



## **Inclusion of library staff in the budgeting and collection development processes in Private Universities in Osun and Oyo States, Nigeria**

**Sirajudeen Femi Bakrin, PhD**

University Library,  
Fountain University Osogbo, Nigeria.

[sf.bakrin@gmail.com](mailto:sf.bakrin@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2870-8257>

**Jelili Adeyinka Liasu**

University Library,  
Fountain University Osogbo, Nigeria.

[jero301990@gmail.com](mailto:jero301990@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

*This paper investigates inclusiveness in budget preparation and collection development in the fifteen NUC-registered private university libraries in the Oyo and Osun States of Nigeria. The study adopted a survey research design targeting the academic librarians and library officers of all fifteen private universities in the two states. Due to the small study population, the total enumeration sampling technique was adopted to select all 111 respondents (academic librarians and library officers). A structured questionnaire was subsequently administered to the respondents to gather data. Eventually, only ninety-seven (97) respondents attended to the questions and the collected data was analysed using descriptive statistics. Findings revealed that though the Collection Development Unit exists in the libraries, the university librarians have appropriated their functions while assigning their lackeys as heads of the unit most times. Also, the study showed high inclusivity in the budgeting process, with all units making necessary contributions. The study concludes by recommending a sustained inclusive and collective budget preparation process, respect for autonomy and job specification of the collection development unit. At the same time, the university libraries should grasp the opportunity of accreditation visits to give their collection a deserved facelift.*

**Keywords:** Inclusive Librarianship, Budgeting Process, Collection Development, Private University Library, Oyo and Osun

### **Introduction**

The core of librarianship and library services revolves around the library's capability to meet the information requirements of its users. University libraries excel by offering supplementary support for their parent institutions' research and educational endeavours. Ranganathan's formulation of the five laws of library science precisely articulates the philosophical foundation of the library profession. In this context, collection development is crucial in bridging the gap between the library's efforts to provide information services and the users' pursuit of essential

information resources. Continuous assessment of the information needs of library users involves analysing demographics, library patronage statistics, and book usage data. In the terminology of the information profession, this practice is known as user studies (Khoo et al., 2012). This ongoing process forms the basis for the concept of the library as a dynamic, growing organism. Through user dissection, the aim is to understand patrons' specific educational and research focus and promptly acquire resources that align with their needs. The collection building and development process in librarianship involves various stages, connecting the internal arrangements of the library with other pertinent components of the university system (Yaa et al., 2014). The Library's Collection Development unit is established to manage crucial tasks, including selecting and acquiring resources, replacing lost or worn materials, weeding print materials no longer needed, and organising to include recent publications or enhancements in specific collection areas. This unit collaborates with the circulation, serials, and e-library units to create a strong collection development plan for the university library during each fiscal session. A comprehensive collection development proposal is developed in consultation with the library administration, considering both the users' needs and the mission and values of the university.

A prosperous collection development process relies heavily on financial support, enabling the library to fulfil its aspirations of satisfying its patrons' needs. Recently, limitations in funds and various expenditures have reduced financial allocations to the library. Simultaneously, the internal conflict between traditional library resources and the emergence of technology-driven e-resources has prompted a reevaluation of fund utilisation within the library. Furthermore, any corporate organisation must establish a financial plan to guide strategic fund management, commonly known as budgeting (Lynden, 2019). Despite being a straightforward process, many libraries have faltered and deviated from their core purpose due to their failure to integrate budgeting effectively into their operational frameworks. Neglect, insufficient understanding of the importance of budgeting, and frustration arising from repeated instances of fund delays to academic libraries might contribute to a lack of emphasis on budget preparation. However, a solid understanding of the collaborative nature, inclusivity and intricacies involved in budget preparation can significantly enhance the collection development process in the library (Chatikobo, 2023). Therefore, this annual ritual is essential and must be diligently addressed to ensure a library collection that effectively caters to the needs of 21st-century information users.

The twin concepts of budgeting and collection development are theoretically exclusive but mutually inclusive in an atmosphere desirous of efficient information service delivery. Besides the disruption they could cause to library operations, they could also hamper the cordiality and mutual understanding expected in a library setting. Many libraries need more organisational harmony when transparency and staff cooperation are not the hallmarks of the processes that lead to budget preparation and book selection (Gerke, 2021). In many instances, it was noted that these issues are treated by the library administration as a secret, with the university librarian being the sole determinant of the elements constituting the annual budget and the materials slated for acquisition (Wikoff, 2016). In these instances, concerned libraries risk the possibility of populating the collection with resources that do not satisfy the yearnings of their patrons or duplicating titles that have been adequately covered in the existing collection. Similarly, cost-effective strategies that have the potential to streamline library budgets by removing irrelevant collections and appropriating funds to more sought-after publications often need to be attended to more (Coghill, 2019). The division of labour, which leads to higher productivity and organisational efficiency, is thus sacrificed on the altar of egoism.

In another breadth, literature has confirmed the prevalence of negligence of academic libraries in preparing annual budgets for the fiscal year (Oyelude & Ola, 2008). Irregular budgetary provision has been noted in many other university libraries (Akerle et al., 2018). All these inadequacies have further culminated into inconsistencies observed in those few libraries that still endeavour to generate an annual budget to drive the yearly activities and expenditures of the libraries (Savova, 2019). This is despite new and dynamic approaches to budgeting in this era of technological advancements. These attitudes cannot be exonerated as the significant trigger of incessant reduction in funds allocated for the university libraries. Appropriate fund allocation and virement for more needed materials within the library's walls can only be executed with an active budget. Besides the availability of a budget, a collective budgeting system, which engenders trust, involvement and collective ownership of the entire process, is sacrificed. The study, therefore, examines the collection development and budgeting process in private university libraries in Oyo and Osun States with a critical look at the involvement of the critical units and stakeholders in the process that yields the budget proposal and the subsequent collections financed with the approved budget.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How well is the collection development unit involved in the selection and acquisition process in academic libraries of private universities in Oyo and Osun States?
2. What is the level of inclusivity of internal library stakeholders in the budget preparation and budgeting process in private university libraries in Oyo and Osun States?

### **Review of Literature**

The library is established to satisfy its clientele's information needs by providing relevant library materials. These information resources, which constitute the sum holdings of any library (Abdullahi & Ahmad, 2019), are made available for accessibility to library patrons (Obiano, 2020). This collection amounts to service delivery in the library (Nwosu & Udo-Anyanwu, 2015), which provides a good learning environment. Due to the nature and workings of the ivory towers, the academic community's reliance on a dynamic collection must be considered (Uwandu & Okere, 2022). To succeed in the quest to deliver on the library's mandate to aggregate reliable publications into collections, library professionals in the various sections, students, and faculty are carried along in the book selection process (Bitherman & Frempong-Kore, 2022). Ordinarily, it is the fundamental responsibility of the collection development unit and the university librarian to acquire information resources for the university (Ajayi et al., 2021). However, even though the collection development unit is traditionally charged with the role of book selection, the absence of written collection development policies in Nigeria (Umar & Haliru, 2022; Umar & Bakare, 2018) has made the task easily susceptible to abuse by the library heads that sometimes appropriate the task. This usurpation of responsibility can negatively affect the team support required in managing a complex organisation like the academic library (Smith, 2022). Terhemen, Richard Iorver, and Terungwa (2020) observed that stakeholders are involved in the selection process at Benue State University, but more budgetary allocation is needed to acquire the necessary raw materials.

Dina (2015) noted that beyond the number of students and courses offered in a university, accreditation exercises and available budgetary allocation constitute the driving forces shaping the collection development agenda of an academic library. Brophy (1991) had long noted that due to a shortage of funds and competing demands in academic institutions, the funds made available for library purchases have become grossly inadequate, leading to the inability to meet students' information needs. Such a cut in the library budget negatively impacts the library's ability to meet the needs of its users (The Economics of Information, 2015). Inadequate funds have thus become a massive challenge in the collection development and, consequently, the budget process. Akerele, Egunjobi, Awoyemi, and Ogunniyi (2018) discovered that the hindrances to the provision of modern resources conducive to learning and academic breakthroughs in Nigerian higher learning centres include irregular library annual budgets, inconsistent sources of income, and inadequate funds allocated to libraries, functioning as obstacles. Hulbert (2023) noted that these challenges have made library budgeting a fundamental issue in library management, especially in academia. Libraries should evolve strategic budgetary allocation that prioritises users' essential needs (Affum, 2023). In an era of shrinking budget allocation, competing demands, and alternative information sources, many libraries still do not appreciate the need to excel in budget planning by adopting a faceted budget structure (Savova, 2019). Borde (2020) postulates that the expenditure history should be evaluated before preparing the budget for the new fiscal year. He further stresses that spending assessment should be done in conjunction with the heads of the various units.

Ordinarily, Van Roestel (2016) believed that there ought to be a budget officer responsible for budget preparation with the assistance of the line managers. His report should be passed to the library head for concurrence after the initial consultation with the library line managers. This concept of devolving budgeting allocations is encouraged in the library to ensure the involvement of all and sundry (Demekaa, 2013). It is essential to incorporate collective budgeting in the budget preparation process to address the needs and perspectives of all library branches and units. Successful budget processes necessitate active staff participation and cooperation from the finance department (Seer, 2000). Subsequently, this transparent and collective budgeting will increase staff confidence in leadership and participation in the activities of the academic libraries (Gerke et al., 2021). There should be an emphasis on the need for increased stakeholder participation in the budgetary process for academic libraries. Ironically, in some libraries, the administrator decides what to allocate to a particular section during the budget process. While many libraries get access to the budgeted fund almost immediately after approval, some would have to wait for the next quarter of the fiscal year before getting access (Wikoff, 2016). The most disturbing aspect is that the academic library often needs to give seriousness to budget preparation in Nigeria. The head often controls the library's expenditure (Oyelude & Ola, 2008). Ajayi et al. (2019) observed that federal universities allocate statutory budget amounts to their libraries annually, supplemented by internally generated revenue from overdue charges and reprographic services. Notably, most private universities in Osun State allocate less than 40% of their annual budget for information resources, facilities, and general funding for academic libraries (Ogunjimi et al., 2018). Contemporary librarianship requires a budget communication plan with an embedded narrative budget to inform the relationship between the annual budget and the library's values (Rossmann, 2019).

## Methodology

This study investigates the role of library units and personnel in the collection development and budgeting process in private universities in Oyo and Osun States. Specifically, the study examines the involvement of the collection development unit, the section traditionally assigned for the selection and acquisition of library materials, in the collection building process. The study population comprises academic librarians (40) and library officers (71) in the fifteen NUC-registered private universities in the two states. Due to the small study population, the total sampling technique was adopted to select all 111 respondents.

Primary data was collected from the academic librarians and library officers of all the fifteen (15) NUC-recognised private universities vis: Ajayi Crowther University, Lead City University, Kola Daisi University, Dominican University, Precious Cornerstone University, Atiba University, and Dominion University (in Oyo State) and Joseph Ayo Babalola University, Oduduwa University, Westland University, Bowen University, Redeemer's University, Adeleke University, Fountain University and King's University (in Osun State) using a survey research design through a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was subsequently administered to the total population. Eventually, only ninety-seven (97) respondents attended to the questions and later submitted the questionnaire. Thereafter, the collected data was analysed using descriptive statistics.

## Data Presentation

**Table 1: Collection development unit's involvement in the selection and acquisition process**

		SD	D	N	A	SA
	<b>Collection Development</b>					
1	The university librarian doubles as the collection development librarian in my library	7	18	8	19	45
2	Loyalty rather than length of service/experience determines who occupies the office of collection development librarian in my library	11	25	7	45	9
3	Collection development unit is no longer a regular unit in the library	4	58	5	23	7
4	Collection development unit is created when there is a need for acquisition in the library	3	51	7	17	19
5	Collection development unit becomes functional during accreditation	2	7	4	36	48

The table above depicts the Collection Development Unit's activities concerning acquiring information resources in the library. A large part of the respondents, numbering 64 (65.97%), strongly agreed (45) and agreed (19) that the functions of the collection development librarian are performed by the university librarian in their university libraries. A total of 33 (34.02%) of the minority did not support when they disagreed (18), were neutral (8), and strongly disagreed (7). The majority of the librarians, 54 (55.67%), who agreed (45) and strongly agreed (9), supported that the collection development librarian is chosen based on his loyalty to the administrative authority in the library rather than his capacity in terms of experience and

longevity of service. The minority, 43 (44.32%), who did not support, disagreed (25), strongly disagreed (11) and maintained neutrality (7). More respondents, 67 (69.07%), represented by those who disagreed (58), were neutral (5) and strongly disagreed (4), did not support the view that collection development has ceased to be a regular unit within the university library. Others agreed (23) and strongly agreed (7) to constitute a minority of 30 (30.92%) respondents who gave their support. When a collection development unit is created in the library, the majority, 61 (62.88%), did not support that the unit comes up when there is a need for acquisition; they disagreed (51), strongly disagreed (3) and neutral (7). The minority who supported were 36 (37.11%). They strongly agreed (19) and agreed (17). On when the collection development unit becomes functional in the library, the majority, 84 (86.59%), supported the assertion that accreditation gingers the functionality of the unit. They showed this support when 48 and 36 respondents strongly agreed and agreed, respectively, But the minority who did not support was 13 (13.40%). They disagreed (7), remained neutral (4) and strongly disagreed (2).

**Table 2: Inclusion of internal library stakeholders in budget preparation and budgeting process**

		SD	D	N	A	SA
<b>Library Budget</b>						
1	My library prepares an annual budget which forms part of the entire university's annual budget	4	9	5	35	44
2	The budget prepared by my library only caters for the expenses of the library in the current semester	18	51	8	10	10
3	The job of budget preparation is done centrally by the bursary on behalf of the university library	17	35	7	10	28
4	Only the University librarian and the collection development librarian determine the budget proposition in my library	5	42	3	36	11
5	Input is harvested from every unit and branch of the library before the final budget proposition is arrived at in my library	10	8	7	27	45
6	NUC accreditation and resource verification increase the amount and percentage of budgetary allocation to the library	5	11	9	46	26

The table above presents the respondents' views about the budgetary process in private university libraries in Osun State. Forty-four (44) and 35 librarians strongly agreed and agreed, making the majority, 79 (81.44%), support the view that the library prepares an annual budget as a part of the university's total budget. There were dissenting opinions; 9 disagreed, five were neutral, and 4 strongly disagreed. Collectively, 18 (18.55%) did not support this question. The majority of the respondents, 77 (79.38%), represented by 51 who disagreed, 18 who strongly disagreed, and 8 who were neutral did not support the view that the budget prepared by the library is only for the current semester at a time when a minority of 20 (20.61%) comprising 10 who agreed and 10 who strongly agreed supported the question in affirmation. The question on the preparation of the budget between the library and the bursary saw a majority of 59 (60.82%) comprising 35 who disagreed, 17 who strongly disagreed, and 7 did not support that the preparation is done centrally by the bursary on behalf of the university library. However, the minority of 38 (39.17%) - 28 and 10 who strongly agreed and agreed, respectively - supported the opinion. Opinions on the university librarian and collection development being the determinants of the

budgetary proposal on behalf of the library did not get the support of 50 (51.54%), with 42, 5 and 3 disagreeing, strongly disagreeing and neutral. This was closely followed by 36 who agreed and 11 who strongly agreed, constituting a solid minority of 47 (48.45%). The majority of respondents, 72 (74.22%), representing 45 and 27 respectively, strongly agreed and agreed, supported that input is taken from other units and branches before a final budget proposal is consolidated in the library. Other respondents, 10, 8 and 7, who strongly disagreed, disagreed and remained neutral constituted the minority with 25 (25.77%). On the effect of NUC accreditation on the budgetary allocation to the library, 46 and 26 agreed and strongly agreed, culminating in the majority of 72 (74.22%) who supported the view that the accreditation leads to an increase in budgetary provisions. However, the minority, with 25 (25.77%) respondents, did not support it.

## Discussion

The research study's findings show that the university librarian has appropriated the role of the collection development unit by taking over the jobs traditionally under the purview of the collection development unit. The concept of division of labour, which every corporate organisation leverages to create industrial harmony, is jeopardised when the democratic system of governance is compromised. This sits comfortably with the assertion of Ajayiet al. 1 (2021,) who argued that the CDU is the section primarily assigned with the task of collection development. Rather than involve the internal unit upon which the assignment falls, as advocated by Butherman and Frempong-Kore (2022), the university librarians in most private universities take over the responsibilities. Besides, librarians assigned with the portfolio to oversee the functions of CDU are usually those who have a close affinity with the university librarian. Here, experience and knowledge of the requirements of the office are sidelined further, making the university librarian the sole determinant of the selection and acquisition routine. It was pleasing that the study confirmed that the CDU has continued to enjoy the status of a unit within the university library system. The study affirmed that the availability of acquisition exercises is independent of the regular existence of the unit within the library structure. However, the work notes that accreditation exercises significantly revitalise activities within the CDU when universities prepare for accreditation visits. With this discovery, the libraries must take advantage of the season to better equip their collections with necessary publications.

Findings further reveal that private university libraries prepare a budget annually to cater for the needs of the libraries in the fiscal year. It displays the corporate standing of the libraries as business-oriented entities with an organisational orientation. This result contradicts the earlier discovery of Akerele et al. (2018) that many libraries would need to prepare an annual budget. It indicates improvement in the organisational modus operandi of the academic libraries. Similarly, the libraries enjoy autonomy in budget preparation and are devoid of interference from the central bursaries of the universities. The result of the study further indicates an inclusive budgeting process with all concerned units brought into contributing to the proposal. This finding aligns with Demeeka's position, which advocated for devolving budgeting. The particular finding, however, is contradictory to the discovery of Wikoff (2016) and Oyelude and Ola (2008), who had noted the overbearing influence of the university library, which was always solely responsible for budget preparation and fund allocation to the various units of the library. As CDU experiences a boom during the accreditation season, budgetary allocation to the

university also increases whenever the accreditors visit the university library, a point of call on any accreditation visit.

## Conclusion

The provision of information services benefits from a series of processes that culminate in library service delivery. Eventually, service delivery projects the library to potential clients. Budget provision and collection development are significant factors in library service delivery. Thus, this study has confirmed inclusivity as a fundamental element in preparing budgets in private university libraries in Oyo and Osun States of Nigeria. However, this is still not the case in collection development, especially in book selection and acquisition. This lack of inclusivity is a potent tool for industrial disharmony, which can hinder the organisational efficiency needed to provide unhindered information services to the teeming patrons.

## Recommendations

The study advocates the following recommendations for total inclusivity within the library work environment, especially in private universities:

1. The private university libraries should sustain the prevailing inclusive and collective budget preparation process to enhance comprehensive budgeting in the libraries.
2. University librarians should respect the autonomy and job specification of the collection development unit in private university libraries to ensure inclusivity in library administration.
3. Additionally, the university libraries should grasp the opportunity of accreditation visits to give their collection a deserved facelift.

## References

- Abdullahi1, D. & Ahmad, A. I. (2019). Availability and Use of Information Resources and Services in Bauchi State Public Library. *Research Journal of Library and Information Science*, 3 (4), 29-35
- Affum, M. Q. (2023). Book Acquisition in the Modern University Library: Challenges and Opportunities. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 8006. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/8006>
- Ajayi, F. F., Oketunji, I., Adetayo, A. J., & Oyeniya, W. O. (2021). Ownership Structure and Collection Development Practices in Private University Libraries in South -West, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 6588. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6588>
- Ajayi, K. D., Diyaolu, B. O. & Amusa, O. I. (2019). Comparative analysis of funding and finance of libraries in federal university, polytechnic and college of education in Ogun State. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2287. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2287>
- Akerele, J. A, Egunjobi, R. A., Awoyemi, A. & Ogunniyi, S. O. (2018). Funding, Communication and Marketing as Correlates of Library Service Delivery to Persons with

Hearing Impairment, PWHI, in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1712. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1712>

Bitherman, B. K. A., & Frempong-Kore, A. (2022). Resource Acquisition and the Role of Collection Development Policy in the Development of Ghana Communication Technology University Library Collection. *Library Philosophy & Practice (e-journal)*. 7402. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7402>

Borde, S.A. (2020). Method of Library Budget. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR)*, 7 (2), 851-855

Brophy, P. (1991). Budgeting in academic libraries: the polytechnic perspective. *Library Management*, 12(4), 4–9. doi:10.1108/01435129110135824

Chatikobo, C. N. (2023). Investigating the optimisation of South African university library budgets in an austerity environment [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of KwaZulu Natal

Coghill, J. (2019). Patron-Driven Acquisition (PDA), *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 16(1), 25–27, DOI: 10.1080/15424065.2019.1596776

Demekaa, U. (2013). Budget preparation, approval and implementation in Polytechnic libraries in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 2(7), 503-505

Dina, Y. (2015). *Collection development/management. Law Librarianship in Academic Libraries*, pp. 27–46. doi:10.1016/b978-0-08-100144-8.00003-4

Gerke, J., Knievel, J. E., & Reynolds, L. J. (2021). Where Does the Money Go? Creating Transparency in Libraries Operational Budgeting. *Library Leadership & Management*, 35(2). <https://doi.org/10.5860/llm.v35i2.7457>

Hulbert, I. G. (2023). Budget. In *Ithaka S+R US Library Survey 2022: Navigating the New Normal* (pp. 16–22). ITHAKA S+R. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep49398.10>

Khoo, M., Rozaklis, L., & Hall, C. (2012). A survey of the use of ethnographic methods in the study of libraries and library users. *Library & information science research*, 34(2), 82-91.

Lynden, F. C. (2019). Financial Planning for Collection Management. In *Financial Planning for Libraries* (pp. 109-120). Routledge.

Ogunjimi, T. T., Bello, M. A. & Olaniyi, O. O. (2018). Institutional budget and impact of internally generated revenue on funding of academic library in a developing economy. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1709. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1709>

Oyelude, A.A. & Ola, C.O. (2008). Budgeting for library technical services in an electronic age. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Paper211. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/211>

Rossmann, D. (2019). Narrative Budgets: Telling the Story of Your Library's Value and Values. *Library Leadership & Management*, 33(4). <https://doi.org/10.5860/llm.v33i4.7384>

Savova, Maria & Price, Jason S. (2019). Redesigning the Academic Library Materials Budget for the Digital Age: Applying the Power of Faceted Classification to Acquisitions Fund Management, *Library Resources and Technical Services*, 63(2),131-142. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.63n2.131>

Smith, L. M., & Ingram, L. E. (2022). Library Administrative Core Duties: An Annual Guide for Planning and Sequencing Events. *Library Leadership & Management*, 36(1). <https://doi.org/10.5860/llm.v36i1.7518>

The Economics of Information: The Indiana State Library and the State Budget Process. (2015). *Indiana Magazine of History*, 111(2), 177–183. <https://doi.org/10.5378/indimagahist.111.2.0177>

Umar, M.N., & Ramatu, A.H. (2022). Collection Development Policy: The Current Scenario in Arewa House Library, ABU, Kaduna. *Fudma international journal of library science information management* 1(1), 103-111.

Umar, Y.M., & Olatunji, A.B. (2018). Assessment of collection development policy in academic libraries: a case study of the National Open University of Nigeria. *Journal of Information Technologist* 15(1).

Van Roestel, M. (2016). *A collaborative approach to budgeting and the impact on the budgeting process: a case study* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).

Wikoff, K. (2016). Budgeting in an Academic Library: A Lively Lunch Discussion. Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316423>

Yaa Anima Adzobu, N. (2014). Building digital collections in a public university library in Ghana: priority-setting and user needs assessment. *Collection Building*, 33(2), 38-45.