

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

Summer 7-21-2021

## Perception and Participation of Faculty Members in Collection Development: A Comparative Study of Five Universities in North India

Har Singh

*Assistant Librarian, Central Library, Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology, Patiala, Punjab-147004, India, infoisil07@gmail.com*

Prof. Preeti Mahajan

*Panjab University, Chandigarh, India*

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



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

---

Singh, Har and Mahajan, Prof. Preeti, "Perception and Participation of Faculty Members in Collection Development: A Comparative Study of Five Universities in North India" (2021). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 6082.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6082>

# **Perception and Participation of Faculty Members in Collection Development: A Comparative Study of Five Universities in North India**

## **Abstract**

The study's objective was to investigate the faculty members' (FM) awareness, perception, participation in collection development, and satisfaction from the library collection in selected university libraries of North India. The questionnaire method was used to collect the data (which included dichotomous questions and a five-point Likert scale) from the faculty members (FMs) of all disciplines from five universities of Northern India, i.e., Maharishi Dayanand University (MDU) (Rohtak) and Kurukshetra University (KU) (Kurukshetra) from the State, of Haryana Panjab University (PU) from Union Territory of Chandigarh and Punjabi University (PbiU) (Patiala) and Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU) (Amritsar) from the state of Punjab. The FMs were selected using the 'Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling Technique.' Collected data was analyzed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Chi-Square test. The results show a significant difference in awareness of collection development policy among the FMs across the libraries. A significant difference was also found in the recommendation of textbooks, reference books, journals, and magazines. In contrast, the similarity was found in recommendations of e-resources among the faculty members across the libraries. FMs across the libraries have the same opinion for the adequacy of library collection except for e-resources. The faculty members (FMs) across the libraries were highly satisfied with their respective libraries' print and electronic collections. The outcomes of this study will certainly help the library authorities and management to understand the awareness of faculty members (FMs) about the collection development process such as collection development policy (CDP) of the library, kind of resources FMs recommend, FMs assessment on adequacy of different kind of resources and their satisfaction from it.

**Keywords:** Collection Development, Collection Building, Collection Development Policy, Faculty Members Perception, Faculty Members participation in Collection Development, University Libraries, India

## **Introduction**

Collection development is the planned purchase of print and electronic material in a library, in fact to fulfill the needs of different kinds of users. Andrade and Vergueiro (1996) stated that collection development and management responsibilities include selection,

acquisition of the material in print and electronic format, selection of the vendors, negotiating contracts to access e-resources. Collection development is a mix of activities that include planning, recommendation, acquisition, preservation, maintenance, and library collection evaluation. The collection development criteria of print resources in libraries include acquisition of books through purchase, donations or gifts, institutional membership, etc., and acquisition of journals/ periodicals through subscription, exchange, and membership of a professional organization, etc. In the modern era, print collections like books, journals, reference materials, microfilms, etc., are increasingly supplemented by information resources accessible through e-mode such as e-books, e-journals, e-databases, etc. The demand of the users for such format is also increasing due to its several advantages over print format such as resolving the space problem, round-the-clock availability, multiple access, etc. All these elements of collection development are well guided by a manual called Collection Development Policy (CDP). It defines the objectives of a library, different kinds of material to be acquired, users' needs, priorities of the library, curriculum support, and other important guidelines. Collection development policies and strategies for both print and electronic documents are required to govern the acquisition program. This includes planning, selection, acquisition, processing, budget, etc. CDP also describes the recommendation rights of the faculty members and other users of the library. Collection development has continuously been a joint responsibility of librarians and faculty members (Rahman & Darus, 2014). The librarians and faculty members should work more closely with each other to collect the library's collection development (Strauch, 1990; Yang, 1991; Riggs, 1995; Hurt, Rein et al. (1995); Chu, 1995). Libraries must involve faculty members especially subject specialists in shaping and developing library collections (Stoller, 2005). The selection of library material includes finding out the appropriate selection tools, followed by the recommendation of the resources by the faculty members (Khan & Bhatti, 2016). Therefore, the present study tends to find out the faculty members' (FM) awareness of the collection development, such as assessment, participation, satisfaction, and challenges faced during resource recommendation.

There is a need for perception and assessment of users' needs, continuous evaluation, and improvement of the library collection, etc. The academic librarians can balance the hybrid collection (print and electronic) by involving their teaching fraternity, continuous evaluation of collection, adopting feedback mechanisms, etc. In light of the above facts, a need was felt to research the topic “*Faculty Members Perception and Participation in Collection Development of University Libraries-A Comparative Study.*” Therefore, it is very significant

that the collection development process of different university libraries be examined by keeping in mind the participating faculty members. Consequently, the study demonstrates the extent of faculty member's involvement in the collection development and their satisfaction.

## **Review of literature**

The faculty members' (FMs) participation in collection development has been studied from time to time. Some such studies across the globe have been reviewed and categorized below in chronological order:

### *Collection Development Policy (CDP)*

Gessesse (2000) highlighted that academic libraries should prepare and review the CDP for print and e-resources. Gunasekara (2003) highlighted that out of 15 university libraries in Sri Lanka, and most university libraries do not have a clear and formal policy regarding print and e-resources. Vickery (2004) analyzed the various arguments and theories for written CDP, including ALA statement, ARL statement, statements given by Futas, McGuigan, and White. Vignau and Meneses (2005) found that only three libraries had a CDP in a documented form. Kanwal (2006) found that only seven libraries (24%) had the CDP in written form. However, these libraries did not have the guidelines for book loss, writing-off books, etc. Adekanmbi (2007) found that out of 6 college libraries in Botswana, 4 libraries had CDP in written form. Joshi, Konnur, and Shinde (2012) examined the collection development policy of six university libraries in Karnataka from 2005 to 2009 and noted that four universities had collection development policies in written form. Singh and Mahajan (2015) indicated that the majority of the respondents (92.5%) from PU (Chandigarh) and none of the respondents from PbiU (Patiala) were aware of the CDP of their respective libraries.

### *Participation in collection development*

FMs of most of the libraries (97%) were actively involved in selecting library resources in the university libraries of Pakistan. Lack of awareness about electronic resources and their selection in the library were some of the restrictions in collection development (Ameen & Haider, 2007). 50% FMs of the Physics department at the University of Minnesota actively participated in the "Book Acquisition Survey" for two weeks (Jensen, 2009). The FMs in all the four Central Universities in UP (India) had the highest control on selecting resources in the library (Khan, 2010). 178 FMs (67.9%) recommended the resources for the library, and 79 FMs

(30.2%) suggested the procurement of library resources frequently. In comparison, 8 FMs (3.1%) never made any suggestion for procurement of material in the library of Maulana Azad Library, AMU (India) (Khan & Zaidi, 2011). 85.86% of librarians selected the library material with the consultation of faculty members, and 71.73% FMs recommended print and non-print resources for the library (Caborero & Mayrena, 2012). The selection of library resources was made by the FMs (Kasalu & Ojiambo, 2012). 21% FMs selected the resources at the five university libraries in Imo State, Nigeria (Nwosu & Udo-Anyanwu, 2015). The selection of library material included finding out the appropriate selection tools, followed by the recommendation of the resources by the faculty members (Khan & Bhatti, 2016). 4% of faculty members recommended the books and other resources frequently, 8% sometimes, 17% rarely, 21% never recommended the books and other resources, whereas 50% of faculty members were not aware of the recommended procedure of the library resources at the American University of Armenia. 10% of faculty members frequently, 33% sometimes, 20% rarely, 20% never recommended the books and other resources, whereas 17% of faculty members were not aware of the recommended procedures of the library resources at the Yerevan State University (Donabedian *et al.*, 2020). Faculty members found that 80% of librarians were helpful in the procurement of resources recommended by them during the library collection development process (Weng & Murary, 2020).

#### *Satisfaction from the library collection*

Korobili *et al.* (2006) found that FMs often use print and e-resources at Technological Educational Institute (Greece). 45 FMs (51.13%) found books and print periodicals partially adequate, 53 FMs (60.22%) found online databases and e-resources inadequate in the library. The majority of the 54 FMs (61.36%) were dissatisfied with the e-journals subscribed at the library of Mangalore University (India) (Mallaiah & Gowda, 2009). Ali & Nisha (2011) found that 31% of users preferred e-journals, 45% preferred print journals, whereas 24% used both at the University of Delhi. Okiki (2012) found that 55% FMs were not fully aware of the subscribed e-resources at the University of Lagos (Nigeria). Users' feedback regularly was a significant step towards renewing the existing e-resources (Bullis & Smith, 2011). 12.2% of lecturers were very satisfied, whereas 24.5% of lecturers were not satisfied with the library collection at the National Open University of Nigeria (Umar & Bakare, 2018).

The literature review thus demonstrates that the faculty members participate in the collection development, selection process, and satisfaction from their respective library

collections. Furthermore, the review of the literature indicates that a maximum number of studies on collection development in libraries and related areas have been undertaken worldwide, revealing the status of collection development of those countries. Although some of the studies on collection development have been undertaken in India, most of them are limited to the different parts of India, limited to a single library. Hence, there is a strong need to understand the collection development, involvement of faculty members, challenges faced by libraries in collection development, and issues faced by the faculty members during the recommendation process. Therefore, the present study attempts to understand the awareness and participation of research scholars and faculty members in the collection development process at five universities of Northern India.

### **Objectives**

- To investigate faculty members' awareness about the collection development policy (CDP) of libraries.
- To investigate faculty members' participation in collection development across the libraries.
- To investigate faculty members' assessment on adequacy of library collection across the libraries.
- To find out faculty members' satisfaction from the print and electronic collection across the libraries.

### **Hypotheses**

- Ho1** There is no significant difference in awareness of collection development policy (CDP) among the faculty members across the libraries.
- Ho2** There is no significant difference in the recommendation of resources among the faculty members across the libraries.
- Ho3** There is no significant difference in the adequacy of library collection among the faculty members across the libraries.
- Ho4** There is no significant difference in satisfaction from the print and electronic collection among the faculty members across the libraries.

## **Brief profile of five university libraries**

The study included five university libraries of North India, namely Maharishi Dayanand University (MDU) (Rohtak) and Kurukshetra University (KU) (Kurukshetra) from the state of Haryana, Panjab University (PU) from Union Territory of Chandigarh, and Punjabi University (PbiU) (Patiala) and Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU) (Amritsar) from the state of Punjab. MDU library holds 375000 books, more than 25000 e-books, 15000 e-journals, approximately 56000 bound volumes, 450 current journals, and magazines. KU library has more than 401500 resources which include books, bound periodicals, and 15000 manuscripts. It has more than 8000 e-journals, 230 current journals, etc. PU library holds more than 650000 resources, including printed books, bound volumes of periodicals, reports, government publications, theses/dissertations, and manuscripts. It subscribes to more than 600 current journals/magazines in print form, more than 20 e-databases, and has more than 10,000 e-journals. PbiU library has more than 560000 resources, including books, bound volumes of journals, government publications, rare collections, theses/dissertations, etc. It has 9000 e-journals, more than 1290 e-books, and more than 300 journals and magazines. GNDU library has 475000 resources, including books, bound volumes, rare books, government publications, theses/dissertations, etc. It has approximately 7500+ e-journals, more than 400 current journals. PU has more than 700 faculty members (FMs), PbiU and GNDU have more than 300 FMs, KU has more than 430 FMs, and MDU has more than 310 FMs.

## **Research methodology**

The questionnaire method was used to collect the data (which included dichotomous questions and a five-point Likert scale) from the faculty members (FMs) of all disciplines from five universities of Northern India, i.e., PU, PbiU, GNDU, KU, and MDU. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire was tested through expert opinion, focused group, and a pilot study before its distribution. The pre-testing of the research tool or instrument was carried out at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University Chandigarh, and Bhai Khan Singh Nabha Library, Punjabi University, Patiala. The FMs were selected using the "Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling Technique." Collected data was analyzed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Chi-Square test. The representative sample size of 307 faculty members (FMs) were taken out of a total population of 2040 FMs based on Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size. However, only 175 filled questionnaires were received back and selected for data analysis.

## Data analysis, findings, and discussion

### *Awareness about collection development policy (CDP) of the library*

The faculty members were asked about the understanding of CDP of their university libraries. The response received from the respondents is depicted in Table 1 below:

Awareness	PU (45)	PBIU (30)	GNDU (30)	KU (30)	MDU (40)	Total (n=175)	Pearson Chi-Square test
Yes	12 (26.7)	8 (26.7)	13 (43.3)	11 (36.7)	31 (77.5)	75 (42.9)	Chi-square = <b>28.102</b>  Df = 4  Sig. = .000
No	33 (73.3)	22 (73.3)	17 (56.7)	19 (63.3)	9 (22.5)	100 (57.1)	

*The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)*

**Table 1: Awareness about collection development policy of the library**

Table 1 indicates that maximum faculty members (FMs) from MDU (77.5%) were aware. In contrast, maximum FMs from PU and PbiU (both 73.3%) were not aware of their respective libraries' collection development policy (CDP). Overall, only 75 FMs (42.9%) were aware, whereas 100 FMs (57.1%) were not aware of the CDP of their libraries.

The calculated chi-square ( $X^2$ ) value and p-value ( $X^2= 28.102$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p\text{-value} =000^*$ ) in respect to all the university libraries shows a highly significant difference (as  $p<0.05$ ) in awareness of CDP among the faculty members across the university libraries. Hence, the null hypothesis **Ho1, "There is no significant difference in awareness of collection development policy among the faculty members across the libraries,"** is rejected. Instead, there is a significant difference in awareness of collection development policy among the FMs across the libraries.



*Category of resources recommended*

The faculty members were asked as to which category of the resources they recommend for their respective libraries. The response received from the respondents is depicted in table 2:

Recommendations		PU (45)	PBIU (30)	GNDU (30)	KU (30)	MDU (40)	Total (n=175)	Pearson Chi-Square test
Text Books	Yes	35 (77.80)	26 (86.70)	25 (83.30)	15 (50)	35 (87.50)	136 (77.70)	<b>Chi-square = 17.452</b> <b>df = 4</b> <b>Sig. = .002</b>
	No	10 (22.20)	4 (13.30)	5 (16.7)	15 (50)	5 (12.50)	39 (22.30)	
Reference Book	Yes	25 (56.60)	14 (46.70)	19 (63.30)	16 (53.30)	33 (82.50)	107 (61.10)	<b>Chi-square = 11.748</b> <b>df = 4</b> <b>Sig. = .019</b>
	No	20 (44.40)	16 (53.30)	11 (36.70)	14 (46.70)	7 (17.50)	68 (38.90)	
Journals and Magazines	Yes	14 (31.10)	8 (26.70)	13 (43.30)	9 (30)	33 (82.50)	77 (44)	<b>Chi-square = 33.146</b> <b>df = 4</b> <b>Sig. = .000</b>
	No	31 (68.90)	22 (26.70)	17 (43.30)	21 (30)	7 (82.50)	98 (56)	
E-Resources	Yes	03 (6.70)	05 (16.70)	02 (6.70)	03 (10)	06 (15)	19 (10.90)	<b>Chi-square = 3.139</b> <b>df = 4</b> <b>Sig. =.535</b>
	No	42 (93.30)	25 (83.30)	28 (93.3)	27 (90)	34 (85)	156 (89.10)	

*The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)*

**Table 2: Recommendations of Resources for the Library**

Table 2 indicates that 35 FMs (77.80%) at PU, 26 FM (86.70%) at PbiU, 25 (83.30%) at GNDU, 15 FM (50%) at KU, and 35 (87.50%) at MDU recommended textbooks. In the case of recommendation of reference books, only 14 FMs (46.70%) at PbiU recommended reference books, whereas 82.50% FMs at MDU recommended the same. 33 FMs (82.50%) at MDU and only a minimum of 8 FMs (26.70%) at PbiU recommended journals and magazines. 16.70% FMs at PbiU and only 6.70% FMs both at PU and GNDU recommended e-resources for their respective libraries. Overall, 136 FMs (77.70%), 107 FMs (61.10%), 77 FMs (44%) and 19 FMs (10.90%) recommended textbooks, reference books, journals & magazines and e-resources respectively across the libraries. The outcome of the present study is supported by the study of Ameen and Haider (2007). They found that 97% FMs of most

libraries were actively involved in selecting library resources in university libraries. Khan (2010) found the highest control of FMs on selecting resources in all the four Central Universities in UP (India). Khan and Zaidi (2011) found 67.9% FMs recommended the resources for the library. Cabonero and Mayrena (2012) found 85.86% of librarians selected the library material with the consultation of faculty members, and 71.73% FMs recommended print and non-print resources for the library. In contrast to this study, Nwosu and Udo-Anyanwu (2015) found that only 21% FMs selected the resources in the five university libraries in Imo State, Nigeria.

The calculated chi-square value ( $X^2$ ) and p-value ( $X^2= 17.452$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.002^*$ ) shows highly significant difference (because  $p<0.05$ ) in case of recommendation of textbooks by FMs. The calculated  $X^2$  value and p-value ( $X^2= 11.748$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p\text{-value} =0.019^*$ ) show a highly significant difference in the case of recommendation of reference books. The  $X^2$  value and p-value ( $X^2= 33.146$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p\text{-value} =0.000^*$ ) show a highly significant difference in journals and magazines' recommendations because  $p<0.05$ . The  $X^2$  value and p-value ( $X^2= 3.319$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p\text{-value} =0.535^c$ ) shows highly non-significant difference in case of recommendation of e-resources because  $p>0.05$ . Hence, it is evident from the above interpretation that the null hypothesis **Ho2 "There is no significant difference in the recommendation of resources among the faculty members across the libraries"** is rejected with respect to the recommendation of textbooks, reference books, journals, and magazines, whereas it is **accepted** in case of recommendation of e-resources by the FMs across the university libraries. It means a significant difference was found in the recommendation of textbooks, reference books, journals, and magazines. In contrast, the similarity was found in recommendations of e-resources among the faculty members across the libraries.

#### *Users' assessment on the adequacy of library collection*

The faculty members were asked about the adequacy and up-to-date collection of their respective libraries. The analysis of the response received from the respondents is depicted in Table 3 below:

Users Assessment		PU (45)	PBIU (30)	GNDU (30)	KU (30)	MDU (40)	Total (n=175)	Pearson Chi-Square test
Text Books	Strongly Agree	14 (31.10)	11 (36.70)	09 (30)	09 (30)	15 (37.50)	58 (33.10)	Chi-square = <b>4.637</b>  df = 16  Sig. = .997
	Agree	15 (33.30)	12 (40)	10 (33.30)	09 (30)	13 (32.50)	59 (33.70)	
	Neutral	08 (17.80)	03 (10)	06 (20)	07 (23.30)	05 (12.50)	29 (16.60)	
	Disagree	04 (8.90)	03 (10)	03 (10)	03 (10)	05 (12.50)	18 (10.30)	
	Strongly Disagree	04 (8.90)	01 (3.30)	02 (6.70)	02 (6.70)	02 (5.00)	11 (6.30)	
Reference Book	Strongly Agree	22 (48.90)	09 (30)	08 (26.70)	08 (26.70)	13 (32.50)	60 (34.30)	Chi-square = <b>12.298</b>  df = 16  Sig. = .723
	Agree	12 (26.70)	13 (43.30)	15 (50)	09 (30)	17 (42.50)	66 (37.70)	
	Neutral	05 (11.10)	05 (16.70)	03 (10)	07 (23.30)	04 (10)	24 (13.70)	
	Disagree	04 (8.90)	02 (6.70)	02 (6.70)	04 (13.30)	04 (10)	16 (9.10)	
	Strongly Disagree	02 (4.40)	01 (3.30)	02 (6.70)	02 (6.70)	02 (5)	9 (5.10)	
Journals and Magazines	Strongly Agree	16 (35.60)	10 (33.30)	8 (26.70)	3 (10)	16 (40)	53 (30.30)	Chi-square = <b>18.190</b>  df = 16  Sig. = .313
	Agree	13 (28.90)	09 (30)	10 (33.30)	08 (26.70)	12 (30)	52 (29.70)	
	Neutral	08 (17.80)	05 (16.70)	07 (23.30)	06 (20)	06 (15)	32 (18.30)	
	Disagree	06 (13.30)	06 (20)	03 (10)	11 (36.70)	04 (10)	30 (17.10)	
	Strongly Disagree	02 (4.40)	00 (00)	02 (6.70)	02 (6.70)	02 (5.00)	08 (4.60)	
E-Resources	Strongly Agree	11 (24.40)	06 (20)	02 (6.70)	01 (3.30)	04 (10)	24 (13.70)	Chi-square = <b>35.383</b>  df = 16  Sig. = .004
	Agree	23 (51.50)	05 (16.70)	08 (26.70)	08 (26.70)	14 (35)	58 (33.10)	
	Neutral	05 (11.10)	07 (23.30)	12 (40)	08 (26.70)	15 (37.50)	47 (26.90)	
	Disagree	04 (8.90)	07 (23.30)	05 (16.70)	06 (20)	05 (12.50)	27 (15.40)	
	Strongly Disagree	02 (4.40)	05 (16.70)	03 (10)	07 (23.30)	02 (5.00)	19 (10.90)	

The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)

**Table 3: Users' assessment on the adequacy of library collection**

Table 3 reveals that maximum (37.50%) FMs at MDU, whereas minimum (30%) FMs at GNDU and KU strongly agree, maximum (8.90%) FMs at PU, whereas minimum (3.30%)

FMs at PbiU strongly disagree with the adequacy of textbook collection in their respective libraries. Maximum (48.90%) FMs at PU, whereas minimum (26.70%) FMs both at GNDU and KU strongly agree, maximum (6.70%) FMs both at GNDU and KU, whereas minimum (3.30%) FMs at PbiU strongly disagree with the adequacy of the reference book collection in their respective libraries. Maximum (40%) FMs at MDU, whereas minimum (10%) FMs at KU strongly agree, maximum (6.70%) FMs both at GNDU and KU, whereas none of the FMs at PbiU strongly disagree with the adequacy of journals and magazines collection in their respective libraries. Maximum (24.40%) FMs at PU, whereas minimum (3.30%) FMs at KU strongly agree, maximum (23.30%) FMs at KU, whereas (4.40%) FMs at PU strongly disagree with the adequacy of E-resources collection in their respective library. Overall, 33.10% FMs strongly agree, and 6.30% FMs strongly disagree with the textbooks collection. 34.30% FMs strongly agree, and 5.10% FMs strongly disagree with the reference books collection. 30.30% FMs strongly agree, and 4.60% FMs strongly disagree with the journals and magazines collection. 13.70% FMs strongly agree, and 10.90% FMs strongly disagree with the e-resources collection across the university libraries. The present study also supports the study of Mallaiah and Gowda (2009), who found that 51.13% FMs found books and print periodicals partially adequate, 60.22% FMs found online databases, and e-resources inadequate in the library.

The calculated chi-square value ( $X^2$ ) and p-value ( $X^2= 4.637$ ,  $df=16$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.997^b$ ) shows highly non-significant difference as  $p > 0.05$  inadequacy of textbooks collection. The calculated  $X^2$  value and p-value ( $X^2=12.298$ ,  $df=16$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.723$ ) shows highly non-significant difference inadequacy of reference books collection. The calculated  $X^2$  value and p-value ( $X^2= 18.190$ ,  $df=16$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.313$ ) shows highly non-significant difference inadequacy of journals and magazines collection. The calculated  $X^2$  value and p-value ( $X^2= 35.383$ ,  $df=16$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.004$ ) shows highly significant difference as  $p < 0.05$  inadequacy of e-resources collection across the libraries. Hence, it is evident from the above interpretation that the null hypothesis **Ho3 "There is no significant difference in assessment on adequacy of library collection among the faculty members across the libraries"** is **accepted** concerning the adequacy of textbooks collection, reference books, and journals & magazines collection, whereas it is **rejected** in respect to the adequacy of e-resources collection. It means FMs of all the libraries have the same opinion for adequacy of library collection except e-resources.

*Satisfaction from the library collection*

The faculty members were asked about the overall satisfaction from the print and electronic collections available in their respective libraries. The analysis of the response received from the respondents is depicted in Table 4 below:

Satisfaction from the library collection		PU (45)	PBIU (30)	GNDU (30)	KU (30)	MDU (40)	Total (n=175)	Pearson Chi-Square Tests
<b>Print</b>	<b>Strongly Satisfied</b>	16 (35.60)	08 (26.70)	09 (30)	07 (23.30)	15 (37.50)	55 (31.40)	<b>Chi-square = 17.543</b> <b>df = 16</b> <b>Sig. = .351</b>
	<b>Satisfied</b>	21 (46.70)	10 (33.30)	08 (26.70)	11 (36.70)	14 (35)	64 (36.60)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	03 (6.70)	05 (16.70)	08 (26.70)	09 (30)	06 (15)	31 (17.70)	
	<b>Dissatisfied</b>	03 (6.70)	04 (13.30)	05 (16.70)	02 (6.70)	04 (10)	18 (10.30)	
	<b>Strongly Dissatisfied</b>	02 (4.40)	03 (10)	00 (00)	01 (3.30)	01 (2.50)	07 (4.00)	
<b>Electronic*</b>	<b>Strongly Satisfied</b>	18 (47.40)	10 (35.70)	08 (30.80)	05 (25)	11 (33.30)	52 (35.90)	<b>Chi-square = 13.046</b> <b>df = 16</b> <b>Sig. = .669</b>
	<b>Satisfied</b>	12 (31.60)	09 (32.10)	08 (30.80)	08 (40)	14 (42.40)	51 (35.20)	
	<b>Neutral</b>	07 (18.40)	04 (14.30)	05 (19.20)	04 (20)	05 (15.20)	25 (17.20)	
	<b>Dissatisfied</b>	01 (2.60)	01 (3.60)	03 (11.50)	02 (10)	02 (6.10)	09 (6.20)	
	<b>Strongly Dissatisfied</b>	00 (00)	04 (14.30)	02 (7.70)	01 (5.00)	01 (3.00)	08 (5.50)	
* 30 respondents across the universities did not provide their response								

*The parenthesis indicates the percentage (%)*

**Table 4: Satisfaction from the library collection**

Table 4 reveals that maximum (37.50%) FMs from MDU, whereas minimum (23.30%) FMs from KU were strongly satisfied, maximum (4.40%) FMs from PU, whereas none of the FM from GNDU was strongly dissatisfied from the print collection available in their respective libraries. Maximum (47.40%) FMs from PU, whereas minimum 925%) FMs from KU were strongly satisfied, maximum (14.30%) FMs from PbiU and none of the FM from PU was strongly dissatisfied from the electronic collection available in their respective libraries. Overall, 31.40% FMs were strongly satisfied, 36.60% FMs were satisfied, 17.70% FMs were neutral, 10.30% FMs were dissatisfied, and 4% FMs were strongly dissatisfied with the print collection available across the libraries. Similarly, 35.90% FMs were strongly satisfied, 35.20% FMs were satisfied, 17.20% FMs were neutral, 6.20% FMs were dissatisfied,

and 5.50% FMs were strongly dissatisfied with the electronic collection available across the libraries. The study is in contrast to the study of Mallaiah and Gowda (2009), who found 61.36% FMs were dissatisfied (35.90% strongly satisfied and 35.20% satisfied in case of the present study) with the e-journals subscribed at the library of Mangalore University, (India).

The calculated chi-square value and p-value ( $X^2= 17.453$ ,  $df=16$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.351^b$ ) shows highly non-significant difference as  $p>0.05$  in satisfaction level of faculty members from the print collection across the libraries. The calculated  $X^2$  value and p-value ( $X^2= 13.046$ ,  $df=16$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.669^b$ ) shows highly non-significant as  $p>0.05$  in satisfaction level of faculty members from the electronic collection across the libraries. Hence, it is evident from the above interpretation that the null hypothesis **Ho4, "There is no significant difference in satisfaction from the print and electronic collection among the faculty members across the libraries,"** is **accepted**. It means faculty members across the libraries were highly satisfied with the print and electronic collections available in their respective libraries.

### **Conclusion, suggestions, and recommendations**

Collection development in libraries has continuously been a joint responsibility of librarians and the teaching fraternity. The critical input of the faculty members is considered crucial for collection development in libraries as they know the needs of the students as per the curriculum. The present study results found that maximum FMs were not aware of the collection development policy (CDP) of their respective libraries except at MDU, where no such difference was found. However, a significant difference in awareness of CDP was found among the FMs across the libraries. A distinction was found in the recommendation of textbooks, reference books, journals, and magazines, whereas similarity was found in recommendations of e-resources among the faculty members across the libraries. The similarity in recommendations of e-resources may be due to the membership of all the libraries to 'E-ShodhSindhu' (earlier known as 'UGC-INFONET Digital Library Consortium') that provides maximum e-resources to the academic libraries. All the five university libraries under the study are members of this Consortium which was established in the year 2004. PU, PbiU, GNDU, and KU libraries became the Consortium member in phase I (2004), whereas the MDU library became its member in phase II (2005).

Collection development is one of the essential activities of libraries, especially at the university level. The primary purpose of this study was to find out the perception and participation of faculty members in the collection development process of their respective

libraries. It is evident from the analysis that the academic librarians do collaborate with the faculty members in the collection development process and its related procedures. The librarians must also ensure that the faculty members are also familiar with the selection and recommendation methods. Since the libraries have a limited budget and have to procure maximum resources within this budget, collection development policy guidelines play a significant role in collection building in libraries. It provides a roadmap from the selection of material to weeding out the material within the library. Hence, the libraries should constitute a committee to monitor the collection development process, and the teaching fraternity must also be included in such a committee. Academic libraries should put more effort into promotion, stimulating demands, and improve the usage of resources among FMs. The librarians must make the CDP more transparent by uploading the same on their library website so that FMs are aware of it and participate in the collection development process. The academic librarians should promote the usage of acquired information resources and take the feedback from the faculty members regularly to develop specific criteria for the collection development. It is clear that the academic librarians do collaborate with the FMs in the collection development process and its related procedures, and librarians must ensure that the faculty members are familiar with the selection and recommendation methods. Such collaboration for the development of academic library collections is even more critical today because of decreasing library acquisition budgets and space constraints, but also because of greater emphasis on shared collections/cooperative collection development, the shift from 'Just in case' to 'Just in time' and the expectations of the library users for faster and more convenient access to information. Moreover, the academic librarian should fully automate their acquisition system with an Integrated Library Management Software (ILMs) having an efficient 'Acquisition Module' to streamline the collection building process.

## References

- Adekanmbi, A. R. (2007). Availability and use of collection development policies in colleges of education libraries, Botswana. *African Journal of Archives and Information Science*, 17(1), 45-52.
- Ali, P.M. Naushad & Nisha, Faizul (2011). Use of e-journals among research scholars at Central Science Library, University of Delhi. *Collection Building*, 30(1), 53-60. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01604951111105023>
- Ameen, K., & Haider S. J. (2007). Book selection strategies in university libraries of Pakistan: An analysis. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services*, 31(2), 208-219. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649055.2007.10766166>
- Andrade, D., & Vergueiro, W. (1996). Collection development in academic libraries: A Brazilian library's experience. *New Library World*, 97(4), 15-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03074809610120171>
- Bullis, D. R., & Smith, L. (2011). Looking back, moving forward in the digital age: A review of the collection management and development literature 2004-08. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 55(4), 205-220. [10.5860/lrts.55n4.205](https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.55n4.205)
- Cabonero, D. A., & Mayrena, L. B. (2012). The development of a collection development policy. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 804. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1993&context=libphilprac> (Accessed on 13 November 2020).
- Chu, F.T. (1995). Collaboration in a closely coupled system: librarian-faculty relations in collection development. *Library & Information Sciences Research*, 17, 135-150. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0740-8188\(95\)90018-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0740-8188(95)90018-7)
- Donabedian, D., Aram, Carey, John & Balayan, Arshak (2020). Collection development at two Armenian University Libraries: A conversation with librarian and faculty. *Liber Quarterly*. 30(1), 1-23. [http://doi.org/10.18352/lq.10318](https://doi.org/10.18352/lq.10318)
- Gessesse, K. (2000). Collection development and management in the twenty-first century with special reference to academic libraries: An overview. *Library Management*, 21(7), 365 – 372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01435120010372551>
- Gunasekara, P. C. D. S. (2003). Existing collection development practices in university libraries in Sri Lanka: A study. *Journal of the University Librarians' Association of Sri Lanka*, 7, 5-17. Available at: <http://dlib.pdn.ac.lk/bitstream/123456789/413/1/Vol.%207%2c%201.pdf> (Accessed on 13 July 2020).
- Hurt, Charlene. S., Rein, Laura O., Connors, Maureen S., Walsh, John C., & Wu, Anna C. (1995). Collection development strategies for a university centre library. *College & Research Libraries*, 56 (1), 487-495. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.56.06.487>
- Jensen, K. (2009). Engaging faculty through collection development utilizing online survey tools. *Collection Building*, 28(3), 117-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01604950910971143>
- Joshi, A. N., Konnur, P. V., & Shinde, M. G. (2012). Collection development policy: a study of university libraries of Karnataka. *PEARL – A Journal of Library and Information Science*, 6(4), 161-166.
- Kanwal, A. (2006). University libraries in Pakistan and status of collection management policy: Views of library managers. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 30(3-4). 154-161. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649055.2006.10766124>
- Kasalu, S., & Ojiambo, J. B. (2012). Application of ICTs in collection development in private university libraries in Kenya. *Collection Building*, 31(1), 23-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01604951211199155>
- Khan, A. M. (2010). Managing collection development and organization in globalizing Indian university libraries. *Collection Building*, 29(1), 15-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01604951011015259>



- Khan, G. & Bhatti, R. (2016). An analysis of collection development in the university libraries of Pakistan. *Collection Building*, 35(1), 22-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CB-07-2015-0012>
- Khan, A. M., & Zaidi, S. M. (2011). Determinants of library's effectiveness and efficiency: A study of collection development, organization and services of Maulana Azad library, AMU (India). *Library Collections, Acquisition, & Technical Services*, 35(4), 95-105. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649055.2011.10766312>
- Korobili, Stella, Tilikidou, Irene & Delistavrou, Antonia (2006). Factors that influence the use of library resources by faculty members. *Library Review*, 55(2), 91-105. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530610649594>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610. Available at: [http://home.kku.ac.th/sompong/guest\\_speaker/KrejcieandMorgan\\_article.pdf](http://home.kku.ac.th/sompong/guest_speaker/KrejcieandMorgan_article.pdf) (Accessed on 13 July 2020).
- Mallaiah, T. Y., & Gowda, M. P. (2009). Collection development in Mangalore University library: A user study. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 46(1), 73-80. <10.17821/srels/2009/v46i1/44072>
- Nwosu, C. C., & 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 Sciences*, 3(1), 126-135. Available at: <http://scientific.cloud-journals.com/index.php/IJALIS/article/view/Sci-301/pdf> (Accessed on 13 November 2020).
- Okiki, O. C. (2012). Electronic information resources awareness, attitude and use by academic staff members of the University of Lagos, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 834. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/834/> (Accessed on 15 August 2020).
- Rahman, Mohd. Zain Abd., & Siti Hawa Darus (2004). Faculty awareness on the collection development of the International Islamic university library. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 9(2), 17-34. Available at: <https://mjlis.um.edu.my/article/view/8404> (Accessed on 04 August 2020).
- Riggs, D. E. (1995). Working with faculty. *College & Research Libraries*, 57(6), 498-499. [https://doi.org/10.5860/crl\\_57\\_06\\_498](https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_57_06_498)
- Singh, Har & Mahajan, Preeti (2015). Library collection assessment: A case study of Two Universities in the region of Punjab, India. *Chinese Librarianship: An International Electronic Journal*, 39. Available at: <http://www.iclc.us/cliej/c138SM.pdf> (Accessed on August 12, 2020).
- Stoller, Michael (2005). Building library collection: It's still about the user. *Collection Building*, 24(1), 4-8. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01604950510576065>
- Strauch, Katina (1990). Librarian versus faculty selection: The goods meet the bad and the ugly. *Collection Management*, 12(1-2), 37-41. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v12n01\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v12n01_07)
- Umar, Yila Musa & Bakare, Olatunji Azeez (2018). Assessment of collection development policy in academic libraries: case study of National Open University of Nigeria. *The Information Technologist: An International Journal of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)*, 15(1), 164-171.
- Vickery, J. (2004). Making a statement: Reviewing the case for written collection development policies. *Library Management*, 25(8/9), 337-342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01435120410562826>
- Vignau, B. S. S., & Meneses, G. (2005). Collection development policies in university libraries: A space for reflection. *Collection Building*, 24(1), 35-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01604950510576119>

- Weng, Cathy & Murraray, David C. (2020). Faculty perceptions of librarians and library services: exploring the impact of librarian faculty status and beyond. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(5). [10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102200](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102200)
- Yang, E. L. (1991). Psychology collection review: A cooperative project between libraries and developmental faculty members. *Collection Management*. 13(3), 43-55. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v13n03\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v13n03_04)