INVESTIGATING IMPEDEMENTS TO EFFECTIVE MULTIMEDIA COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN KENYA.

BY

HENRY MORARA NYARANGO

A PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE OF KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

2002
DECLARATION

This research is my original work and has not been presented for any other degree in any university.

HENRY MORARA NYARANGO

This research work has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university supervisor.

P.G MWATHI, B.ED., B.L.S., M.ED., M.L.S.

SENIOR LECTURER,

Department of Library and Information Science

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
DEDICATION

To my entire family for their moral, emotional and financial support especially my mother, Anna Moraa and my dad Patrick Nyarang'o.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am conveying my sincere gratitude to all those who participated in one way or another to ensure that this work is complete.

My sincere thanks go to my project supervisor, Mr. P. G. Mwathi who apart from guiding me in my work encouraged me all through the course. I cannot forget to appreciate the efforts of the lecturers in the Department of Library and Information Science, Dr. Kaane, Mr. E. W. Muya, Mr. Mukuvi, Ms. Mathu and Mr. Thuku for their contributions.

I am also grateful to my colleagues in class, Mr. Joshua Gichiri, Beatrice Wangari, Caroline Ngacaku and Wangari Ngovi for being there for me in encouraging me and supporting me wherever necessary.

Special acknowledgement goes to my family members, my parents, brothers and sisters who have provided the ground both materially and emotionally for my completion of this programme. Lastly, I express my thanks to Janet Wanjoji for typing this work.

God bless you all!

Henry Morara
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title page</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of tables</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of acronyms</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background for the study

1.1.1 Information provision in university libraries

1.1.2 Collection development

1.1.3 Multi-media resources in university libraries

1.1.4 Background information on K.U library

1.1.5 Background information on U.S.I.U library

1.2 Statement of the problem

1.3 Objectives of the study

1.4 Research questions

1.5 Assumptions

1.6 Significance

1.7 Scope and limitations of the study

1.8 Definition of terms

## CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Collection development policy

2.3 The budget
2.4 Library staff 28
2.5 Selection and acquisition 30
2.6 Evaluation and weeding 33
2.7 Bibliographic control 35
2.8 Space 36
2.9 Information technology 38

CHAPTER THREE
3.0 METHODOLOGY 40
3.1 Introduction 40
3.2 Research sample 40
3.3 Instruments 41
3.4 Administration procedures 41
3.5 Data presentation analysis and interpretation 41

CHAPTER FOUR
4.0 DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION 42
4.1 Introduction 42
4.2 Collection development policy 43
   4.2.1 Collection development budget 44
4.3 Acquisition mode of multimedia resources 46
   4.3.1 Procedures of developing list of required resources 47
   4.3.2 Selection tools 48
4.4 Multi-media equipments and storage media 50
4.5 Problems of developing multi-media resources 51
4.6 Staff evaluation 54
   4.6.1 Adequacy of multi-media resources 54
   4.6.2 Currency of multi-media resources 56
   4.6.3 Relevancy of multi-media resources 57
   4.6.4 Level of participation in selection 59
4.6.5 Staff responses to impediments in multi-media development 60
4.6.6 Staff suggestions to solve the problems 61
4.7.0 Students’ responses to use participation and selection 62
  4.7.1 Use and participation in selection 62
  4.7.2 Students’ evaluation of currency 65
  4.7.4 Students’ evaluation of relevance 66
  4.7.5 Problems observed in developing multimedia 68
  4.7.6 Students’ suggested solutions 69

CHAPTER FIVE
5.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 71
5.1 Introduction 71
5.2 Summary of findings 72
  5.2.1 Collection development policy 72
  5.2.2 The budget 72
  5.2.3 The staff 73
  5.2.4 Selection and acquisition 73
  5.2.5 Staff and Student attitudes on multimedia 74
  5.2.6 Weeding and evaluation 74
  5.2.7 Media equipment and storage media sets 74
  5.2.8 Problems of multimedia collection development 75
  5.2.9 Suggestions to the problems 76
5.3 Conclusions 77
5.4 Recommendations 78
5.5 Suggestions for further research 79

Bibliography 81
Appendixes 87
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Collection development policy response table
Table 2 - Budget allocations
Table 3 - Acquisition modes
Table 4 - Multimedia acquisition listing criteria
Table 5 - Media equipment and storage media
Table 6 - Problems of developing multimedia collections
Table 7 - Suggestion to problems
Table 8 - Staff evaluation of adequacy of multimedia
Table 9 - Staff evaluation of currency of resources
Table 10 - Staff evaluation of relevancy
Table 11 - Staff responses in participation in acquisition
Table 12 - Staff responses to problems of multimedia
Table 13 - Student’s responses to need, use and selection
Table 14 - Student evaluation of currency of resources
Table 15 - Student’s evaluation of adequacy
Table 16 - Student’s evaluation of relevancy
Table 17 - Student’s responses on multimedia collection development.
## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. C. R. L.</td>
<td>American College and Research Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. R. L.</td>
<td>American Research Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. L. A.</td>
<td>American Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. V.</td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM</td>
<td>Compact disc – Read Only Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.U.E.A.</td>
<td>Catholic University of East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTTP</td>
<td>Hyper Text Transport Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.U</td>
<td>Kenyatta University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.P.A.C.</td>
<td>Online Public Access Catalog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.E.A.B.</td>
<td>University of East Africa – Baraton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.I.U.</td>
<td>United States International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.R.L.</td>
<td>Universal Resource Locator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWW</td>
<td>World Wide Web.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate on the factors that impede on the collection development and maintenance of multi-media information resources in University Libraries in Kenya. The study was a result of the problem in that despite the realization of the importance of multi-media information resources as important components in study, teaching and research, print collections have always dominated in libraries. In many cases multi-media resources have been poorly developed and hence there is need for a strong academic collection of these resources.

The study investigated on core aspects of collection development to include:

- Collection development policy
- Budget
- Staff
- Space
- Attitudes.

The findings of the study among others indicated serious shortcomings in these major areas of collection development and it is on this that recommendations have been made to aid in solving the problem that recommendations have been made to aid in solving these problems in University Libraries.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

Universities are known to be the major producers of high level manpower who are major contributors to the development of nations. This has been possible because of the various training programmes offered in these institutions which aim at producing manpower with specific talents to meet the demands of various sectors of economies. Much as the universities have already taken up this task, the prevailing conditions surrounding individual institutions and countries has had a profound impact on the way these institutions are able to achieve their objectives. The situation has been worse in developing countries. As defined by Lacquer (1971) that a developing country in a country that is trying to become richer and to improve the living conditions of its people. This term is synonymous to the term third world. Like any other third world countries, Kenya is struggling with the problem of:

- Underdeveloped economies
- Illiteracy
- A colonial past resentment of former colonial power and imperialism (Lacquer 1971).
As pointed by Rowland (1997) we are living in a time of profound change. The introduction of information and communication technologies is having a far-reaching effect on individuals, organizations, and on states. It is changing the ways in which we work, learn and play changing the relationship between individuals and the state, changing the nature of business and commerce and may in the long run change fundamentally the characteristics of cultures that have evolved over centuries.

As developing countries struggle to catch up with more technologically advanced societies of the world, they require a high level man power from universities and other higher institutions of learning. Universities are thus challenged to produce the quality of graduates who are able to meet the challenges at a changing time. Libraries in Universities and other higher institutions thus become integral parts without which these objectives can never be realized.

As pointed by the University grants Committee in Great Britain:

*The character and efficiency of the university may be gauged by its treatment of its central organ the Library. We regard the fullest provision for library maintenance as the primary and most vital need in the equipment of a university.*
The above statement is supplemented by Ndegwa (1983), who has also pointed that the most important element in a University library is its collection and that to facilitate its development an acquisition policy is necessary. In the annual report of Princetson University of 1970 in Jaspher (1974:xxi)

*While the effectiveness of a library is determined by the skill of library staff in putting to work to meet the needs of the users, the foundation factor is the collections itself.*

According to IFLA, (1983) standard guidelines, a University library is evaluated on the context of quality of library services, collections, staff facilities, budget and other important functions of the library operations. It is to this lines that the library is able to fulfill the obligations of faculties and students to learn, teach, study, investigate and publish freely (IFLA 1963).

Most of these conditions are however not effectively met in developing countries. As pointed by Nwoye (1983), a University library in a developing country is characterized by:

- Poor funding reflected inadequate stock and lack of scientific and technical books.
- Lack of adequate manpower to manage libraries and its operations
Low standards of service because of lack of facilities and modern applications in libraries.

1.1.1 Information provision in University Libraries

A University library facilitates the interaction between people and information they need. It exists to support the information needs of all members of the institution, who include students, faculties, administration, and support staff. It provides resources in many formats (L.A. 1995). Library users have diverse needs and require access to a wide range of equipments, relating to both storage and retrieval of books and periodicals, audio-visual and high technology provision. The resource base of any library thus should comprise of both the print and non-print media resources. Ahmad (1984:107) commenting on non-print media points that:

*The most significant aspect of collection building is the great importance of non-print media in libraries they must be accepted as valuable tools to assist the teaching and learning process in universities.*

Abidi S. (1991) has pointed to information and communication as the engines of growth and social transformation. He points to information as a resource and is applicable in social, political, economic and technological fields. This statement is further complimented by Dove (1975) postulating that no matter in what form literature or information is presented, it is the librarians job
to acquire it, to house it and to exploit it to the full. Dove further points that:

As librarians or information scientists,
we are concerned with knowledge in all
fields whether that knowledge is contained in books
or a piece of film or tape or in a disc, it should be
available to the potential user.

The advancement of information technology offers libraries opportunity to facilitate collection, packaging and repacking and creating local content in formats suitable to the needs of various communities. The development thus of information resources in a university library or any other library is done through a collection development process.

1.1.2 Collection Development.

Collection development also referred to as material management involves identification acquisition and evaluation of library resources, which include print materials, audio visual or electronic resources for a community of users. (Definition available at: URL:http://www.dlapr.lib.az.us/cdt/colldev.htm).
Evans (1979) refers to collection development as a universal process in which libraries acquire diverse materials to meet patron demands. This he points constitutes six distinguishable elements, which include community analysis, policies, selection acquisition, weeding and evaluation. It is the process of making certain the information requirements of people using collections met in timely and economical manner using information resources produced both inside and outside the organizations (Evans 1987: 3).

According to Hannaford (1980) collection development must be defined as more than just the sum total of its parts, which are selecting, acquiring, budgeting and allocating. Collection development is therefore defined as a systematic building of library collection based on meaningful data rather than subjective choice of chance. Baughman (1980) also points that to build a library collection, a Librarian relies on published knowledge of the collections as well as the user’s needs.

Phyllis (1982) has pointed out that collection development begins with the process of acquisition. This can be subdivided into policies and procedures for selecting and purchasing of materials. Policies explain why a collection exists establishing the basis for the collection programme activities and delineates what will be included in the collection, how policies are to be implemented and
the personalities to be responsible. Policies thus need to be
developed before procedure statements can be written.
Collection development is thus the main process through which all
resources available at a given library are acquired. The process
thus has to be done with a lot of integrity if it has to be of
importance to the relevant University library.

1.1.3 Multi-Media Resources In University Libraries
The Multi-media information resources also referred as non-print
resources, as seen by Pemberton (1984) are those library materials
that require some form of equipment to be used. This definition
excludes things like still pictures, photographs and maps but
includes microforms and microcomputer software. A common
characteristic of these resources is their reliance upon equipments
to be assessed. Equipments are thus an integral part of non-print
collection and central to the issues of selection acquisition and
use. Dove (1975) points that:

\begin{quote}
Libraries are communication centers and \\
that media materials should be given the \\
same consideration awarded to books as regards \\
selection evaluation and acquisition.
\end{quote}

Multi-media resources are developed to both entertain and inform.
While the technological development that brought many of the media resources formats began more that a hundred years ago, their rate of innovation had increased dramatically in recent years. This development poses a special challenge to libraries that undertake to collect these resources (Schmidt 1990:236).

The audio visual policies in college libraries by A.L.A. points that early audio visual collections in academic libraries typically included 16mm films, reel-to-reel audio recordings and phonograph records. By 1987, the guidelines had noted the potential of A.V. to support research and instruction. The advent of formats like videocassettes, laser discs and audio compact had brought A.V. into the majority of academic libraries.

Although CD-ROM was becoming popular in academic libraries, they were text only and therefore not of concern to many librarians.

By 1990, Multi-media CD-ROM made their way before this time. Both analog and optical were played on a single machine but today computers are equipped with CD-ROM drive, sound card and video card and can thus use most soft wares. (URL: http://www.ala.org/acrl/guides/index/htm).
Multi media collections are now important collections in any university library. The 1999 guidelines for media resources in academic libraries by A.C.R.L. group recommend that:

- All academic libraries collect media resources in all formats. This should be in line with immediate and anticipated programme needs.
- Libraries should provide adequate funding to media services and collections.
- All media resources should be classified for easier access.
- Collection management practices that apply to print resources also should apply to media collections.
- Collection preservation practices that apply to media to print should also apply to media collection (Media guidelines, URL: A.C.R.L. 1999.)

Gardner (1981) also in addition to the above statement says that:

*Few libraries can be build satisfactory collections unless they also include non-print resources. Collections should be thought of as entities composed of many different formats but all formats should be judged by the same standards.*

The traditional focus of many libraries has been the development and acquisition of print resources in paper formats. As technology advances, the impact is felt in all section with the libraries included. The development of computer technology has meant that
the organization of information has become a hugely complex area. Many of the information resources are now available in electronic formats in Internet, intranet and internal databases. Libraries are thus to change their approach to information acquisition organization and dissemination to incorporate the newly emerging systems in the information world. As noted in Ariadne Journal of Library and Information Science that:

Libraries are required to support ventures that are hybrid in every sense. They must provide access to a wide range of resources and across boundaries of curatorial traditions. As the proposition of the resource base available in digital form continues to increase success will depend on dual approach of enhancing the scope and quality of the digital proportion of information while also promoting the print resources. (Available at the web page: URL:http://www.ariadne.ac.uk (March 2001)

This therefore requires libraries to effectively develop and maintain multimedia resource bases to effectively exploit the already emergent information and communication technologies. Advantages of multimedia collection include:

- Meeting the requirements of disabilities, for example those who cannot read can access audio books.
Providing appropriate materials to people who require graphic display for better comprehension.

It provides information repackaged in alternative formats e.g. CD-ROMS databases through a computer.

Provides music scores and games in support of educational pursuits.

1.1.4 Background Information About Kenyatta University Library

The library dates back to 1973 when it started at what was currently referred to as Old Library. The audio-visual unit was created within the library and this section is meant to store and disseminate information in non-print formats. It houses both the playback equipments, e.g. computers, projectors etc as well as storage medias e.g. audiocassettes, filmstrips, microfilms and others. The services meant to be offered in this section include:

- Film viewing
- Audio cassette listening
- Microfilm and microfische reading
- CD-ROM database searches
- Printing services
- Recordings especially audiocassettes etc.

The Kenyatta University Library is not automated and so does not have search facilities like the OPAC. It has not also linked itself to
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Very little has been published about the state of multi-media resources in University libraries in Kenya. Studies so far did have continuously indicated poor state of media resources in libraries. Rosenberg (1997) pointing that:

*Lack of current books and journals was considered by library staff, academic and postgraduate students as the most serious problem failing the library.*

The current journals in a university library can be obtained online or through CD-ROM subscriptions. In this time of information explosion, the traditional view that print collections are the only viable sources of information is outdated. The research problem thus addressed in this study is that despite the realization of multi-media resources as important components in academic scholarship, research and general communication, the development and maintenance of these resources has remained a problem in many university libraries. University libraries are keener on developing print information resources as opposed to multi-media information resources. These collections in many university libraries have remained stagnant and undeveloped over a long period. This study seeks to investigate on factors that
impede the development of these collections and offer possible
guidance aimed at promoting strong academic collections of multi-
media information resources. This is in line with the fact that
many of the information resources are now in electronic formats
optical and analog media formats and thus form a rich resource
base which should be developed for effective utilisation for
teaching, instruction, communication and research in University
libraries.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are:

i) To examine the collection development policy provision on
multi-media resources.

To ascertain the completeness of multimedia sets in
university libraries.

ii) To find out the relationship between the acquisition mode
and quality of multimedia resources in libraries.

iii) To ascertain the adequacy of budget and budgetary
allocation on multi-media resources.

iv) To find out the extent of user participation in the selection
and development of multimedia resource.
v) To find out the adequacy and quality of staff in multimedia resource development.

vi.) To find out the library's position on evaluation and weeding of multimedia resources.

vii.) To find out the staff and student attitudes towards multimedia resources in regard to adequacy, currency and relevancy.

viii.) To find out specific problems affecting the development of multimedia information resources in libraries.

ix.) To solicit views aimed at solving the problems identified.

x.) To offer specific recommendations to University libraries which have and which intend to develop multi-media resources.

1.4 Research Questions

1.4.1. Does the library have a collection development policy?

1.4.2. Does the policy provide for multimedia resources development?

1.4.3. What media playback equipment and storage media resources are acquired by the library?

1.4.5. How adequately relevant and up to date are the multimedia resources in the library?

1.4.6. Are the library staff adequate and qualified in managing and developing multimedia resources?
1.4.7. What are the altitudes of staff, librarian and students towards the multi media resources?

1.4.8. Are the multi media resources in the library evaluated and weeded?

1.4.9. What problems are encountered in developing and maintaining multi media resources in libraries?

1.4.10. What possible solutions can be offered to manage this problem?

1.5 Assumptions

The study is going to be based on the following assumptions.

1.5.1 That provision of multi media resource in the collection building is very essential in multi media collection building.

1.5.2 That provision of adequate budget is essential for effective multi media collection development.

1.5.3 That trained and qualified staff is a pre-requisite to effective multi media collection building.

1.5.4 That a number of obstacles exist in trying to develop and maintain multi media collections in university libraries.
1.6 **Significance of the Study**

This study was concerned with investigating the impediments to effective multi media collection building in university libraries in Kenya. The study is therefore justified by the fact that:

1.6.1. It could contribute favorably to multi media resource development in university libraries.

1.6.2. The study would serve as a guide to those universities, which are setting up multi media entries as part of their resource building projects.

1.6.3. It could give suggestions for improvement of the existing multi media resources to make them more relevant, adequate and appropriate.

1.6.4. It could be used as a planning tool by preparing the libraries to put in place machineries to combat expected impediment to multi media collection building to fit in the modern demands.

1.7 **Scope and Limitation of the Study**

The study is limited to Kenyatta University and U.S.I.U. Africa libraries in Nairobi, Kenya. This is because research was done along side coursework hence no time was available to travel to all universities in Kenya. Another factor was the financial limitations, which could not allow the researcher to travel
extensively to cover many institutions. Some respondents were unwilling to fill the questionnaires. The findings of the are assumed to affect on both the automated and non automated environments.
1.8 Definition of Terms.

Collection Development:
Process involving identification acquisition and evaluation of library collections of resources, which include print materials, audio-visual or electronic resources for a community of users.

Information Technology:
The acquisition, processing, storage and dissemination of vocal, pictorial textual and numerical information by micro-electronic based combination of computing and telecommunications.

Database:
Refers to information stored on computer files and accessible via a remote terminal and telecommunications link.

Format:
Refers to layout or presentation of items in machine-readable form or in a machine printout, can also refer to physical type of an audio-visual item.

Multi-Media:
Refers to a collection of a document by materials in various media including non-book materials, audio-visual and nonprint materials.

Automation:
Refers to the organization of machine handling of routines or operations, requiring minimal human intervention.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.

Multi-media resources are important in university libraries in facilitating teaching, study and research. They can be provided in various formats as either optical electronic resources e.g. CD-ROMS, online resources through the Internet links to various databases or analog media formats e.g. audio-cassettes, video cassettes films etc. Much as the importance of these resources is realized in university libraries, this has been a problem in developing and maintaining this resources for maximum utilization. As pointed by Smith (1981) some of the reasons for this has been that:

- Multi-media resources present a complex of physical and organizational problems.
- There is lack of qualified staff to deal with multi-media resources.
- They require big space for storage of media and play back equipments.

Information transfer according to Smith (1981) cannot be relegated solely to one format and that libraries have traditionally acquired and stocked information regardless of format on the prime that
information is the prime ingredient to facilitating learning. Lancaster (1975) points that:

The library exists as an interpole between the universe of bibliographic resources and a particular user population.

To serve the above needs, university libraries should begin from a comprehensive collection development policy. This will involve careful selection and acquisition of relevant resources as postulated by Baughman (1980) that effective selection is based on published sources as well as user information needs.

The reviewed literature in this section constitutes articles and studies based on the collection development experience in regard to collection development and maintenance of multimedia resources in University libraries.

i) Collection development policy

ii) The budget

iii) The selection and acquisition

iv) Evaluation and weeding

v) Staff

vi) Information technology

vii) Bibliographic control

viii) Space.
2.2 Collection Development Policy.

A collection development policy is a written statement about the library's intentions for building its collection. It describes the collection strengths and weaknesses and provides guidelines for staff. It should be a living document adaptable to change and growth. It provides guidelines that can be modified, as the library needs change.

(Available at: URL: http://www.dlapr.lib.az.us/cdt/colldev.htm.)

Evans (1987) describes a policy statement as a document that presents a plan of action and information that gives guidelines to staff thinking and decision-making. Through such a policy, the library can make decisions quickly and correctly regarding the selection and acquisition of resources. Inadequate policies lead to inadequate collections Hannaford (1980).

A collection development policy serves the purpose of providing a point of reference for staff to consult when deciding on whether to acquire, discard or reject an item. By following guidelines established in the policy, one can make more consistent and informed decisions about collection and provide continuity during times of staff turnover and funding changes. The policy also serves as a source of reinforcement when an item is challenged by a patron. According to Gorman (1997) the policy should constitute:
• The community profile i.e. state clearly the nature of the community to be served by the library.

• Collective goals: These goals will show the library’s priorities are for various aspects of collection development. Lowly prioritized resources in the policy means less or none of the same will be acquired.

• Selection responsibility to show the personnel responsible for the selection of what the library should have.

As printed by Gelfand (1968:63) that:

To be effective, the library must provide books and other library materials that are appropriate to the teaching and research requirement of the university. The principle of appropriateness implies that selection shall be deliberate and discerning; that is shall be planned in accordance with well defined policies and procedures.

The above statement by Gelfand means therefore that for the multi-media resources to be appropriately developed, they must be reflected in the collection development policy.

A study by Diana Rosenberg (1997) reveals that there is a trend of collection policies giving priority to textbook purchase. The studies on university libraries in Africa indicate that very few libraries are being tempted by policies of access replacing purchases. Rosenberg (1997 vol.1: 18) points that collection development
policies should be comprehensive to stipulate all the media formats to be acquired by the library.

2.3 The budget

According to Martin (1978:15), a budget is simply a planning document which sets out in summary form the categories and amounts of expenditures that appears necessary to maintain the library programs. Library budgets reflect the budgetary style of the parent institution. Five such types are:

i) Object classification budget based primarily on all kinds of expenditure.

ii) The programme budget, which is based largely on the measurement of programmes with consequently less emphasis on the objects purchased, and their relationship to organizational units.

iii) The performance budget, which is based primarily on the establishment of relationship between the investment of resources and the production of services.

iv) Planning, programming, budget system, which combines both the proceeding methods, adding, cost analysis and management of objectives.
v) The formula budget, which is based on the use of standards and quantitative modes in allocation of funds (Martin 1978:24-25). Adequate budget is vital for any meaningful collection, development. As pointed in Diana Rosenberg’s report that:

Collection policies of Libraries remain, in theory,
geared to purchase of all materials equipped
to support teaching and research. Many Librarians
added the proviso that to have a collection policy at
all was unrealistic without an adequate budget
(Rosenberg 1997: Vol.1:18)

According to Gakobo (1985), library budget depend on the parent organization’s grants, other sources of income and on the policy on budgeting. In many African public universities, the general trend indicates that a greater percentage allocated to staff salaries and cost adds very little on resource. Examples pointed by Rosenberg indicate that during 1995/96 academic years, 93% of the library budget was for staff at Kenyatta University. While at Moi University, the overall percentage of staff salaries allocation rose from 44%. In 1989/90 to 80% in 1993/94.
The contrast is true with private universities. Whereby for example at CUEA the percentage spent on staff salaries decreased from
18%, 1989/90 to 9% in 1993/94, while UEAB, the percentage also decreased from 26% in 1989/90 to 12% in 1993.94.

The minimal budgets offered to libraries by most universities can only reflect a lack of support for these libraries and unwillingness to recognize and tackle the information problem. (Rosenberg 1997: vol.1:24)

The A.L.A. guidelines points that:

> It is the responsibility of the Librarian to advise
> the institutional management of the library
> resource needs, prepare estimate budgets
> and control expenditure in accordance with the
> agreed objection (A.L.A. 1999:15)

The guidelines also acknowledge formula fund for the library to ensure the library receives consistent share of resources. This could be based on unit of resource to the library or a formula represented by the equation. The use of budget headings allows the librarian to track expenditure.

It is therefore important to recognize the need for sound budgetary allocations to libraries if they have to develop multi media resources in the holdings.
Gelfand (1968:150) concludes by stating that:

While none will say absolutely how much money a university library must have, all will agree that strong financial support is required for effective library service and that administration of the library’s funds must be sound. Studies of financial aspects of library service are therefore likely to include analyses of budgetary procedures, distribution and control of funds, areas of weak support and comparison of expenditure with published standards for library support.

It is through this that the library can chain enough to build and effectively maintain a collection of multi media resources.
2.4. Library Staff:

Library staff contributes a great deal to the teaching and learning needs as well as research in a University community. As pointed by Ahmad (1984:44)

> If university libraries are to render an efficient service to support educational objective of the university, the professional staff must be forthcoming in using their knowledge and skills. It is only through loyalty that libraries become the educational instrument essential for study and research.

According to American Library Association (A.L.A.) guidelines, the role of library staff include:

- Ensuring that the library is well managed and provides quality service in return for resources available.
- Clients needs are identified and addressed.
- Clients are provided with professional reference and information services.
- The library environment is conducive to learning
- Clients have access to learning resources they need either from collection of materials or through electronic network.
- Information is indexed efficiently.
- Clients are taught how to use information effectively.
Liason and cooperation are maintained in libraries. The above roles can never be done if the staffs are not able to perform them. It is in this respect that Gelfand 1968:50) notes that:

*Libraries require above all the intellectual and professional service of men and women who have been trained for precisely such purposes.

*Unfortunately there is a shortage of trained Librarians in developing countries.*

The shortage of staff impacts negatively on the overall development of library operations. As outlined by Hobrock (1992) that the rapid growth of information technology, a major characteristic of an information society and a component of change in the character and culture of research libraries and higher education, raises a broad range of issues for library administrators. As a system of scholarly communication moves into the growing environment of electronic/optical text and bibliographic access, students, scholars, librarians and administrators must prepare to deal with a new information culture based on information technology (Hobrock 1992:1). This statement indicates the need for trained staff to be able to exploit the potentialities of the new information technology exemplified by effective multi media collection development and use.
Multi media resources require special knowledge in building and handling if success in building and maintaining the resources has to be achieved as noted by Durey (1976:85) that:

A library staffed by reliable, honest, conscientious, intelligent, skilled, tactful, attentive staff ought to run better than one with unreliable, dishonest, lazy, stupid, unskilled, tactless, ugly librarians.

This statement by Durey explains all the importance of a well-trained staff in Library Resource Management. Gelfand points that the central importance of a competent staff of adequate size is clearly recognized in all types of library evaluations, which include:

- Staff size
- Qualification and experience of staff
- The proportion of non-professional and professional
- Academic status
- Working conditions
- Participation in professional and scholarly activities
- Quality and scope of library service.

2.5 Selection and Acquisition

Library resources can be obtained through:

- Purchases
- Gifts and donations
• Subscriptions
• In house creation
• Exchanges
• Resource sharing approaches.

Regardless of the method employed by a university library to acquire these resources, inappropriate materials even if free are ultimately expensive (Gelfand 1971:71). Margaret Chisholm in her paper "selection of media" notes that the process of developing multi media can be performed using complex models based on theory and research and thoughtful use of sophisticated selection, evaluation and assessment tools. As however noted in (Stueart 1980:489)

*No one medium can be identified as being the only alternative to meet a learning objective,*

*therefore, any collection must be marked by diversity of resources to be able to meet requirements of individual learners through optimum number of options.*

Various examples pointed by Margaret, which could impact on the process of multi media selection include:

• A university where selection is done by a traditional librarian.

• An institution, which employs on instructional developer with an extensive staff.
• An institution where selection is performed personnel who have no professional background.

• An institution just opening a multimedia resource center.

Additional factors, which inevitably influence selection, are:

• Budgets

• Goals and objectives of the institution

• The type of students

• The attitude of administrators and faculty towards media and utilization of media (Stueart 1980:481)

Agoulu (1978) emphasize the importance of bibliographic tools in selection by saying that inadequate bibliographic tools often prevent libraries from learning of the existence of new publications. Ahmad (1984:79) complements the above statement by saying that the library requires a comprehensive and up to date collection of four types of selection tools for:

• Choosing reference materials

• Choosing books

• Choosing periodicals and continuations

• Choosing non-print materials.

Hicks (1970) has pointed out three major aids in choosing multimedia resources:
Aid through involvement: This involves studying the characteristics of library clienteles in that information continuously supplied should form the books in determining the type of material that satisfies demand.

Aid through preview: Involves looking closely to the formats to determine their relevance then decide appropriate medium and then judge the capacity for integration with cultural, social and learning experience of clienteles.

Aid through reviews: This reduces unnecessary duplication and maximizes efficient use of professional time and provides a broader base of critical appraisal, furnishes technical and subject specialization expertise.

This therefore means that if wrong selection is done which does not match the interest of the clienteles, then the multi media resources will constitute a lowly used collection hence ineffective.

2.6 Evaluation and Weeding

According to the sub committees on review of collection published by A.L.A. –Chicago, an item or a group of items are considered for deselection when:

- It is redundant in the collection
- It is no longer relevant to the library’s programmes as defined by the collection development policy.
• It's physical conditions makes in unusable (A.L.A. 1991:15)

As reflected by (A.A.S.L. 1976:79)

*Having outdated or inaccurate materials in a collection discourages use, gives a false impression of adequacy of the collection, wastes time of the staff and obstructs users in their search for useful materials.*

Evaluation of multi media is also very important aspect in a library. As also indicated by A.A.S.L. (1976), Evaluation of collection relates to what exists in the collection to what is needed; providing guidance to making decisions about the collection, and provides a measure of effectiveness of the plan and directs monetary resources to areas needing attention. Kartz (1960) points four aspects in building library collections and includes:

- Reviewing the existing holdings
- Consulting the users of the collection
- Developing a plan for consistent purchasers
- Carefully considering other sources of the region.

(Kartz 1960:109-110)

The A.L.A. also acknowledges the fact that deselecting multi media present more of a challenge to librarian than for print resources for several reasons:

1) Fewer standards or core lists of recommended multi media resources than list of journals.
ii) Only a small percentage of multi media is reviewed so that each potential withdrawal may have to be reviewed by media specialist in terms of specific needs of the collection.

iii) The media content is less accessible for review and evaluation than point resources because considerable time to monitor audio-visual titles in appropriate hardware.

2.7 Bibliographic Control

Past studies in bibliographic control in Kenya have indicated that there is poor bibliographic control in Kenya some of which are attributed to lack of personnel, lack of publicity and lack of effective bibliographic tools Nganga (1991), Njuguna (1983). As noted by Kohtenstete (1971) inadequate bibliographic control is a significant deterrent to more form acceptance and use. An effective system of bibliographic control must indicate the availability and location of library materials on three levels.

i) National and international: bibliographic and library catalogues, provide information about the existence of a given item for example microform whether its in the holding of a library or available for sale from an institution or micro publisher.
ii) Local bibliographic control e.g. card catalogs entries and printed guides provide potential users with the availability, nature and location of microforms in a library’s own buildings.

iii) Internal bibliographic control such as bibliographic targets and microfiche heading areas are part of the microform itself and identify it when it is removed from its storage cabinet or other containers.

Other studies that complement the above studies are those done by Simonton (1962) Holmes (1969) and Thorpe (1971) all found that the bibliographic control of microform as part of the media is inadequate. Inadequate bibliographic control impacts negatively on the acquisition and collection development of multi media resources in university setting.

2.8 Space

Space can be a major hinderance to the library in expanding its services. A study by Rosenberg (1997) indicates lack of space as one of the problem affecting university libraries in Africa. Among the earliest academic library studies conducted, after the advent of videocassettes was Integration of non-print media (Association of Research Library ARL, SPEC kit 33) published in May 1977. It described the bleak condition of audio-visual collection and
services in academic research libraries. Librarians cited three significant obstacles to the establishment and growth of audio-visual collections in their holding, they include:

- The existence of a well established book collections and fear that purchase of expensive audio-visual materials would lead to the decline of print collection.
- Many libraries lacked the physical space needed to house a new collection that requires special equipment and handling.
- Existence of biases on the post of faculty towards traditional instructional method and print information sources (ARL 1977).

Novac G (1978) points that the only rational solution to space problem is new construction; recognition of this fact is an important first step. Unfortunately, he points that library space problem is usually interpreted, as a collection; storage problem but is more than a single deficiency. Other formidable building problem include:

- Inadequate seating for population served.
- Inadequate space for staff
- Structural and/or mechanical deficiencies
- Poor environment
- Poor service due to poor building configuration.
The above explains why consideration for space for any meaningful library development is important. Libraries may fail to acquire necessary multi media resources because of storage and use problems due to scarcity of space.

2.9 Impact of Information and Communication Technology (I.C.T) on multi-media collection building.

Information technology has now almost entirely changed the traditional way of acquisition, storage analysis distribution and presentation of vast quantities of information. Rosenberg (1997) notes that:

At the rate of information technology is developing
and being adopted in industrialized countries, developing countries will have increasing difficulty in acquiring
publication in traditional print format.

Information technology enables access to intellectual databases and other remote information system and facilitates the organization, storage retrieval and dissemination of information already available in a given country.
For effective multimedia development to take place in libraries in developing countries information technology is irreversible. However, the biggest problems in I.T. development lies in the implementation as noted by M.Dosa and J. Katzer that (1992) that:

*New information and telecommunication systems are frequently implemented on ad-hoc basis, leading to lack of coordination among different agencies and projects thereby decreasing overall effectiveness probably hope of the most overlooked problem of information technology in its mystique and appeal to policy as turnkey solution to all kinds of ills.*

It is therefore indisputable that improving multimedia has to go hand in hand with state of its application in individual libraries, which emphasizes the need for automation.
CHAPTER THREE

2.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodologies employed in carrying out the research. This includes the selection of the research sample, administration of research tools and presentation, analysis and interpretation of data obtained from the research. The description follows under four categories, which include the research sample, instruments, administration procedures and finally data presentation analysis and interpretation.

3.2 Research Sample.

The sample selected for study was drawn from two universities namely Kenyatta University and USIU- Africa libraries. The sample itself constitutes of four categories of respondents from each institution selected through both random and purposeful sampling techniques. These include the Chief Librarians, the Multimedia librarians, lecturers and staff library users of multimedia resources and students. The first two respondents were selected by purposeful sampling and the later two were selected by use of simple random. The institutions sampled are a representation of both the automated and non-automated environment.
3.3 Instruments

Three categories of instruments were applied in this research. They are:

- Questionnaires to the respondents
- Unstructured interviews to the respondents
- Observation of multi media collections and services offered.

3.4 Administration Procedures

The questionnaires were distributed to the four categories of students individually by the researchers. Unstructured interviews were used to clarify concepts, which were unclear, and to elicit responses not included in the questionnaires.

3.5 Data Presentation Analysis and Interpretation

The data obtained from both the questionnaires interviews and observation was recorded and tabulated in frequency tables. Descriptive analysis and tables were used in the presentation of the findings. Each table is a summary of response to a given variable under investigation.
CHAPTER FOUR

4 DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction:

The study was set out to investigate the factors that impede the development and maintenance of multi media resources in University libraries in Kenya. The researcher wanted to find out the problems in developing multi media resources in university libraries in Kenya with a view to suggesting possible solutions to the problems faced in developing strong academic collections of multi media resources.

The information gathered through questionnaires observations and interviews was analyzed presented and discussed as per the objective and research question of the study. The information was grouped according to important elements of investigation to include:

- Collection development policy
- Library budget
- Library staff
- Selection and acquisition
- Staff and attitude
- Evaluation and weeding
- Experienced problems
- Suggested solutions to the problems encountered.
4.2 Collection Development Policy

Chief Librarians from the two libraries under investigation filled the questionnaires as well as responded to unstructured questions from the interview and the responses were summarized in the table below.

Table 1: Collection development policy in University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection development policy</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy divisions</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of policy</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for multi media</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format specifications</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy usefulness in multi media collection building</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above responses, both Kenyatta University and U.S.I.U library have a collection development policy. There is an indication that there are divisions within the policy but no exclusive provisions have been given for multi media collection development. The policy's usefulness in regard to guidance in multi media collection was however not indicated in any of the libraries. The failure of the collection development policy on multi media is a reflection of a weak point affecting the development of these resources. As already pointed out a policy should clearly stipulate and show what the library should acquire and what it should not.
The failure of the policy becomes the starting point for the failure of the whole collection in the library because of lack of systematized development.

### 4.2.1 Library Budget in University Libraries

A library budget is very crucial in any meaningful library collection development. The high cost of multi media resources requires that adequate budget be provided for their effective development and maintenance. The Chief Librarians from the libraries investigated responded to budget and budget allocations and the responses were summarized as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Library budget requested</td>
<td>72,000,000</td>
<td>41,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget allocated</td>
<td>61,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage allocation (%)</td>
<td>84.72%</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation on multi media resource collection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians rating of adequacy</td>
<td>Moderately adequate</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the budgetary requests in an academic year and that allocated in return. U. S. I. U. library requested 72,000,000 for the library activities in a year and was awarded 61,000,000. This converted to 84.72% of the requested budget. Similarly,
Kenyatta University requested for 41,000,000 and in turn received 10,000,000 translating into 24.30% of the requested budget. The two librarians rated the budget and moderately adequate and inadequate respectively. However, within the allocated budget, no distinguished provision was indicated as specifically meant to develop and maintain multi media resources.

The findings from the table indicate different ways in which libraries are regarded in different institution. The realization of the role of a library in an institution makes it possible for an institution to meet the budgetary requirement for the same. The different in percentage allocation reflects differences in prioritization in the budget allocation in universities. Libraries should be given a major priority because they form the core of the university learning, study teaching and research needs.

The failure to quantify the amount allocated towards building of multi media resources also could be a reflection on the failure of the libraries in realizing the importance of developing these resources. This could be associated with the belief that library resources are majority print resources. It could also be because of lack of systematization in multi media collection development.
4.3 Acquisition mode of Multi Media Resources in University Libraries

The method used to acquire resources in any given library might reflect on the quality of the available resources available. Different libraries employ different modes of acquisition. The responses in regard to acquisition modes from the studied libraries is summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition mode</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In house creation</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource sharing</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
(✔): Yes.
(x): No.

From table 3 above, the commonly used method of acquiring the available multi media resources include purchases, donations, in house creation and subscription. Exchanges and resource sharing does not apply in any library in regard to multi media collection development. These may be attributed to the nature of multimedia resources, which require careful handling and could be due to the scarcity of these resources in many university libraries hence not
enough to facilitate for the exchanges or resource sharing. The leading mode of acquisition at U.S.I.U. seemed to be purchases followed by subscription. This can be attributed to the ability of the library to financially support these ventures. On the other hand, Kenyatta University reported In-house resources and donation to be the major modes employed in developing multi media resources in its holdings. This can be reflected by the many numbers of audiocassettes available in the library meaning they are Marjory created In-house. This is a reflection of the budgetary constraint. Both libraries seem not to appreciate the value of resource sharing and exchanges. This may be attributed to low-level level use of resources in some libraries or only limited collection to warrant exchange or sharing.

4.3.1 Procedures Used in Developing a List of Required Resources

Many different approaches are used in determining the list of required Multi media resources. The list should be carefully developed based on careful analysis and needs of library clients. The responses from both K. U. and U. S.I. U. indicates different approaches employed as shown in the table below:
Table 4: Criteria used in developing list of required Multi Media Resources in University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>K. U.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant media into sources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional administration</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User opinions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian’s views</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All libraries reported to have used all the four criterion in developing needed lists however at different magnitudes both the user, the administration, the librarian have a greater say on what the library should acquire however, haphazard acquisition may lead to dissatisfaction hence leading to subsequent failure by the library to meet its objectives.

4.3.2 Selection Tools used in University Libraries

The tools which are mentioned to have been used by the library are the only ones, which were tabulated. Their currency was rated by use assigned codes (numbers), which have been given various values of currency. The results are tabulated in the table below.

The keys used are:

- ✔ - Applicable
- X - Not applicable

1. Very current
2. Falsely current
3. Not very current
4. Not at all current
Table 5: Selection Tools used in University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools Used</th>
<th>U. S. I. U.</th>
<th>K. U.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔/x code</td>
<td>✔/x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers Catalog</td>
<td>✔ 1</td>
<td>✔ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>✔ 2</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers list</td>
<td>✔ 2</td>
<td>✔ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal guides</td>
<td>✔ 2</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog guides</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM data bases</td>
<td>✔ 3</td>
<td>✔ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for Internet as a tool for selection of resources at U.S.I.U., all the other tools applied in selection both K.U. and U.S.I.U. are either fairly current or not very current. The knowledge about what to select is pegged on the currency of the source in use. There is need to rely more on Internet because of currency. The difference in the currency of tools used for selection at K. U. and U. S. I. U. can be attributed to the fact that U.S.I. U. is automated and thus and that automated acquisition has facilitated the need for use of currency of materials for selection. As the library uses more current sources in selection, there is a tendency for the resources to gain more acceptances.
4.4 Media Equipments and Storage Media in University Libraries

University libraries house different types of equipments and storage media resources, which makes complete for use. Complete Sets of equipment are important because without this, the resources may not be exploited, e.g. a video player goes hand in hand with video films for complete use. The response from the media libraries indicated different equipments and media housed in libraries. The table below summarizes the responses obtained from both libraries.

Table 5: Media Equipment and Storage Media in University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Computer programmes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio cassettes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Audio cassettes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projectors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Slides/films</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video players</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Video cassettes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanners</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.V. sets</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro film readers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Micro films</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM players</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>CD-ROM discs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramophone record</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Gramophone disc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video cameras</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Video cameras</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche readers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Microfiches</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
The table above has indicated different media equipment and storage media resources. One notable problem that has come out clearly in the table is incompleteness in media sets. Examples are seen whereby K.U. has a collection of video films in the library while there is no video player or T.V for their exploitation. In addition, U.S.I.U. has recorded to have collections of microfiche and microfilms but do not have microfiche and microfilms readers. Incomplete sets of multi media can bring a problem in exploiting the resources and render the collection valueless. Except for Internet, resources housed in the collection are not as current as expected.

4.5 Problems of Developing Multi Media Resources in University Library

The problems that tend to affect the development of multi media resources were outlined in a table and librarians from the study institutions were asked to tick (✓) for the problems they accept as applying in their library and counsel (X) for a problem they felt does not apply in their library. The results were then tabulated as provided in the table below. The keys used are:
Table 6: Problems in developing multi-media resources

Key

√: Yes.
X: No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem definition</th>
<th>U.S.I.U</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate budgeting allocation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost of multimedia hardware and softwares</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-qualified staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space problem</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment maintenance problem</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-comprehensive policy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone links and exchange</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic control</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration policies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete set of equipment and storage media</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource sharing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non use of resources</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, the entire problem affected both libraries except for telephone link and exchange problem resource sharing and nonuse of resources. The table thus has reflected on the most common problems among libraries in developing multi media resources. No extra response was added apart from those outlined in the table.

4.5.1 Solutions Suggested by Librarians

The Librarians were required to give suggestions aimed at solving the problems accepted in table (6) above. The following table is a summary of the responses given.
Table 7 – Suggested solutions to problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions suggested</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff training programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate donor support</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate income generating</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate budget allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional campaign on multi media</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound liaison with administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound resource management policies put in place</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In developing effective collection of multi media resources, the librarians from the two institutions cited funding problem as well as qualified staff to lead in developing these important resources. The solution cited by the media staff pointed to:

- Staff training programmes to inserving staff on multi media as well as employing qualified staff in managing media resources.
- Negotiate for donor support to supplement existing budgetary allocations.
- Initiate income generating activities to generate money for the library as well as encouraging those who are willing to support the library.
- Adequacy of budget allocated to library and that part of the allocated budget devoted to multi media categories of resources.
• Sound liaison with administration was pointed as a solution as is known that bad relations may lead to poor funding for the library activity.

• Sound resource development and management policies to be put in place to ensure efficient collection development.

4.6 Staff Evaluation of Multi Media Resources in University Libraries

The staff was provided with questionnaires aimed at finding how they rate the available collections of multi media in terms of adequacy, currency and relevance to their study teaching learning and research needs. The staff constituted of both lecturers and regular users. The result fare presented in the tables below:

4.6.1 Adequacy of Multimedia resources in libraries

Adequacy of multimedia resources is important because it is from the adequacy that users are able to be accessible to various categories of resources. Adequacy thus becomes an important aspect of evaluating library resources.
Table 8: Staff Rating of the Adequacy of Multi Media Resources in University Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately adequate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above only 2 out of 8 responded from U.S.I.U, rated the resources as adequate. This constituted 25% of the total respondents. 1 out of 13 respondents to K.U. rated the multi media resources as adequate translating into 7.69%. 5 out of 8 respondents from U.S.I.U. translating into 62.5% rated the resources as moderately adequate while on the other hand 5 out of 13 respondents translating to 38.46% rated the resource as being moderately adequate. 6 out of 13 of respondent from K.U. rated the resources as inadequate while only 1 out of 8 respondents from U.S.I.U. rated the resources as slightly adequate from the interview inadequacies at U.S.I.U. was attributed to inadequate space for housing media collections which is also true with the K.U. situation.
4.6.2. Staff Evaluation of Currency of Multi Media Information Resources

The staff also rated the multi media resources housed in the library in regard to currency and result obtained are represented in the table below:

Table 9: Staff Perception of currency of Multi Media Information Resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately current</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly current</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not current</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The currency of information provided as well as the equipment contributes a great deal towards quality of the library resources. Equipment and resources ought to be current to gain appeal to the users. From the results of the above table, 50% of respondents from U.S.I.U. rated the multi media resources as current while 37.5% rated them as moderately current. 12.5% did not know how to rate them. At K. U., 15.38% rated the resources as current, 30.76% as moderately current, 15.38% as slightly current and 38.46% as not being current. Nobody expressed not to know of the currency of resources.
The greater percentage of current and moderately current rating of information at U.S.I.U. library can be attributed to modern technology application in the library which has exposed many of the staff to use computers and other multi media resources for research training and study. The Internet use as information gateway is a pool to many users of the library. A greater majority of the K.U. respondents i.e. 15.38% and 38.46 rating the resources as slightly current and not current respectively constitutes more than half of the total respondents. This can be attributed greatly to the nature of housed resources that do not provide much for modern application equipment and resources. Most of what is available is dated back to when the library started and therefore looking at the collections reflects an old collection that is then rated not current.

4.6.3 Staff Evaluation of Relevancy of Multi Media Collection in University Library

Resources to be used cannot be of any use if they are not relevant to the needs of the users. Relevant resources facilitate use and appeal to them. The relevancy of the resources is an important consideration in developing multi media collections. The following table summarizes the findings of staff responses on the relevancy of multi media collection in university libraries.
Table 10: Staff's Evaluation of Relevance of Multi Media Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately relevant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly relevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table 62.5% and 23.07% of respondents from U.S.I.U. and K.U. respectively rated the resources as being relevant while 37.5% and 53.85% respectively rated the resources as moderately relevant. Only 7.69% of the respondent from K.U. rated resources as irrelevant while 15.38% of respondents from K.U. did not know about the relevancy of the resources.

The results above indicate that relevant resource demands are appreciated by many staff users. Higher percentage of staff responding to the satisfaction of resources at U.S.I.U. could be due to automated environment which has led to many of them accepting and appreciating the use of these resources. K. U. staff also indicates that 53.85% appreciate the resources as moderately relevant and 23.07% as relevant.

This can be attributed to the fact that staff now has no option but to constantly use multi media resource both for teaching study and research hence need to appreciate them as they use them.
4.6.4 Level of staff participation in selection

The staffs are crucial figures in a university setting. Faculties are the link between the learners and the instructional mediums. Their participation in acquisition by giving views on what to be acquired by the library is very important. The summaries of the Faculty participation as obtained from various responses are summarized in the table below.

**Table 11 staff responses to participation in selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>U.S.I.U</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for Multi-media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in acquisition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participated in acquisition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it is indicated that only 37.5% of staff from U.S.I.U. and 15.38 staff from K.U. participated in selection. Majority did not participate at all. This is contrary to the expected outcome because the level of staff participation is supposed to be significantly high. The results above may be attributed to over-emphasis laid on print collection in acquisition. These leaves the staff with less know how of what is to be selected in the category of multi-media. The low level of development of multi-media resources in libraries in that most of them only are familiar with and used to print resource selections.
4.6.5 Staff response to problems affecting the development of multi-media resources in University Libraries.

The Faculties and staff who gave their responses indicated different responses to problems affecting the development of multimedia resources, the result are summarized in the table below.

Table 12: Problems affecting multi-media development as indicated by staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space Problem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate collection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization problem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above 87.5% of respondents from U.S.I.U. and 84.6% from K.U. indicated space as a major problem while inadequacies in the collection is reflected by 62.5% and 92.30% from U.S.I.U. and K.U. respectively.
Organizational problem and access problem received significantly low percentages in responses. The problem of outdated in collection was only evident in K.U. This could be due to the age of the university and given that the old collections of multi-media resources have never been replaced or changed. The table thus indicates that space and inadequate collection are the major problems affecting university libraries in developing multi-media collections. The access problem represented by 25% from U.S.I.U. and 30.76 % from K.U. could be attributed to lack of knowledge of resources or exploitation techniques. The problem is most profound in K.U. with a representational value of 30.76%. The low % percentage at U.S.I.U. could be as a result of familiarity with technology application in libraries.

4.6.6 Staff suggestions to solve the problems.

- Increasing more workstations
- Create space by expanding library buildings
- Acquire materials for all groups
- Increase in acquisition especially on research materials e.g. full text CD-ROM database.
- More staff to guide on exploitation and use of multimedia resources.
4.7.0. Students need for use and Participation and Selection of Multi Media Resource.

4.7.1 Use and Participation in selection.

The students for whom multi media resources are meant for one very important in regard to collection development of these resources. Any meaningful collection development must take into consideration the community to whom the resources are made. The study also investigated the students attitudes towards the need for these resources, the use and their participation in the selection and acquisition of these resources. The results are summarized in the table below:

Table I3. Students responses on importance use and Participation in Multimedia collection Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>K.U.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for multi media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used multi media resource</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used multi media resource</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participated in acquisition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table is a summary of students responses in regard to need, use and participation in multi media collection development in university libraries. From the results tabulated in table 11 above, 85.71% of the students at U.S.I.U. expressed need to build multi media’s collections by realizing that they are important while
68.75% of K.U. students also realize the importance of building multi media collections in University libraries. 85.71% of the respondents at U.S.I.U expressed having used the resources while 34.48% of the respondents at K.U. equally expressed the same. A none of the respondents however admitted to have participated in acquisition of multi media collection and expressed that their was work of Librarians.

The higher percentage need for multi media resource development can be attributed to the realization of the importance of these collection by the students, but higher percentage of use is recorded at U.S.I.U. and can be attributed to greater use of modern technology in the library e.g. the O.P.A.C. On the other hand, low use of resource at K.U. can be attributed to inadequacy of multi media resource and lack of technical know how on exploitation as well as biases towards print collections in the library.

4.7.2 Student Evaluation of Currency of Resources

The students realize the value of currency of information resources. However, the currency can only best be determined by those who know and use the resources. In determining the currency of multi media collections, only those whose responses indicated as having used the resources were considered to give a valid evaluation and the results are summarized in the table below:
Table 14: Students Evaluation of Currency of Multi Media Resources in Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately current</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly current</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not current</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, 75% of the respondents at U.S.I.U. have rated the information resources as current. Only 18.2% of the respondents at K.U. rated the resources as current while 16.67% and 36.36 rated the resources as moderately current by U.S.I.U. and K.U. respectively. 8.33% and 27.27% respectively rated the resources as slightly current while only 9.09 in K.U. expressed dissatisfaction on currency of multi media resources in the library. A significant low percentage of respondents in K.U. indicated that the resources are current compared to the U.S.I.U. proportion. Majority of the respondents from K.U. indicated that the resources are either moderately current (36.36%) or slightly current (27.27%). This explain the low usage of the resources indicated from K.U. because they are not seen to be current hence not of very high value as compared to U.S.I.U. where the rating corresponds with use of resources.
4.7.3. Adequacy of resources

Resources in the library have to be adequate for better exploitation. This depends on the number of users and the demand of use. Inadequate resources discourage use because of inconveniences caused from long time waiting especially when many people are competing against single equipment. The summary of adequacy responses from students is summarized below.

Table 15: Adequacy of Multi Media Resources in University Library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the table shows that only a small percentage rated the resources as adequate i.e. 33.3% at U.S.I.U. and 9.09% at K.U. 25% and 27.27% indicated that resources were moderately adequate at U.S.I.U. and K.U. respectively. The remaining lot indicated to the resources as being slightly Adequate, U.S.I.U. 16.67% and K.U. 45.45% and Inadequate responses represented by 27% at U.S.I.U. and 18.18%. The overall trend in both libraries indicates some level of inadequacies in multi media collections.
Inadequacies of collection can be as a result of inadequate budgets and inefficient organization in development of multi media due to failure to plan the collection through the policy. Staff deficiencies can also result in inadequateness because of failure of professional in developing the resources. The mark seems to be difficult to measure from the responses because of the almost evenly distributed percentages in each category. What is observed from the above table is that in any environment there is always a given value of inadequacies.

4.7.4 Relevance of Multi Media Resources in Libraries.

In spite of currency and adequacy, the aspect of relevance is very crucial. If is only through relevance that the resources appeal to the needs of the users. Equally, multi media resources have to be relevant to the needs of the student. This will require that the information contained in these will in itself be a motivating factor in promoting use in itself. The aspect of relevancy of these resources was evaluated by students through their responses and the results summarized in the following table.
Table 16: Student’s evaluation of relevancy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevancy</th>
<th>U.S.I.U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>K.U.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.66%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately relevant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly relevant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of U.S.I.U. respondents indicated resources as being relevant and moderately relevant. This translates to 41.66% and 25% respectively while a relatively lower percentage of students from K.U. indicated that the resources were relevant and moderately relevant translating to 9.09% and 27.27% respectively. Those who rated the multi media resources as being slightly relevant constitute 16.67% from U.S.I.U. and 36.36 from K.U. while those who rated the resources as being irrelevant to the need of student constitute of 0% (non) from U.S.I.U. and 18.18% expressed their lack of ability to rate the relevance of multi media resources.

The aspect of relevance can be attributed to the numbers of exploitable mediums in use in the library, greater use means the resources to a greater degree satisfied the requirement of the users and are therefore relevant to their needs. Low percentage of use reflects low relevancy rate. The above can be attributed to a greater exposure to machine based information processes in
U.S.I.U. as compared to K.U. Frequent exposure also facilitates use hence inculcating an ability to rate the resources in terms of relevance. Variety is also provided in that the Internet resources becomes a substitute when internal data based resources fail to satisfies the requirements of the users.

4.7.5 Students observation of problems affecting multi-media collection development.

In response to problems affecting the development of multi-media resources, the students marked the problems they feel affect the development of multi-media resources in their libraries, and the responses are given in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>U.S.I.U Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>K. U. Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity of equipment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem of space</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information relevancy problem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of exploitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Students observation of problems of multi-media in University Libraries.
From the above table, scarcity of equipments is a major problem followed by space. This is represented by 78.57% and 57.14% at U.S.I.U., while the same are represented by 93.75% and 87.5% at K.U respectfully. The reasons for these would be that the two main problems pointed out are clearly visible in nature and as such, many students observed them. On the other hand, staff related problem was not a major problem to many of the students because there is an assumption that whoever manages or is in standby in the multimedia resource room is always taken as a full professional in the area. Only a few could realize as seen from 18.76% responses obtained from K.U. Knowledge of exploitation and use of resources is yet another obstacle as postulated by 71.88% of the student responses from K.U. but low at U.S.I.U. seen by 21.42%. This difference could be attributed to the level of automation between the two environments. The trend indicates that the more advanced in automation the environment, the higher the knowledge of exploitation.

4.7.6 **Students suggested solutions to the problems.**

The students suggested the following solutions to the problems identified above.

- The libraries should acquire more equipments and storage media to cater for the appropriate numbers of student using the resources at the same time.
- Libraries should expand buildings to create more space for the resources.
There should be initiatives to teach the students on the appropriate mean of exploiting the resources housed in the libraries.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This study was focused on factors impeding on the collection development and maintenance of multi media resources in university libraries in Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives:

• To examine the collection development policy on multi media resources.
• To determine the completeness of multi media equipment and storage media sets in university libraries.
• To find out the relationship between the acquisition mode and quality of multi media resources.
• To ascertain the adequacy of budget in the development of multi media resources.
• To find the extent of user participation in the selection of multi media resources.
• To find out the adequacy and quality of staff in multi media collection development.
• To find out the place of weeding and evaluation of multi media resources.
• To find out the staff and students attitudes towards multi media resources in regard to adequacy, currency and relevancy.
• To find out problem affecting the development of multi media resources in university libraries.
• To solicit views aimed at solving the problem of multi media resources in libraries.
• To offer specific recommendation to university libraries on the development of multi media resources.

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.2.1 Collection Development

From the study it is clear that despite the fact that the libraries have a collection development policy, it is incomprehensive in nature in that it does not stipulate the kind of multi media resources to be acquired. Much as the library might acknowledge that these resources are important for research and teaching and study, failure to provide for their development in the policy reflects failure of the library to recognize their usefulness. Other findings from the study indicated that no policy statement had been revised. This contravenes the basic definition of the policy that also states that “The policy should be a living document adaptable to change as the library needs change”. The findings about the policy contradicts my expectation in that an automated environments whereby much emphasis should be placed on multi media resources, the policy still does not reflect them. This is a star of failure.

5.2.2 The Budget

This study revealed that the budget allocated to university libraries is inadequate, further to inadequacies of the budget is the problem of allocation. As exemplified from the findings, the budget did not exclusively provide for multi media resources. This means most of the multi media resources are developed hand in hand with the print resources. Libraries allocated larger budgets for their collection development e.g. U.S.I.U. (84.72%) of the required budget proved to have more developed resource base for multi media than libraries with low budget like K.U. which had 24.39% of the required budget.
This is shown from the staff rating of the adequacy of resources whereby 25% and 62.5% of staff from U.S.I.U. rated the resources as adequate and moderately adequate respectfully while the same at K.U. is represented by 7.69% and 38.46% respectively. This therefore indicates that more funds should be allocated for the development of multi media resources.

5.2.3 The Staff
The findings of the study indicated inadequacy and quality of the staff in the development of multi media. This is evident from the librarians responses indicating more demand for trained staff on multi media resources. The expressed lack of staff also affect other operational areas like the revision of policy and even the quality of acquired resources.

5.2.4 Selection and acquisition
The study revealed that there is a relationship between the mode of acquisition and the relevance and quality of multi media resources obtained. Those resources acquired through purchase and subscription rated high in relevancy than resources acquired through donations and in-house creation. This can be seen from the staff responses whereby 62.5% of U.S.I.U. rated the resources as relevant while only 23.07% at K.U. rated the resources as relevant. The results from the modes of acquisition indicated purchases and subscription as major modes of acquisition of multi media resources while donations and in-house creation ranked in high in multi media resource development at K.U. This then implies that purchased resources are mostly more appealing as compared to the other modes as in-house creation.
5.2.5 Staff and student attitudes on multi-media resources

The findings of the study reflected a positive attitudes of both staff and students towards multi media resources. This is reflected by the high level of students expressing the need for multi media resources seen from 85.71% of the students of U.S.I.U. and 68.75% of students from K.U. However, the results have indicated that high need of resources does not mean high use. This is seen from K.U. where 68.75% require multi media but only 34.35% used the resources. The difference is seen at U.S.I.U. where all the 85.71% expressing need also used the resources. This can be as a result of the quality of resources especially as a result of automated environment.

5.2.6 Weeding and evaluation

The study found that no meaningful evaluation and weeding is done on multi media resources in university libraries. This is indicated from the failure of any of the libraries to accept weeding of evaluation as a measure to improve the quality of multi media collections in this holdings.

Evaluation is normally done to ensure that the resources are still of use to the target audiences. Failure of evaluation leads to bulky collections which sometimes are inefficient and unable to meet the needs of the users.

5.2.7 Media equipment and storage media sets

A careful analysis of the multi media resources in libraries are either inadequate or incomplete. Incomplete collections of multi media resource equipments and storage media resources is a problem. This is evident from U.S.I.U, where we have microfiche collections without a microfiche readers and K.U. where we have video films without a
T.V. screen nor a video player. An incomplete set of multi media resources renders the resources inexploitable.

5.2.8 Problems of multi media collection development

From the response table from Librarians on the general problems affecting the development of multi media development in University Libraries, the following problems were suggested apart from those already investigated.

These were:

- Inadequate budgetary allocations towards multi media resources.
- High cost of multi media resource proportion.
- Inadequateness of staff for the development of multi media resources.
- Scarcity of space to house media collections
- Poor maintenance practices in libraries.
- Non-comprehensive policy on multi media resources
- Incomplete sets of equipment and storage media hampering exploitation of resources.
- Bibliographic control problem
- Unfavourable administrative policies.

The problems which were not accepted by any one library included:

- Resource sharing
- Non use of resources
- Telephone links and exchange problem.
5.2.9 Suggestions to expressed problems

- Encourage staff training programmes
- Negotiate donor support
- Seeking sponsorship
- Initiate income generating activities
- Reduce equipment student ratio
- Promotional campaign on multimedia resource proportion
- Sound liaison with administration
- Adequate budgetary allocation
5.3 CONCLUSIONS

5.3.1 Favourable budgets are essential for effective multimedia development.

5.3.2 Automated environments are a predisposing factor for effective multimedia collection development.

5.3.3 Space is essential for the storage and exploitation of multimedia.

5.3.4 A comprehensible collection development policy is a pre-requisite for balanced collection development.

5.3.5 Trained personnel are essential for any meaningful multimedia resource development and maintenance.

5.3.6 Well-planned acquisition of multimedia equipments avoids ambiguities in collection development.
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made. They include that:

- University libraries should have a comprehensive collection development policy, which should be revised from time to time to allow for changes to be made where applicable. The resource formats of multimedia acquired should be stipulated in the policy.

- University libraries should divide budget allocated to various resources in the library on formula basis. This will avoid the problem of biased collection development. Multi media resources should be given their proportionate share of the budget to ensure continuity in their development.

- University libraries should aim at facilitating training programmes for both staff and students to make them not only active users but also active participants in the developing and maintaining the multi media resources.

- In planning for the development of multi media resources, university libraries should ensure that the space available could easily accommodate the intended media resources and even give room for future expansion. These could ensure that development and exploitation are not put at stake.

- Non-automated university libraries should strive to automate their libraries as a mean of laying ground for effective development of multi media resources.
University libraries should carefully evaluate and weed their collection of multimedia resources to ensure they retain the utility based on the objective of the library goals for the resources.

For effective maintenance of the resources, it is recommended that the library should have a multimedia maintenance technician with the background of equipment functioning and use. This could minimize the breakdown problems experienced due to technical failure of equipments to operate normally.

Libraries should work hand in hand with the administration of the university to ensure high-level development. Good relationship will ensure good will hence facilitating libraries being given priority in different areas of development.

The current economic problems in many university libraries should propel them to initiate income generating projects to supplement the allocated budget to boost on the development of multimedia resources.

The development of multimedia should be found on research of user needs especially taking into account the different segments of user profiles e.g. blind, deaf users, undergraduate needs, postgraduate and staff needs. This will then lead to higher levels of acceptance and use because the resources will gain a wider appeal.
5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. A study covering all types of libraries in multimedia developments can be done to find more about the development of this resource in University libraries.

2. A study comparing the appeal of multimedia resources to different categories of users can be done to find out how different groups prefer the use or non-use of these resources.

3. A study should be done to ascertain the utilities achieved by multimedia resources in university libraries.
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Sam Nwoye Problems for university libraries in natural system in


QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE CHIEF LIBRARIAN

1. What is the approximate population served by your Library?

2. Does your Library have a collection development policy?
   - Yes
   - No

3. If yes, when was it drawn?

4. Has the policy been revised since then?
   - Yes
   - No

5. If yes, how often is it revised?
   - Quite oftenly revised
   - Fairly oftenly revised
   - Rarely revised

6. If your answer to (4) above is no, why?

---

7. Does the library budget for a year?
   - Yes
   - No

---

8. If yes, which categories are these?
7. Does the policy recognize the collection development of multi media resources?
   - Yes
   - No

8. Does the policy specify on the multi media formats to be acquired by the library?
   - Yes
   - No

9. How useful has the policy statement been in developing multi media resources?
   - Very useful
   - Moderately useful
   - Slightly useful
   - Not useful

10. What has been your average library budget for a year?

[Budget Amount]

11. Is your budget divided into categories?
   - Yes
   - No

12. If yes, which categories are these.
   i) ..............................................................
   ii) ..............................................................
   iii) ..............................................................
   iv) ..............................................................

13. Does the budget cater for acquisition of multi media resources exclusively?
   - Yes
   - No
14. If yes, what percentage of the overall budget is located to library multi media resources?

a) What was the total budget requested for library collection last academic year?

b) How much was allocated instead?

15. How in your view is the adequacy of budget allocation towards library resource development?

- Adequate
- Fairly adequate
- Slightly adequate
- Inadequate

16. How in your view is the adequacy of staff in all sections of the library?

- Overstaffed
- Enough
- Understaffed
- Can’t say

17. Do you have enough trained staff to handle multi media library resource?

- Yes
- No
18. What problem do you think affect your library in regard to collection development of multi media resource?

19. What solutions would you suggest to the above problems?

Thank you.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LIBRARIAN IN CHARGE OF MULTI MEDIA COLLECTION

1. Please Tick (✓) or (x) if any of the following methods does apply or does not apply respectively in your library in acquiring multi media resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>✓ / x</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhouse creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What formal or informal process to develop a list of needed media resources?

- Relevant media information sources
- Institutional administration
- Users opinions
- Librarian determination

Others ---------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------
3. What tools are used by your library in selecting and acquiring multi media resources?

i) ________________________________

ii) ________________________________

iii) ________________________________

iv) ________________________________

v) ________________________________

4. How could you rate the sources mentioned above in terms of currency?

- Very current
- Fairly current
- Not very current
- Not at all current

5. Do you weed your multi media collection?

- Yes
- No

6. If your answer is No, why?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

7. If your answer to (5) above is yes, how often?

- Quite oftenly weeded
- Fairly oftenly weeded
- Rarely weeded.
8. How could you rate the media resources in your library in regard to:

A) Adequacy of resources.
   - Adequate
   - Fairly adequate
   - Slightly adequate
   - Inadequate

B) Currency of resources
   - Current resources
   - Fairly current
   - Slightly current
   - Not current

C) Relevancy of resource
   - Relevant
   - Fairly relevant
   - Slightly relevant
   - Not relevant

D) Use of resources
   - Frequency used
   - Moderately used
   - Rarely used
   - Not used.

9. Below is a list of multi media equipment and storage media resources in the library. Please tick as appropriate Yes or No if the type of resource mentioned is found in your library or not.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Equipments</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Storage Media</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Computers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CD-ROMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Radio Cassette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio Cassette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Projectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video Cassette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Video Players</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scanners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internet resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. T.V. sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diskettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Microfilm readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filmstrips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CD-ROMS Players</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CD-Players</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Film (rolls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gramophone recorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microfilms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Radios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Are all the equipment and storage in perfect working order?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

11. How often do you carry out repairs and maintenance for the multi media resources housed.
   - [ ] Quite oftenly maintained and repaired
   - [ ] Fairly oftenly maintained and repaired
   - [ ] Rarely maintained and repaired
   - [ ] Not at all maintained and repaired.

12. Does the library have a maintenance technician?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

13. Below is a list of problem which tend to affect the collection development and maintenance of multi media collection in
libraries. Please tick Yes or No for these that apply or don’t apply in your library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem definition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inadequate budgetary allocation to media collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High cost of hardware and software components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inadequate staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Non-qualified staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of space to accommodate multimedia resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hardware and software maintenance problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-comprehensive policy as an obstacle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administration policies as an obstacle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Telephone links and exchange problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Problem of bibliographic control e.g. access rights, selection tools etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hardware/Software incompatibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Obsoleteness of media resources and equipments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Resources cooperation problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Non-participation of users in selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Non-use of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any other problem that also affect the collection development and maintenance of multi media resources.

i)  -----------------------------

ii) -----------------------------

iii) -----------------------------

14. What can you attribute to the problems above under these
broad categories below. (Please rank in order of descending intensity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributed factor</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What suggestion can you give to best improve the situation above (List as many as you see them.)

i) ...........................................................

ii) ...........................................................

iii) ...........................................................

iv) ...........................................................

Thank You.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FACULTIES AND STAFF USERS

1. Which department do you belong?

2. How long have you served in the Institution?

3. Do you use Multimedia resources for teaching, study research.
   - Yes
   - No

4. If yes, how frequent?
   - Very frequent
   - Fairly frequent
   - Not very frequent
   - Rarely frequent

5. If your answer to (3) above is No, why?
   
   
   

6. How could you rate the Multimedia resources in your Library in regard to Adequacy, Currency and relevance.
A) Adequacy of resources

- Adequate
- Moderately adequate
- Slightly adequate
- Inadequate
- Don’t know

B) Currency of resources

- Current
- Moderately current
- Slightly current
- Not current
- Don’t know

C) Relevancy of resources

- Relevant
- Moderately relevant
- Slightly relevant
- Irrelevant
- Don’t know

7. Have you ever been asked to suggest the multi media resources you could need acquired by your library?

- Yes
- No

8. Do you think it is important for you to participate in this exercise?

- Yes
- No
9. What problems do you see as affecting the development of the multimedia resources in the Library. (tick as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list any other problem you think affect the development of these resources.

i) .................................................................

ii) .................................................................

iii) .................................................................

iv) .................................................................

10. What suggestions can best apply in solving the problems above?

i) .................................................................

ii) .................................................................

iii) .................................................................

iv) .................................................................

v) .................................................................
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

1. What is your degree title

2. What is your year of study

3. Have you ever used the multi media resources in your library for study or recreation or research.
   - Yes
   - No

4. Do you think these resources are important for collection and development in University libraries.
   - Yes
   - No

5. Have you ever participated in determining which multi media resources the library should acquire?
   - Yes
   - No

Give reasons for your answer:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
6. How could you evaluate your library multi media collections in terms of currency, adequacy and relevancy.

A) Currency of resources
   - Current
   - Fairly current
   - Slightly current
   - Not at all current
   - Don’t know

B) Adequacy of resources
   - Adequate
   - Fairly adequate
   - Slightly adequate
   - Inadequate
   - Don’t know

C) Relevancy
   - Relevant
   - Fairly relevant
   - Slightly relevant
   - Irrelevant
   - Don’t know

8. Below is a list of common factors affecting multi media resources libraries. Please tick and rank in decreasing order the ones you feel apply to your library.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem definition</th>
<th>✓/x</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity of equipments e.g. computers etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem of space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff related problems/few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information relevancy problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of exploitation problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any other problems you think hinder the development of multimedia resources in your library.

i)  

ii)  

iii)  

9. What do you think university libraries should do to solve the above problems.

i)  

ii)  

iii)  

iv)  

10. Please rank in the table below in order of preference the category of multimedia resources as you could wish your library to develop them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optical media resource e.g. CD-ROM database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analog media components e.g. diskettes audio and order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online electronic media components e.g. internet/intranet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>