library managers. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, Vol. 30, no. 3-4: 154-161. Available at: doi: 10.1016/j.lcats.2006.12.003.

Khan, G. and Bhatti, R. 2016. An analysis of collection development in the university libraries of Pakistan. *Collection Building*, Vol. 35, no. 1: 22-34. Available at: doi: 10.1108/CB-07-2015-0012.

Kim, I.S., Park, M.J., Park, M.Y., Yoo, H. and Choi, J. 2013. Factors affecting the perception of importance and practice of patient safety management among hospital employees in Korea. *Asian Nursing Research*, Vol. 7, no. 1: 26-32. Available at: doi: 10.1016/j.anr.2013.01.001.

Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 30, no. 3: 607-610. Available at: doi: 10.1177/001316447003000308.

Kunaviktikul, W., Nantsupawat, R., Sngounsiritham, U., Akkadechanunt, T., Chitpakdee, B., Wichaikhum, O.A., Wonglieukirati, R., Chontawan, R., Keitlertnapha, P., Thungaraenkul, P., Abhicharttibutra, K., Sanluang, C.S., Lirtmunlikaporn, S. and Chaowalaksakun, P. 2010. Knowledge and involvement of nurses regarding health policy development in Thailand. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, Vol. 12, no. 2: 221-227. Available at: doi: 10.1111/j.1442-2018.2010.00523.x.

Levenson, H.N. 2019. Nimble collection development policies: an achievable goal. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, Vol. 63, no. 4: 206-219. Available at: https://journals.ala.org/index.php/lrts/article/view/6785/9782.

Mishra, R.N. and Ngurtinkhuma, R.K. 2015. Collection development and management of e-resources: issues and challenges for librarians in digital environment. *VSRD International Journal of Technical and Non-Technical Research*, Vol. 6: 53-61.

Nwosu, C.C. and Udo-Anyanwu, A.J. 2015. Collection development in academic libraries in Imo State Nigeria: status analysis and way forward. *International Journal of Advanced Library and Information Science*, Vol. 3, no. 1: 126-135. Available at: doi: 10.23953/cloud.ijalis.241.

Öğütçü, G., Testik, O.M. and Chouseinoglou, O. 2016. Analysis of personal information security behavior and awareness. Vol. 56: 83-93. Available at: doi: 10.1016/j.cose.2015.10.002.

Park, S.J., Kang, J.Y. and Lee, Y.O. 2012. A study on hospital nurses' perception of patient safety culture and safety care activity. *Journal of Korean Critical Care Nursing*, Vol. 5, no. 1: 44-55.

Patel, S. 2016. Collection development in academic libraries. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, Vol. 8, no. 7: 62-67. Available at: doi: 10.5897/IJLIS2015.0601.

Pexton, M. 2015. Current trends in the use of collection development policies in law firm libraries. *Legal Information Management*, Vol. 15, no. 3: 160-164. Available at: doi: 10.1017/S1472669615000390.

Pfohl, I. 2018. Building an academic library collection in a developing country. *Collection Management*, Vol. 43, no. 1: 64-77. Available at: doi: 10.1080/01462679.2017.1388204.

Pickett, C., Stephens, J., Kimball, R., Ramirez, D., Thornton, J. and Burford, N. 2011. Revisiting an abandoned practice: the death and resurrection of collection development policies. *Collection Management*, Vol. 36, no. 3: 165-181. Available at: doi: 10.1080/01462679.2011.580426.

Primomo, J. 2007. Changes in political astuteness after a health systems and policy course. *Nurse Educator*, Vol. 32, no. 6: 260-264. Available at: doi: 10.1097/01.nne.0000299480.54506.44.

Primomo, J. and Björling, E.A. 2013. Changes in political astuteness following nurse legislative day. *Policy, Politics & Nursing Practice*, Vol. 14, no. 2: 97-108. Available at: doi: 10.1177/1527154413485901.

Rains, J.W. and Carroll, K.L. 2000. The effect of healthy policy education on self-perceived political competence of graduate nursing students. *Journal of Nursing Education*, Vol. 39, no. 1: 37-40.

Rothe, L.F. 2009. *Evidence and expectations: a look into how DNA impacts jury decisions in criminal trials*. (Masters thesis), University of Maryland, College Park. Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/1903/9307.

Sambo, A.S., Abu-Udenyi, H., Urhefe, E.A. and Yakubu, M.D. 2014. *Collection development policy of e-resources in Nigeria libraries: certified librarians perception.* Information and Knowledge Management. Vol. 4, no. 9: 25-34. Available at: https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/IKM/article/view/15648.

Silber, K. 1999. Every library is special and so is its collection development policy. *AALL Spectrum,* Vol. 4, no. 4: 10-38.

Spitzer, A. and Golander, H. 2001. Israeli nurses' knowledge of health care reforms. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 36, no. 2: 175-187. Available at: doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01958.x.

Swart, R.P., Pretorius, R. and Klopper, H. 2015. Educational background of nurses and their perceptions of the quality and safety of patient care. *Curationis*, Vol. 38, no. 1: 1126. Available at: doi: 10.4102/curationis.v38i1.1126.

Tilden, V.P. and Tilden, S. 1985. Book Review: Benner, P. (1984). From novice to expert: excellence and power in clinical nursing practice. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 307 pp., $12.95 (soft cover). *Research in Nursing & Health*, Vol. 8, no. 1: 95-97. Available at: doi: 10.1002/nur.4770080119.

Umar, Y.M. and Bakare, O.A. 2018. Assessment of collection development policy in academic libraries: case study of National Open University of Nigeria. *Information Technologist*, Vol. 15, no. 1.

van Zijl, C. 1998. The why, what, and how of collection development policies. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, Vol. 66, no. 3: 99-106. Available at: doi: 10.7553/66-3-1438.

Vignau, B.S.S. and Meneses, G. 2005. Collection development policies in university libraries: a space for reflection. *Collection Building*, Vol. 24, no. 1: 35-43. Available at: doi: 10.1108/01604950510576119.

APPENDIX

Informed Consent Form

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am currently conducting a study on "awareness of the importance and knowledge of collection development policy among academic librarians in Nigeria". Given your experience, I invite you to be a respondent for my study to answer the attached questionnaire for gathering the necessary data. By responding to the enclosed questionnaire, you will provide essential information about your awareness of the importance and knowledge of collection development policy.

Please be assured that all your responses will remain confidential and are solely used for academic research only. If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please contact Mr. Yakubu Buhari (email to buharitbk89@gmail.com).

Thank you very much for your participation and for providing complete and accurate information for this study. I appreciate your effort and time to answer this questionnaire.

CONSENT

I have read and understood the information provided and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and without cost. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

Participant's signature: _____

Date : _____

Investigator's signature: _____

 Date _____

Assessing academic librarians' awareness on the importance and knowledge of collection development policy in Nigeria

Questionnaire

The survey has three sections - sections A to C. Answer all sections.
Please select the option by ticking the ( ) or write in the space provided.

Section A: **Demographic Information (Mark Only One)**
1) What is your gender?
   a. Male   [ ]
   b. Female   [ ]

2) What is your age?
   a. Below 30 years [ ]
   b. 31 – 40 years   [ ]
   c. 41 – 50 years   [ ]
   d. 51 and above   [ ]

3) Please indicate your institution
   _____

4) What is your highest qualification?
   a. Bachelor Degree   [ ]
   b. Master degree   [ ]
   c. Ph.D.   [ ]

5) How many years have you been working in an academic library?
   a. Below 10 years   [ ]
   b. 11 – 20 years   [ ]
   c. 21 to above   [ ]

Section B: Awareness of the Importance of Collection Development Policy
Based on IFLA Guidelines, the following are the importance of collection development policy in developing library collection. Please indicate your awareness level of the importance of collection development policy.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all aware	**Slightly aware**	**Somewhat aware**	**Moderately aware**	**Extremely aware**

No	Items	1	2	3	4	5
	Collection development policy is important to …………….					
1	Outline the criteria for selecting print and non-print material					
2	Reduce the personal bias or influence of a single selector					
3	Ensure continuity in the selection process even if there is a change in fund and staff					
4	Allow selection decisions to be justified and evaluated					
5	Provide a sound foundation for future planning					
6	Help to determine priorities especially when financial resources are limited					
7	Save library budget by describing reasons for acquiring each material					
8	Ensure fair allocation of resources among subjects and formats of materials					
9	Facilitate communication between library and users					
10	Facilitate communication between library and funding agencies					
11	Help library to handle challenges from users regarding the selection and rejection of certain materials					
12	Help library to handle challenges from funding bodies regarding the selection and rejection of certain materials					
13	Demonstrate to the community of users what a libraries do with their allocated funds					
14	Demonstrate to the funding agency what a libraries do with their allocated fund					
15	Demonstrate to users what they expect in terms of collections and services					
16	Help the library to reject sectarian or potential offensive materials					
17	Outline the criteria for weeding of print and non-print materials					
18	Help to describes the position of a library on the principle of intellectual freedom					
19	Help the library to politely but firmly reject unwanted gifts					
20	Facilitate local and interlibrary cooperation and networking					
21	Facilitate global or international cooperation and networking					
22	Facilitate collaborative development of library resources					

Section C: Knowledge Level of Collection Development Policy

Based on IFLA Guidelines, an effective collection development policy (CDP) should have standard elements and include sections that address various issues related to collection development. Please indicate your knowledge level of the elements necessary for a written collection development policy.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	**Slightly**	**Somewhat**	**Moderately**	**Highly**
knowledgeable	knowledgeable	knowledgeable	knowledgeable	knowledgeable

No	Items	1	2	3	4	5
	The elements of collection development policy include ……………					
1	Description of the overall objectives of the library and that of the parent institution					
2	Description of the purpose of writing the policy					
3	Description of the users' community (the number and types of users serve)					
4	Description of the scope of library collection (size and formats of the materials)					
5	Description of the criteria of selecting library materials					
6	Description of the unit or person(s) responsible for selecting library materials.					
7	Description of the library collection priorities or collection intensity level					
8	Description of the methods of evaluating strength and weaknesses of the collection					
9	Description of the timetable for evaluation of the library materials					
10	Description of the library principles on intellectual freedom and copyright issues					
11	Description of the budget summary library will spend on various materials					
12	Description of the subjects of library materials using a classification scheme					
13	Description of the criteria for the weeding and disposal of unwanted materials					
14	Description of the special sources of funds such as grants or donations					
15	Description of the criteria for acceptance or rejection of gift and donation					
16	Description of the cooperative programs in which the library is involved					
17	Description of the timetable for policy review/revision					
18	Description of the procedure or process of policy implementation					
19	Description of the statement of policy approval by senior management					