

Funding and Library Resources in Government Owned University Libraries in Nigeria

Ntui Aniebiet Inyang and Wiche Humphrey Igwechi

Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of Education, University of Calabar, Nigeria

Publication Date: 22 October 2015

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23953/cloud.ijalis.242>



Copyright © 2015 Ntui Aniebiet Inyang and Wiche Humphrey Igwechi. This is an open access article distributed under the **Creative Commons Attribution License**, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract The main thrust of this study was to investigate funding and library resources in university libraries in Rivers State, Nigeria. Survey research design was adopted for the study. A sample of 105 was used for the study; purposive sampling technique was used to select the sample for the study. Questionnaire was the main instrument used for data collection. The data collected were analysed using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The result of the analysis revealed that the perceived source of funding significantly influenced library resources in university libraries in Rivers State, Nigeria in terms of provision of information resources, library facilities provision and maintenance, human resources availability and provision of library services. Based on these findings, it was recommended that librarians should explore other means of funding where necessary to improve their services. Efforts should also be made to address the issues of human resources development, facility procurement and maintenance. Finally, the university librarian should be carried along in the strategic planning of their institutions.

Keywords *Funding; Information Resources; University Libraries; Rivers State*

1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the Study

Universities are veritable tools for the realisation of national development, the development of cultural citizens, promotion of basic research, conversation of knowledge; pursuit and dissemination of knowledge through teaching; provision of intellectual leadership.

The University library helps the university to fulfil its mandate of teaching, learning, research, cultural development through her collections, visual materials, print, non-print materials and computer databases. However, for a university library to remain relevant, it must be stocked with current and relevant information resources to meet the needs of the host institution and other information seekers. This explains the reason why during the "oil boom" era, Nigerian University libraries flourished; library shelves were filled with learning materials in order to sustain the main academic disciplines established by their parent universities. Unfortunately the story is very different today because,

University libraries are faced with the problems of maintaining core library collections, which represent their universities' curricula and the challenges of the emergence of information and communication technology (ICT) into the educational system worldwide.

Library funding is the act of providing or making available financial resources for use in developing and equipping the library, these funds are needed to provide library services, materials and development of human resources. In fact, funding has the capacity to bring about renewal, maintenance, and sustenance, nourishment, durability of university libraries. However the library is invariably a part of a wider university and its budget is negotiated with its parent organization. The parent body is therefore the proprietor that takes full responsibility for its funding. Academic libraries are financed from the budgets of their parent institutions. These funds usually cover only the current expenditure. But sometimes, libraries are supported by government ministries particularly Ministry of Education, non-governmental organisations, donor agencies, Tertiary Education Trust Fund and individuals.

Cursory observations indicate that libraries are gradually losing their credibility and standard, which has brought about an outcry among academics, students and users. This falling standard is attributable to many factors which may include; inadequate funding. Students no longer use the libraries. The materials in these libraries are seen as out dated, while internet facilities are epileptic. If the university libraries receive funds from the various sources mentioned above, then what actually is the problem?

It is however not certain whether or not the financial support given to university libraries has any influence on the development of the library in terms of material and human resources. The main thrust of this study is to find out how the various sources of funds given university libraries contribute to the sustainability of library resources in Rivers State of Nigeria.

2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of the funding on library resources in university libraries in Rivers State, Nigeria. The study specifically aimed:

- 1) To determine the influence of government subvention on library resources in university libraries in Rivers State.
- 2) To examine the influence of internally generated revenue from the library on library resources in university libraries in Rivers state.
- 3) To determine the influence of Tertiary Education Trust Fund on library resources in university libraries in Rivers state.

3. Research Methods

The survey research design was adopted for this study. Three (3) university libraries in Rivers state were selected for the study. They are Rivers State University of Science and Technology library (RSUST), University of Port Harcourt (UNIPORT) and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt (IAUOE) the entire population was used for the study as the number of library staff was small, the sample of this study comprised 105 library staff. Thus, all the professional and Para – professional librarians in these libraries constituted the sample (See Table 1)

Table 1: Population Showing Number of Library Staff in Rivers State University of Science and Technology, University of Port Harcourt and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt

S/N	Library	Total Library staff
1.	RSUST	34
2.	IAUOE	15
3.	UNIPORT	56
	Total	105

Source: (RSUST, UNIPORT and IAUOE Libraries 2015)

For The Purpose of data collection, a structured questionnaire titled funding and library resources in university library questionnaire (PFLSIULQ) was used. The questionnaire consisted of two sections (A and B). Section A of the questionnaire deals with demographic data of respondents while section B was used to measure funding and library resources.

To ascertain that the research instrument measured consistently what it was designed to measure, the instrument was trial tested using twenty (20) subjects who were randomly selected outside the population under study. The data generated were analysed to establish its internal consistency using the Cronbach alpha reliability estimates. Cronbach alpha is useful to estimate the proportion of variance that is systematic and consistent in a set of scores. The result shows that the reliability estimate range estimate of the sub-scales ranged from 0.70 to 0.89, hence the instrument was adjudged reliable enough to be used for the study.

The major dependent variable of the study was the state of library resources in University libraries. This major dependent variable had four sub-variables, namely; information resources, human resources, library facilities and library services. Each of these variables was measured on a four-point rating scale using six questionnaire items. Based on the four point scale, the minimum and maximum scores obtainable by respondents were 4 and 24 respectively. Summaries of descriptive statistical analysis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for All Continuous Variables in the Study

S/No.	Variable	N	\bar{X}	SD
1	government subvention	95	18.21	4.23
2	library internally generated revenue	95	17.64	4.13
3	tertiary education tax fund	95	19.44	4.93
4	Information resources	95	20.68	3.49
5	Human resources	95	21.08	3.38
6	library facilities	95	18.17	3.18
7	library services	95	20.32	3.52

4. Presentation of Results

4.1. Hypothesis One

There is no significant influence of government subvention on library resources in university libraries in Rivers State.

The independent variable in this hypothesis is government subvention (classified into highly funded, moderately funded, and lowly funded) while the dependent variable is library resources in university libraries which is divided into Information resources, human resources, library facilities and library services. The classification of the government subvention under funding of university libraries was

based on their mean scores from the university libraries funding questionnaire. Respondents that scored above the mean were classified as being “Highly funded”, while those below the mean were classified as “Lowly funded”, and respondents whose scored about the mean were classified as “Moderately funded”. One-Way Analysis of Variance statistical technique was employed in testing the hypothesis. See the results of the analysis in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for the Influence of Government Subvention on Library Resources in University Libraries

S/No.	Variable	Level of Funding	N	\bar{X}	SD
1	Information resources	Lowly funded	22	18.05	4.87
		Moderately funded	41	20.71	2.67
		Highly funded	32	22.47	1.83
		Total	95	20.68	3.49
2	Human resources	Low funded	22	18.32	4.41
		Moderately funded	41	21.20	2.86
		Highly funded	32	22.84	1.51
		Total	95	21.08	3.38
3	Library facilities	Lowly funded	22	16.23	3.75
		Moderately funded	41	17.46	2.62
		Highly funded	32	20.41	1.93
		Total	95	18.17	3.18
4	Library services	Lowly funded	22	18.09	4.17
		Moderately funded	41	20.15	3.03
		Highly funded	32	22.06	2.69
		Total	95	20.32	3.52

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA for the Influence of Perceived Government Subvention on Library Resources in University Libraries

S/No.	Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	MS	F
1	Information resources	Between Groups	255.115	2	127.558	13.224*
		Within Groups	887.411	92	9.646	
		Total	1142.526	94		
2	Human resources	Between Groups	267.896	2	133.948	15.300*
		Within Groups	806.431	92	8.755	
		Total	1073.326	94		
3	Library facilities	Between Groups	263.528	2	131.764	17.677*
		Within Groups	685.778	92	7.454	
		Total	949.305	94		
4	Library services	Between Groups	207.711	2	103.856	9.986*
		Within Groups	956.815	92	10.400	
		Total	1164.526	94		

*significant at .05; critical F=3.09

Results of analysis in Table 4 show that the calculated F ratio for the influence of perceived government subvention on library resources in university libraries in terms of Information resources (13.224), human resources (15.300), library facilities (17.677) and in terms of library services (9.986) were each greater than the critical F ratio of 3.09 at .05 level of significance, with 2 and 92 degrees of freedom. This means that, government subvention funding as perceived significantly influence library resources in university libraries in Rivers State in terms of Information resources, human resources, library facilities and use of library services. By these results the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate upheld.

A Post-Hoc comparison test was carried out using Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) method to discover the pair-wise group means difference responsible for the significant influence. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Fisher's LSD for the Influence of Government Subvention on Library Resources in University Libraries

S/No.	Variable	Level of Funding	High (n=32)	Moderate (n=41)	Low (n=22)
1	Information resources	Highly funded	22.47a	1.76b	4.42
		Moderately funded	2.41*c	20.71	2.66
		lowly funded (MSW=9.646)	5.19*	3.24*	18.05
2	Human resources	Highly funded	22.84	1.64	4.52
		Moderately funded	2.34*	21.20	2.88
		Lowly funded (MSW=8.755)	5.51*	3.69*	18.32
3	Library facilities	Highly funded	20.41	2.95	4.18
		Moderately funded	4.56*	17.46	1.23
		Lowly funded (MSW=7.454)	5.50*	1.71	16.23
4	library services	Highly funded	22.06	1.91	3.87
		Moderately funded	2.51*	20.15	2.06
		Lowly funded (MSW=10.400)	4.35*	2.42*	18.09

*significant at .05

- (a) Group Means are along principal diagonals
- (b) Differences among group means are above the principal diagonals
- (c) t-values are below the principal diagonals.

Results of analysis in Table 5 show that there were significant pair-wise group differences as follows: library services – highly funded versus moderately funded (2.41, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (5.19, $p < .05$) and moderately funded versus lowly funded (3.24, $p < .05$), human resources - highly funded versus moderately funded (2.34, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (5.51, $p < .05$) and moderately funded versus Lowly funded (3.69, $p < .05$); Library facilities – highly funded versus moderately funded ($t=4.56$, $p < .05$) and highly funded versus lowly funded (5.50; $p < .05$) and library services– highly funded versus moderately funded ($t=2.51$, $p < .05$), highly funded versus Lowly funded (2.34, $p < .05$); moderately funded versus lowly funded ($t=2.42$, $p < .05$). If the results are considered using the group means there is an indication that it was university libraries that were highly funded through government subvention that sustained it services and resources than their counterparts. That is the higher the level of government subvention funding of university libraries the better the level of their resources.

4.2. Hypothesis Two

Library internally generated revenue has no significant influence on library resources in university libraries in Rivers State.

The independent variable in this hypothesis is perceived library internally generated revenue (classified into highly funded, moderately funded, and lowly funded) while the dependent variable is university library resources in terms of Information resources, human resources, library facilities and library services. The classification of the perceived library internally generated revenue funding of university libraries was based on their mean scores from the university libraries funding questionnaire. Respondents that scored above the mean were classified as being "Highly funded", while those

scored below the mean were classified as “Lowly funded”, and respondents whose scored about the mean were classified as “Moderately funded”. One-Way Analysis of Variance statistical technique was employed in testing the hypothesis. See the results of the analysis in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for the Influence of Perceived Library Internally Generated Revenue on Library Resources in University Libraries in Rivers State

S/No.	Variable	Level of Funding	N	\bar{X}	SD
1	Information resources	Lowly funded	22	18.08	4.89
		Moderately funded	34	20.09	2.64
		Highly funded	39	22.69	1.51
		Total	95	20.68	3.49
2	Human resources	Low funded	22	18.36	4.76
		Moderately funded	34	20.76	2.51
		Highly funded	39	22.90	1.59
		Total	95	21.08	3.38
3	Library facilities	Lowly funded	22	16.05	3.65
		Moderately funded	34	17.35	2.59
		Highly funded	39	20.08	2.21
		Total	95	18.17	3.18
4	library services	Lowly funded	22	18.00	4.07
		Moderately funded	34	18.82	2.89
		Highly funded	39	22.92	1.48
		Total	95	20.32	3.52

Table 7: One-Way ANOVA for the Influence of Perceived Library Internally Generated Revenue on Library Resources in University Libraries in Rivers State

S/No.	Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	MS	F
1	Information resources	Between Groups	322.529	2	161.264	18.093*
		Within Groups	819.998	92	8.913	
		Total	1142.526	94		
2	Human resources	Between Groups	294.528	2	147.264	17.396*
		Within Groups	778.798	92	8.465	
		Total	1073.326	94		
3	Library facilities	Between Groups	263.817	2	131.908	17.704*
		Within Groups	685.488	92	7.451	
		Total	949.305	94		
4	library services	Between Groups	458.816	2	229.408	29.907*
		Within Groups	705.710	92	7.671	
		Total	1164.526	94		

*significant at .05; critical F=3.09

Results of analysis in Table 7 show that the calculated F ratio for the influence of perceived library internally generated revenue on library resources in university libraries in terms of Information resources (18.093), human resources (17.396), library facilities (17.704) and in terms library services (29.907) were each greater than the critical F ratio of 3.09 at .05 level of significance, with 2 and 92 degrees of freedom. This means that, perceived library internally generated revenue funding as perceived significantly influence on library resources in university libraries in Rivers State in terms of Information resources, human resources, library facilities and use of library services. By these results the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate uphold.

A Post-Hoc comparison test was carried out using Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) method to discover the pair-wise group means difference responsible for the significant influence. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 8.

Results of analysis in Table 8 show that there were significant pair-wise group differences as follows: library services – Highly funded versus moderately funded (3.71, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (5.76, $p < .05$) and moderately funded

Table 8: Fisher's LSD for the Influence of Perceived Library Internally Generated Revenue on Library Resources in University Libraries

S/No.	Variable	Level of Funding	High (n=39)	Moderate (n=34)	Low (n=22)
1	Information resources	Highly funded	22.69a	2.60c	4.61
		Moderately funded	3.71*c	20.09	2.01
		lowly funded	5.76*	2.45*	18.08
		(MSW=8.913)			
2	Human resources	Highly funded	22.90	2.14	4.54
		Moderately funded	3.15*	20.76	2.40
		Lowly funded	5.82*	2.96*	18.36
		(MSW=8.465)			
3	Library facilities	Highly funded	20.08	2.73	4.03
		Moderately funded	4.27*	17.35	1.30
		Lowly funded	5.52*	1.73	16.05
		(MSW=7.451)			
4	Library services	Highly funded	22.92	4.10	4.92
		Moderately funded	6.31*	18.82	.82
		Lowly funded	6.65*	1.08	18.00
		(MSW=7.671)			

*significant at .05

- (a) Group Means are along principal diagonals
- (b) Differences among group means are above the principal diagonals
- (c) t-values are below the principal diagonals.

versus lowly funded (5.76, $p < .05$); human resources – Highly funded versus moderately funded ($t=3.15$, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (5.82, $p < .05$) and moderately funded versus lowly funded (2.96; $p < .05$) library facilities – Highly funded versus moderately funded (4.27, $p < .05$) and highly funded versus lowly funded (5.52, $p < .05$); library service – Highly funded versus moderately funded ($t=6.31$, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (6.65, $p < .05$). If the results are considered using the group means there is an indication that it was university libraries that were highly funded through perceived library internally generated revenue that sustained it services and resources than their counterparts. That is, the higher the level of perceived library internally generated revenue funding of university libraries the better the level of their sustainability.

4.3. Hypothesis Three

Perceived tertiary Education Trust Fund assistance has no significant influence on library resources in university libraries in Rivers State.

The independent variable in this hypothesis is perceived tertiary Education Trust Fund assistance (classified into highly funded, moderately funded, and lowly funded) while the dependent variable is university library resources through Information resources, human resources, library facilities and library services. Respondents that scored above the mean were classified as being "highly funded",

while those scored below the mean were classified as “lowly funded”, and respondents whose scored about the mean were classified as “moderately funded”. One-Way Analysis of Variance statistical technique was employed in testing the hypothesis. See the results of the analysis in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for the Influence of Perceived Tertiary Education Trust Fund Assistance on Library Resources in University Libraries

S/No.	Variable	Level of Funding	N	\bar{X}	SD
1	Information resources	Lowly funded	12	15.42	4.72
		Moderately funded	35	20.09	2.47
		Highly funded	48	22.44	2.05
		Total	95	20.68	3.49
2	Human resources	Low funded	12	16.33	4.52
		Moderately funded	35	20.51	2.77
		Highly funded	48	22.69	1.97
		Total	95	21.08	3.38
3	Library facilities	Lowly funded	12	14.58	3.20
		Moderately funded	35	17.89	2.89
		Highly funded	48	19.27	2.68
		Total	95	18.17	3.18
4	library services	Lowly funded	12	15.83	3.19
		Moderately funded	35	19.06	3.07
		Highly funded	48	22.35	2.25
		Total	95	20.32	3.52

Table 10: One-Way ANOVA for the Influence of Perceived Tertiary Education Trust Funds Assistance on Library Resources in University Libraries

S/No.	Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	MS	F
1	Information resources	Between Groups	493.054	2	246.527	34.921*
		Within Groups	649.472	92	7.059	
		Total	1142.526	94		
2	Human resources	Between Groups	405.604	2	202.802	27.942*
		Within Groups	667.722	92	7.258	
		Total	1073.326	94		
3	Library facilities	Between Groups	215.367	2	107.683	13.498*
		Within Groups	733.939	92	7.978	
		Total	949.305	94		
4	Library services	Between Groups	495.995	2	247.997	34.128*
		Within Groups	668.532	92	7.267	
		Total	1164.526	94		

*significant at .05; critical F=3.06

Results of analysis in Table 10 shows that the calculated F ratio for the influence perceived tertiary Education fund assistance on library resources in university libraries in terms of Information resources (34.921), human resources (27.942), library facilities (13.498) and library services (34.128) were each greater than the critical F ratio of 3.09 at .05 level of significance, with 2 and 92 degrees of freedom. This means that, Tertiary Education fund assistance significantly influence library resources in university libraries in Rivers State in terms of Information resources, human resources, library facilities and library services. By these results the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate uphold.

A Post-Hoc comparison test was carried out using Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) method to discover the pair-wise group means difference responsible for the significant influence. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 11.

Results of analysis in Table 11 shows that there were significant pair-wise group differences as follows: Information resources – Highly funded versus moderately funded (3.98, $p < .05$) and highly funded versus lowly funded (8.26, $p < .05$) and moderately funded versus lowly funded (5.25, $p < .05$); human resources- highly funded versus moderately funded (3.63, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (7.31, $p < .05$) and moderately funded versus lowly funded (4.64, $p < .05$); library facilities- highly funded versus moderately funded (2.16, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (5.15, $p < .05$) and moderately funded versus lowly funded (3.52, $p < .05$) and library services – Highly funded versus moderately funded ($t=5.48$, $p < .05$), highly funded versus lowly funded (7.49, $p < .05$) and moderately funded versus lowly funded (3.59, $p < .05$) If the results are considered using the group means there is an indication that it was university libraries that were highly funded through Tertiary education Fund assistance that sustained its services and resources than their counterparts. That is the higher the level of Tertiary Education fund assistance of university libraries the better the library resources

Table 11: Fisher's LSD for the Influence of Perceived Tertiary Education Funds on Library Resources in University Libraries

S/No.	Variable	Level of funding	High (n=48)	Moderate (n=35)	Low (n=12)
1	Information resources	Highly funded	22.44	2.35	7.02
		Moderately funded	3.98*	20.09	4.67
		lowly funded	8.26*	5.25*	15.42
		(MSW=7.059)			
2	Human resources	Highly funded	22.69	2.18	6.36
		Moderately funded	3.63*	20.51	4.18
		Lowly funded	7.31*	4.64*	16.33
		(MSW=7.258)			
3	Library facilities	Highly funded	19.27	1.36	4.69
		Moderately funded	2.16*	17.89	3.31
		Lowly funded	5.15*	3.52*	14.58
		(MSW=7.978)			
4	Library services	Highly funded	22.35	3.29	6.52
		Moderately funded	5.48*	19.06	3.23
		Lowly funded	7.49*	3.59*	15.83
		(MSW=7.267)			

*significant at .05

- (a) Group Means are along principal diagonals
- (b) Differences among group means are above the principal diagonals
- (c) t-values are below the principal diagonals.

5. Discussion of Results

5.1. Hypothesis One

Perceived government subvention and library resources in university libraries in Rivers state: The result shows that there is a significant influence of government subvention on library resources in university libraries in Rivers state. The result also indicates that, government subvention influences Information resources, library facilities, human resources and library services.

This result is in agreement with Fawowe (2006) in his study of funding academic libraries in Nigeria: a survey of some university libraries in Nigeria. The study revealed that, university libraries depend entirely on government funding to survive. The result of the study is also in line with the findings of Ubogu and Okiy (2010) which revealed that the main source of funding academic libraries is government subvention. Thus, perceived government subvention has an influence on university

library sustainability, the higher the level of perceived government subvention, the higher the level of library efficiency in form of its resources.

5.2. Hypothesis Two

Perceived library internally generated revenue and university library resources in Rivers state: The findings of the study shows that, there is a significant influence of perceived library internally generated revenue on library resources in university libraries in Rivers state. The result also shows that, perceived library internally generated revenue has a high influence on library facilities, human resources and library services. Little wonder, Okojie (1999) stated the federal government through the NUC has consciously directed all federal universities to explore ways of generating revenues internally. However the study is in agreement with Zaid (2008) who revealed in his study of internally generated revenue (IGR) by university libraries in Nigeria. That, in order for Nigerian academic libraries to survive in the 21st century, there is need for some internally generated revenue which he said will make Nigerian libraries services efficient, viable and relevant. Thus university libraries with various means of internally generated revenue, tends to have a greater level of library resources sustainability.

5.3. Hypothesis Three

Perceived tertiary Education Trust Fund and library resources in Rivers state: The result shows that, there is significant influence of perceived tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND) on the state of library resources in university libraries in Rivers state in terms of Information resources, human resources, library facilities and library services. This study is consistent with that of Odunsanya and Osinulu (2004) whose findings revealed that, prior to the intervention of the education trust fund (ETF), budgetary allocation to the library was abysmally low and hence the library was not able to perform many of its functions satisfactorily. With the intervention of the ETF, the library was able to purchase computers equipment and library processing tools needed for the effective functioning of the library. Similarly Osinulu and Daramola (2011) who studied government intervention in the funding of Nigerian university libraries: the role of the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETF) revealed that the TETF agency came at the right time to alleviate the inadequate funding experienced in the education sector and the university library in particular. They further revealed that, acquisition of learning resources such as journals and ICT facilities by the participating libraries in the south west has been reinforced and greatly enriched. Thus, the greater the support received the higher the level of the resources

6. Conclusion

The study investigated funding and library resources in university libraries in Rivers State; perceived government subvention, perceived library internally generated revenue, perceived tertiary Education Trust Fund, were studied as sub variables of funding while information resources, human resources, library facilities and library services were studied as sub variables of library resources.

Based on the result of the study the following conclusions were reached, perceived funding significantly influenced library resources in university libraries in terms of provision of Information resources, library facilities, human resources and provision library services. The result of this survey has also revealed that in Nigeria the main source of academic library funding is from the university budget which invariably comes from the government. However, the time has come when academic libraries should begin to think of alternative sources of funding to supplement whatever is provided by the government. At present, although libraries make some money from overdue fines, photocopying and charges for lost books, such money is paid into the universities central account (library internally generated revenue). Perhaps, academic libraries now need to make a case for the retention of these fees and fines in their account. For example, the money realised from photocopying can be used to

maintain the machines which will enable it to be in constant working condition. This will increase the amount realised from this source. It will also provide some more money which can be used to maintain other library services. Another source of potential revenue that can be tapped in the library is through binding and the two libraries studied have a functional bindery section. This section can be expanded to cater for people outside the university environment.

Endowments and Foundations as a way of attracting more funds specifically into university libraries must be given a trial. Adequate funding of libraries by universities should be considered a basic necessity for the effective development of these libraries. It is for this reason that the National Universities Commission has recommended that 10 percent of the university budget be allocated to the library.

Faculty members who serve on important committees such as the Senate Estimates Committee or the Finance and General Purposes Committee of the universities must join in advocating for adequate funding for the libraries. After all, the materials and services being provided by the academic libraries are meant to serve these faculty members and their students. Perhaps, there is no better time to start this campaign than now when staff and students cannot afford any extra money to purchase books and journals which they need. It must always be made clear to the university community, particularly the administrators that library services cannot be run successfully on token and inadequate funding.

Recommendations

- 1) Librarians in universities should be carried along in the strategic planning of the institution to enable them meet the set goals and objectives of the institution.
- 2) Continuous training and re-training of academic library staff is recommended.
- 3) Academic library authorities should make fund available in order to acquire materials.
- 4) Comprehensive assessment of library materials should be carried out with adequate participation by users.
- 5) Where there are in-adequate facilities, efforts should be made to address them.
- 6) Evaluation process should be made available electronically giving opportunities for all categories of users to participate.
- 7) Librarians should explore other means of funding.

References

- Asamoah-Hassan, H.R., 2012: *Non-Governmental Organisation (NGOs) and Library Development in Africa*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/4180>
- Fowowe, S.O., 2006: *Funding Academic Libraries in Nigeria. A Survey of Some Nigerian University Library*. University of Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.
- Odusanya, A.K. and Osinulu, L.F. *The Impact of ETF Funding on Academic Libraries. A Case Study Approach African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*. 2004. 14 (2) 185-192.
- Odusanya, O.K. and Osinulu, L.F. *The Impact of ETF Funding on Nigerian Academic Libraries. A Case Study Approach African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*. 2004. 14 (2).
- Okojie, J.A., 2009: *Innovative Funding in the Nigerian University System*. Available at <http://www.unilorin.edu.ng/unilorin/downloads/okojie-innovative%20Funding.ppt> retrieved on 26/7/14
- Ubogu, J.O. and Okiy, R.S., 2011: *Sources of Funds in Academic Libraries in Delta State, Nigeria*. Retrieved from <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/>
- Zaid, Y.A. *The Study of Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) by University libraries in Nigeria*. Borno Library of Archival and Information Science Journal. 2008. 7 (1) 1-14.