

Availability and Utilisation of Library Resources and Services by Students and Faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education

Ahmed Olakunle Simisaye

Department of Library and Information Science
Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State

Temitope Adeleke Osisanwo

Department of Library and Information Science
Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State
&

Olufela Ibiyemi Adeyeoye

Department of Library and Information Science
Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the availability and utilisation of the library resources and services by the students and faculty staff of Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State. A survey research design was adopted for the study. The population of the study comprised 10,724 undergraduates, 250 post-graduate students and 278 faculties. 986 undergraduates were selected as sampled using stratified random sampling technique while total enumeration method was used to capture the postgraduate students and faculty staff which implied that these two were all selected. Questionnaire was the main instrument for data collection and was supplemented with Focus Group Discussion. The finding revealed that the inadequacy of library resources and services were inadequate while the level of utilisation of library resources and services by respondents, was low. Major hindrances to the utilisation of library resources and services included inadequate skills needed for rendering information services by librarians, lack of awareness of availability of library resources and services by users, and inadequate library opening hours. The results showed that there was significant difference in the utilisation of library resources by the students ($\bar{x} = 58.58$) and by the faculty ($\bar{x} = 38.88$). Moreover, there was a significant relationship between the availability and utilisation of library resources by students (r value is -0.150) and by faculty (r value is -0.160). The findings also revealed that there was significance difference in the utilisation library services by students ($\bar{x} = 57.74$) and by faculty ($\bar{x} = 44.18$). The study concluded that the library collection was inadequate and there is significant relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources among the respondents while several factors hindered the availability and utilisation of the resources and services of the university library. Recommendations like increased need for the library to acquire more relevant materials to boost the present collection which is inadequate, among others were proffered

Keywords: University Library, Availability and Use, library resources, Library Services, Tai Solarin University of Education.

Introduction

University libraries occupy a vintage position in the university systems as it is the heart and hub of academic activities in post-secondary educational institutions by supporting research,

teaching, and learning. They are established to support the functions of the university which are the enhancement of learning, teaching, research and community services. The libraries support these functions by providing adequate information resources and services relating to the educational mandates of the university that it serves. Without the use of the university library's information resources and services, students and faculty would find it very difficult to accomplish their goals. In order to accomplish these tasks, university libraries gather, organize, process, and distribute information sources in a variety of formats (Emezie, 2018).

According to Adegun (2015), library resources are items that patrons consult in the library to meet their information needs. In general, print, non-print, electronic, and web-based library resources are essential to university students' academic success while they are also important for faculty's teaching and research. When these resources are properly organized, accessed and utilized, they could lead to better and meaningful research process and outcomes (Odu & Egbe, 2016).

Apart from organizing library resources for use, academic libraries also render services that are capable of attracting potential users. These services include lending services, interlibrary loans, document delivery, reservations, user education, reference services, and information literacy programs (Hussain & Kumar, 2013). Others include displays and exhibitions, literature searches, information distribution, and referral services (Oyedipe, Adekunmisi, Ajiboye, Olarewaju & Adesoye, 2018).

Globally, libraries and information centers have always placed a high priority on the availability of library materials and their use. Libraries promote the use of their holdings in line with one of the core laws of librarianship which says that books are for use. This study therefore intends to study the availability and utilisation of library resources and services by the students and faculty staff of Tai Solarin University of Education (TASUED).

Statement of the Problem

Tai Solarin University library has witnessed continuous improvement in its print and non-print collections since it was established in 2005. This library is supposed to be the centre of academic activities on campus however, preliminary observation by the researchers suggests that there is low utilisation of the resources by students and faculty. The circulation and reference areas of the library are frequently less crowded, and the seats in the readers' services section are frequently underutilized. Besides students are seen reading in vacant classrooms, under the trees planted on the campus, along the roads on the campus, and sometimes with their laptops and smart phones around the library instead of entering the library to study. This may imply apathy for the use of library or ignorance of the resources and services of the library which may adversely affect the teaching, learning, research and other academic activities of the university. This undesirable situation called of the availability and utilization of the resources and services of the Tai Solarin University of Education for investigation to reverse this trend.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are to:

1. find out the availability of library resources to students and faculty in Tai Solarin University of Education Library;

2. determine the frequency of utilization of library resources by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education;
3. find out the frequency of use of library services by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education;
4. (vi) identify the factors that hinder the utilisation of library resources and services by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education.

Hypotheses

HO1: There is no significant difference in the utilisation of library resources by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education.

HO₂: There is no significant difference in the use of library services by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education.

HO3: There is no significant relationship between the availability and utilisation of library resources by students of Tai Solarin University of Education.

HO4: There is no significant relationship between the availability and utilisation of library services by faculty staff of Tai Solarin University of Education.

Review of Related Literature

University libraries play a prominent role in providing information services in various forms to students, lecturers and researchers. This is why Okunu, Akalumhe, and Monu (2011) concluded that the university library is the heart and blood of the university. Rare books, manuscripts and institutional documents are preserved in special collections and archives which offer distinctive original sources that aid in cutting edge research (Miller, 2010). In order to promote equal access to information, university libraries make open access journals, institutional repositories, and open educational resources (OERs) easier to access (Suber, 2012; Poynder, 2014).

In addition, university libraries provide a range of services and programs. Programs for information literacy assist students in acquiring the skills necessary to find, access, and use information effectively, which improves their academic performance and capacity for critical thought (Julien & Barker, 2009). On the other hand, reference services are provided by university libraries to assist patrons in locating materials and carrying out research. More and more people are getting customized support through online reference services and personalized research consultations (RUSA, 2008). In order to promote digital literacy, libraries offer digital services such as computer labs, multimedia equipment, and software applications, online catalogues, electronic reserves, and digital repositories (Tenopir, 2003). In order to promote cooperation and creativity, modern university libraries have maker-spaces, study rooms, and group workspaces (Lippincott, 2006).

Many studies have looked into libraries and how people use them. A barren library is not a functional library. Utilizing library resources is therefore, essential to the institution's survival. This is in line with the theory that using library resources is a tool that helps management think about how it may best serve library consumers as noted by Onifade, Ogbuiyi, and Omeluzor (2013). Thus, user studies are acknowledged as a valid means of evaluating libraries and their resources. The availability and use of print information resources for study by final-year library and information science (LIS) students at the University of Jos library was examined by Panle, Akhimien and Mang (2021). The results showed that final-year LIS students' use of the various print information resources was insufficient and they encountered difficulties in using the

resources. According to Kumah (2015), postgraduate students use the library because it provides a comfortable environment for studying and they value the resources offered. However, Lateef, Omotoso and Owalabi, (2013) found that students did not frequently use their library's resources because the resources were not updated and the materials did not meet their information needs. Unegbu and Lawal-Solarin (2017) conducted a research to evaluate the accessibility and availability of library materials as factors influencing library use at Lagos State University Library. The findings showed that there was a statistically significant positive association ($r = 0.433$, $P < 0.05$) between the availability of library materials and the use of the library by students. Additionally, the study found a highly significant positive association ($r = 0.668$, $P < 0.05$) between students' use of the library and the accessibility of library materials. Salubi, Ondari-Okemwa, and Nekhwevha (2018) investigated how generation Z students used libraries. They discovered that the majority of undergraduates used print information resources more than electronic databases. Similarly, Okonoko, Sambo and Ejoro (2018) reported that majority of students in Nigerian higher education institutions primarily used textbooks, serials, reference materials, and the Internet. Kumar (2017) carried out a research on how University of Agricultural Science researchers and postgraduate students use the library materials and services. The study reported that the respondents used more of traditional print resources than electronic resources. . Onuoha, Ikonne and Madukoma (2013) examined postgraduate students' usage of libraries and research productivity; they found that postgraduate students valued print books more than electronic journals and the Internet. Salman, Ahmed, Raheem, and Pelemo (2020) studied the usage, accessibility and availability of electronic information resources by undergraduates at Fountain University Library, Osogbo, Nigeria. It was discovered that the respondents could access and use the electronic information resources. However, the electronic information resources were insufficient. Usman (2016) examined the Kashim Ibrahim Library's usage by faculty staff and students at Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria. The findings revealed that majority of the respondents were not aware of the availability of the library resources. This showed that library resources and services can be underutilized when students and faculty are not aware of their availability.

The frequency of library usage is predictive of library effectiveness. Olajide and Adio (2017) investigated the effective usage of the library by undergraduates and reported that 172 (44.8%) of the undergraduate students at Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria visited the university library occasionally. The study concluded that most students expressed dissatisfaction with the library building, reading area, ventilation, restrooms, and protection given to their personal belongings. Obodo, Eze and Ani (2022) also concurred that lecturers underutilised library resources and services. The primary reasons for infrequent or non-use of resources have been identified as follows: lack of awareness, perceived lack of relevance, lack of time, distance, incompetence in using electronic resources, personal books and/or books borrowed from friends, Internet access at home and public libraries, lack of necessity, and denial of use (Preston & O'Dell, 2013). It has been reported that half of all library patrons leave the building without bothering to speak with the librarians because they think they are too busy, their questions are too easy, or they had a bad encounter with a librarian in the past (Chimah, Nwajei & Akom, 2015).

Research also showed that the main reasons for disgruntled consumers are "unapproachable busy library staff," "poor employee behaviour," and a lack of competence.

Patrons of libraries have expressed their discontent and apathy towards rules and restrictions, which

h is why they are advocating for a relaxation of these principles (Nicholas, Sterling, Davis, Lewis, Mckoy-Johnson, Nelson, Tugwell & Tyrell, 2015)

Methodology

The research design used in the study was a descriptive survey. It adopted a mixed method research. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used in the investigation. The academic staff and students of TASUED comprised the study's population. The five colleges studied were Vocational and Technology Education (COVTED), Social and Management Sciences (COSMAS), Science and Information Technology (COSIT), College of Humanities (COHUM), and College of Specialized and Professional Education (COSPED). The total population of undergraduates is 19,724. In line with standards set by Sarantakos (2012), 5% of the population (986) were selected as sample using stratified sampling technique. Total enumeration method was adopted to involve all the 278 faculty staff and 250 post-graduate students. The data collection instrument was a structured questionnaire developed by the researchers based on literature reviewed. Thirty copies of the questionnaire were pretested on faculty members and students of Olabisi Onabanjo University Ago-Iwoye to guarantee the face validity. Data were subjected to reliability analysis using the Cronbach Alpha technique. The reliability test result for the clusters in the instrument was 0.78. The questionnaire was administered on the students and faculty by the researchers and five research assistants. Data was gathered over a period of three to four weeks. Data gathered were analysed using SPSS version 22 while the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significant. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted to compliment the questionnaire. The FGD was carried out on randomly selected fifty (50) undergraduates; ten (10) students were selected from each of the colleges. 10 post-graduate students were selected, two (2) from each college while 25 faculty staff, that is five (5) from each college were selected to further elicit information that were difficult to get through the questionnaire. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics of mean, standard deviation and percentages, while hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. The data from the FGD was analysed using content analysis.

Data Presentation and Results

Demographic Information of Students

Table 1: Demographic Information of Students

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	364	37.6
Female	603	62.4
College	Frequency	Percentage
COSIT	154	15.9
COHUM	184	19.0
COSPED	291	30.1
COSMAS	190	19.6
COVTED	148	15.3
Level	Frequency	Percentage
100	156	16.1
200	221	22.9
300	130	13.4
400	263	27.2

Masters	191	19.8
PhD	6	0.6

As could be seen from Table1, demographic information of the students showed that 364(37.6%) of the respondents were male while 603(62.4%) were female. The table shows the college of the respondents, 154(15.9%) were from COSIT, 184(19.0%) were from COHUM, 291(30.1%) were from COSPED, 190(19.6%) were from COSMAS and 148(15.3%) were from COVTED. The table also shows the level of the respondents, 156(16.1%) were 100l, 221(22.9%) were 200l, 130(13.4%) were 300l, 263(27.2%) were 400l, 191(19.8%) were Masters and 6(0.6%) were PhD.

Table 2: Demographic Information of Faculty

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	117	54.9
Female	96	45.1
College	Frequency	Percentage
COSIT	39	18.3
COHUM	38	17.8
COSPED	97	45.5
COSMAS	39	18.3
COVTED	39	18.3
Educational	Frequency	Percentage
PDG	58	27.2
MSC	117	54.9
PHD	38	17.8
Experience	Frequency	Percentage
11-15	78	36.6
16-20	57	26.8
21-25	39	18.3
26-30	19	8.9
31YRS and above	20	9.4
Status	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate Assistant	39	18.3
Assistant Lecturer	78	36.6
Lecturer 1	19	8.9
Senior Lecturer	57	26.8
Associate Professor	20	9.4
Age	Frequency	Percentage
25-30	39	18.3
31-35	57	26.8
36-40	117	54.9

As indicated in Table 2, demographic information of faculty showed that 117(54.9%) of the respondents were male while 96(45.1%) were female. 76(35.7%) of the respondents were single while 137(64.3%) were married. The results show that the college to which respondents belonged are 39(18.3%) from COSIT, 38(27.2%) , from COHUM, 97(45.5%) were from COSPED, 39(18.3%) were from COSMAS and 39(18.3%) from COVTED. In addition, the

educational qualification of the respondents, showed that 58(27.2%) had PGD, 117(54.9%) had Masters and 38(17.8%) had PhD. The results also revealed that the work experience of the respondents showed 78(36.6%) covered <5yrs, 57(26.8%) covered 6yrs-10yrs, 39(18.3%) covered 11yrs-15yrs, 19(8.9%) covered 11yrs-15yrs while 20(9.4%) had 21yrs above. In addition, it showed the cadre of the respondents, 39(18.3%) were Graduate Assistant, 78(36.6%) were Assistant Lecturer, 19(8.9%) were Lecturer 1, 57(26.8%) were Senior Lecturer and 20(9.4%) were Associate Professor.

Research Question 1: What is the availability of library resources to Students in Tai Solarin University of Education?

Table 1a: Availability of library resources to students and faculty

S/n	RESOURCES	Very Readily available	Readily Available	Not Readily available	Not available	Mean	Std. D.
1.	Internet facilities	305(31.5%)	266(27.5%)	195(20.2%)	201(20.8%)	2.30	1.12
2.	Journals	307(31.7%)	279(28.9%)	175(18.1%)	206(21.3%)	2.29	1.13
3.	Books	319(33.0%)	260(26.9%)	189(19.5%)	199(20.6%)	2.28	1.13
4.	Dictionaries	323(33.4%)	238(24.6%)	230(23.8%)	176(18.2%)	2.27	1.11
5.	Computer	341(35.3%)	261(27.0%)	147(15.2%)	218(22.5%)	2.25	1.16
6.	Abstract	341(35.3%)	252(26.1%)	174(18.0%)	200(20.7%)	2.24	1.14
7.	Manuals	333(34.4%)	277(28.6%)	147(15.2%)	210(21.7%)	2.24	1.14
8.	Biographies	322(33.3%)	273(28.2%)	190(19.6%)	182(18.8%)	2.24	1.11
9.	Reports	317(32.8%)	271(28.0%)	210(21.7%)	169(17.5%)	2.24	1.09
10.	CD-ROM Facilities	326(33.7%)	269(27.8%)	193(20.0%)	179(18.5%)	2.23	1.11
11.	Encyclopaedias	335(34.6%)	265(27.4%)	184(19.0%)	183(18.9%)	2.22	1.12
12.	Directories	335(34.6%)	259(26.8%)	202(20.9%)	171(17.7%)	2.22	1.10
13.	Conference Proceedings	326(33.7%)	281(29.1%)	182(18.8%)	178(18.4%)	2.22	1.10
14.	Handbooks	340(35.2%)	269(27.8%)	176(18.2%)	182(18.8%)	2.21	1.12
15.	Gazettes	330(34.1%)	292(30.2%)	181(18.7%)	164(17.0%)	2.19	1.08
16.	Newspapers/Magazines	347(35.9%)	272(28.1%)	178(18.4%)	170(17.6%)	2.18	1.10
17.	E-Resources	349(36.1%)	274(28.3%)	178(18.4%)	166(17.2%)	2.17	1.10
18.	Bibliographies	347(35.9%)	274(28.3%)	182(18.8%)	164(17.0%)	2.17	1.09
19.	Almanacs	358(37.0%)	205(21.2%)	283(29.3%)	121(12.5%)	2.17	1.07
20.	Atlases/Maps	345(35.7%)	280(29.0%)	169(17.5%)	173(17.9%)	2.16	1.10
21.	Index	386(39.9%)	258(26.7%)	147(15.2%)	176(18.2%)	2.12	1.13
Mean of the average						2.92	1.53

Criteria: \bar{x} =3.0 or >3.0 is accepted

Table 1a shows the availability of library resources to students and faculty. The results show among others that majority 31.54% of the students said internet facilities was very readily

available, while 27.5% said readily available, 20.8% indicated not available and 20.2% said not readily available. For journals, 31.7% said very readily available, 28.9% affirmed readily available, 21.3% said not available while 18.1% indicated not readily available. For books, majority 33.0% said very readily available, 26.9% indicated readily available, 20.6% affirmed not available while 19.5% said not readily available. In respect of dictionaries, 33.4% said very readily available, 24.6% affirmed readily available, 23.8% indicated not readily available while 18.2% affirmed not available. Concerning computers, majority 35.3% said very readily available, 27.0% affirmed readily available, 22.5% indicated not available while 15.2% said not readily available. Level of other library resources are shown in the Table. The result shows that library resources to students is not readily available. This is depicted by the average of the means score of 2.92 which is less than the criterion mean. The table also revealed that the most very readily available library resources to students are internet facilities ($\bar{x} = 2.30$), journals ($\bar{x} = 2.29$), books ($\bar{x} = 2.28$) and dictionaries ($\bar{x} = 2.27$).

Table 1b: Availability of library resources to Faculty

RESOURCES		Very available	Readily Available	Not Readily available	Not available	Mean	Std. D.
1.	Books	53(24.9%)	99(46.5%)	36(16.9%)	25(11.7%)	2.17	0.92
2.	Journals	73(34.3%)	101(47.4%)	17(8.0%)	22(10.3%)	1.94	0.91
3.	Internet facilities	85(39.9%)	89(41.8%)	12(5.6%)	27(12.7%)	1.91	0.98
4.	Newspapers/Magazines	87(40.8%)	87(40.8%)	11(5.2%)	28(13.1%)	1.91	0.99
5.	Conference Proceedings	91(42.7%)	79(37.1%)	16(7.5%)	27(12.7%)	1.90	1.01
6.	Directories	83(39.0%)	91(42.7%)	18(8.5%)	21(9.9%)	1.89	0.93
7.	Gazettes	96(45.1%)	81(38.0%)	5(2.3%)	31(14.6%)	1.86	1.02
8.	Abstract	89(41.8%)	88(41.3%)	13(6.1%)	23(10.8%)	1.86	0.95
9.	Handbooks	93(43.7%)	81(38.0%)	18(8.5%)	21(9.9%)	1.85	0.95
10.	Biographies	92(43.2%)	84(39.4%)	16(7.5%)	21(9.9%)	1.84	0.94
11.	Bibliographies	94(44.1%)	83(39.0%)	15(7.0%)	21(9.9%)	1.83	0.94
12.	Dictionaries	95(44.6%)	83(39.0%)	14(6.6%)	21(9.9%)	1.82	0.94
13.	Atlases/Maps	95(44.6%)	80(37.6%)	20(9.4%)	18(8.5%)	1.82	0.92
14.	Almanacs	97(45.5%)	80(37.6%)	13(6.1%)	23(10.8%)	1.82	0.96
15.	E-Resources	95(44.6%)	84(39.4%)	13(6.1%)	21(9.9%)	1.81	0.93
16.	Computer	94(44.1%)	84(39.4%)	17(8.0%)	18(8.5%)	1.81	0.91
17.	Encyclopaedias	98(46.0%)	77(36.2%)	20(9.4%)	18(8.5%)	1.80	0.93
18.	Index	97(45.5%)	80(37.6%)	17(8.0%)	19(8.9%)	1.80	0.93
19.	Manuals	97(45.5%)	86(40.4%)	10(4.7%)	20(9.4%)	1.78	0.91
20.	Reports	92(43.2%)	91(42.7%)	18(8.5%)	12(5.6%)	1.77	0.83
21.	CD-ROM Facilities	98(46.0%)	84(39.4%)	15(7.0%)	16(7.5%)	1.76	0.88
Average Mean						1.85	0.94

Criteria: $\bar{x}=3.0$ or >3.0 is accepted

Table 1b shows the level of availability of library resources to faculty members. The result shows among others that 46.5% said books were readily available, 24.9% affirmed very readily available, 16.9% said not readily available, while 11.7% indicated not available. For Journals, 47.4% affirmed readily available, 34.3% said very readily available, 10.3% indicated not available while 8.0% said not readily in the library. In respect of Internet facilities, 41.8% indicated not readily available, 39.9% said very readily available, 12.7% affirmed not available while 5.6% said not readily available in the library. On Newspapers, 40.8% said very readily available, 40.8% also indicated readily available, 13.1% affirmed not available while 5.2% said not readily available. The result shows that the library resources to faculty are not available. This is depicted by the average of the means score of 1.85 which is less than the criterion mean. The table also revealed that library resources very readily available to faculty are books ($\bar{x} = 2.17$), journals ($\bar{x} = 1.94$), Internet facilities ($\bar{x} = 1.91$), newspapers/Magazines ($\bar{x} = 1.91$) and conference proceedings ($\bar{x} = 1.90$).

Research Question 2: What is the frequency of use of library resources by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education?

Table 2a: Frequency of use of library resources by students

S/n	RESOURCES	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Mean	Std. D.
1.	Books	425(44.0%)	77(8.0%)	44(4.6%)	196(20.3%)	225(23.3%)	3.29	1.70
2.	Journals	281(29.1%)	112(11.6%)	158(16.3%)	196(20.3%)	220(22.8%)	3.04	1.55
3.	Internet facilities	305(31.5%)	128(13.2%)	100(10.3%)	201(20.8%)	233(24.1%)	3.07	1.60
4.	Handbooks	253(26.2%)	126(13.0%)	111(11.5%)	225(23.3%)	252(26.1%)	2.90	1.56
5.	Newspapers/Magazines	310(32.1%)	104(10.8%)	100(10.3%)	216(22.3%)	237(24.5%)	3.04	1.61
6.	Computer	271(28.0%)	158(16.3%)	83(8.6%)	210(21.7%)	245(25.3%)	3.00	1.59
7.	E-Resources	266(27.5%)	107(11.1%)	110(11.4%)	230(23.8%)	254(26.3%)	2.90	1.58
8.	Encyclopaedias	237(24.5%)	129(13.3%)	125(12.9%)	228(23.6%)	248(25.6%)	2.87	1.54
9.	Manuals	224(23.2%)	161(16.6%)	93(9.6%)	233(24.1%)	256(26.5%)	2.86	1.54
10.	Biographies	226(23.4%)	132(13.7%)	138(14.3%)	225(23.3%)	246(25.4%)	2.86	1.52
11.	CD-ROM Facilities	246(25.4%)	123(12.7%)	132(13.7%)	220(22.8%)	246(25.4%)	2.90	1.54
12.	Reports	226(23.4%)	116(12.0%)	159(16.4%)	223(23.1%)	243(25.1%)	2.85	1.51

		%)	%)	%)	%)	%)		
13.	Dictionaries	181(18.7%)	159(16.4%)	152(15.7%)	231(23.9%)	244(25.2%)	2.80	1.46
14.	Atlases/Maps	285(29.5%)	112(11.6%)	108(11.2%)	222(23.0%)	240(24.8%)	2.98	1.59
15.	Index	199(20.6%)	153(15.8%)	138(14.3%)	222(23.0%)	255(26.4%)	2.81	1.49
16.	Directories	206(21.3%)	128(13.2%)	152(15.7%)	221(22.9%)	260(26.9%)	2.79	1.50
17.	Bibliographies	250(25.9%)	106(11.0%)	122(12.6%)	231(23.9%)	258(26.7%)	2.85	1.56
18.	Gazettes	257(26.6%)	104(10.8%)	121(12.5%)	242(25.0%)	243(25.1%)	2.89	1.55
19.	Conference Proceedings	237(24.5%)	127(13.1%)	121(12.5%)	235(24.3%)	247(25.5%)	2.87	1.54
20.	Abstract	195(20.2%)	161(16.6%)	128(13.2%)	241(24.9%)	242(25.0%)	2.82	1.48
21.	Almanacs	445(46.0%)	226(23.4%)	169(17.5%)	85(8.8%)	42(4.3%)	2.98	1.17
Mean of the average							2.92	1.53

Criteria: $\bar{x}=3.0$ or >3.0 is accepted

Table 2a shows that the frequency of use of library resources of students in Tai Solarin University of Education is low. This is depicted by the average of the means score of 2.92. The table also revealed that the respondents frequently utilized Books ($\bar{x} = 3.29$), Journals ($\bar{x} = 3.04$), Internet facilities ($\bar{x} = 3.07$), Newspapers/Magazines ($\bar{x} = 3.04$) and Computer ($\bar{x} = 3.00$).

Table 2b: Frequency of use of library resources by faculty

	RESOURCES	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Mean	Std. D.
1.	Books	46(21.6%)	16(7.5%)	27(12.7%)	75(35.2%)	49(23.0%)	2.69	1.46
2.	Journals	19(8.9%)	12(5.6%)	9(4.2%)	75(35.2%)	98(46.0%)	1.96	1.24
3.	Internet facilities	17(8.0%)	15(7.0%)	6(2.8%)	77(36.2%)	98(46.0%)	1.95	1.22
4.	Gazettes	16(7.5%)	17(8.0%)	6(2.8%)	76(35.7%)	98(46.0%)	1.95	1.22
5.	E-Resources	18(8.5%)	13(6.1%)	7(3.3%)	76(35.7%)	99(46.5%)	1.94	1.23
6.	Almanacs	14(6.6%)	13(6.1%)	11(5.2%)	77(36.2%)	98(46.0%)	1.91	1.16
7.	Conference Proceedings	16(7.5%)	11(5.2%)	10(4.7%)	77(36.2%)	99(46.5%)	1.91	1.18
8.	Directories	17(8.0%)	4.2%)	12(5.6%)	75(35.2%)	100(46.9%)	1.91	1.19
9.	Dictionaries	19(8.9%)	9(4.2%)	6(2.8%)	78(36.6%)	101(47.4%)	1.91	1.21
10.	Newspapers/	7(3.3%)	25(11.7%)	5(2.3%)	78(36.6%)	98(46.0%)	1.90	1.12

	Magazines							
11.	Index	17(8.0%)	6(2.8%)	14(6.6%)	78(36.6%)	98(46.0%)	1.90	1.16
12.	Manuals	18(8.5%)	10(4.7%)	4(1.9%)	82(38.5%)	99(46.5%)	1.90	1.195 37
13.	Bibliographies	14(6.6%)	9(4.2%)	15(7.0%)	77(36.2%)	98(46.0%)	1.89	1.13
14.	Biographies	12(5.6%)	13(6.1%)	13(6.1%)	77(36.2%)	98(46.0%)	1.89	1.13
15.	Handbooks	16(7.5%)	7(3.3%)	12(5.6%)	80(37.6%)	98(46.0%)	1.89	1.15
16.	Computer	13(6.1%)	9(4.2%)	15(7.0%)	78(36.6%)	98(46.0%)	1.88	1.11
17.	Atlases/Maps	14(6.6%)	8(3.8%)	15(7.0%)	78(36.6%)	98(46.0%)	1.88	1.12
18.	Abstract	9(4.2%)	16(7.5%)	12(5.6%)	77(36.2%)	99(46.5%)	1.87	1.09
19.	CD-ROM Facilities	14(6.6%)	7(3.3%)	13(6.1%)	81(38.0%)	98(46.0%)	1.86	1.11
20.	Encyclopaedias	10(4.7%)	9(4.2%)	19(8.9%)	77(36.2%)	98(46.0%)	1.85	1.06
21.	Reports	17(8.0%)	1(.5%)	12(5.6%)	84(39.4%)	99(46.5%)	1.84	1.11
							1.94	1.17

Table 2b shows that the frequency of use of library resources of faculty staff member in Tai Solarin University of Education is low. This is depicted by the average of the means score of 1.94. The table also revealed that the respondents frequently utilized Books ($\bar{x} = 2.69$), Journals ($\bar{x} = 1.96$), Internet facilities ($\bar{x} = 1.95$) and Gazettes ($\bar{x} = 1.95$).

It concluded that the frequency of use of library resources of students and faculty in Tai Solarin University of Education is low as reflected by the mean score of 1.94

Research Question 3: What is the frequency of use of library services by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education?

Table 3a: Frequency of use of library services by Students

	SERVICES	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Mean	Std. D.
1.	Reference services	306(31.6%)	90(9.3%)	85(8.8%)	293(30.3%)	193(20.0%)	3.02	1.57
2.	Reprographic services	204(21.1%)	122(12.6%)	137(14.2%)	318(32.9%)	186(19.2%)	2.83	1.43
3.	Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) services	165(17.1%)	181(18.7%)	116(12.0%)	320(33.1%)	185(19.1%)	2.81	1.39
4.	Document delivery services	176(18.2%)	147(15.2%)	144(14.9%)	313(32.4%)	187(19.3%)	2.81	1.39
5.	Bulletin Board Services	179(18.5%)	126(13.0%)	181(18.7%)	291(30.1%)	190(19.6%)	2.81	1.39

6.	Database search services	218(22.5%)	116(12.0%)	132(13.7%)	305(31.5%)	196(20.3%)	2.85	1.46
7.	Inter library loan services	220(22.8%)	101(10.4%)	131(13.5%)	324(33.5%)	191(19.8%)	2.83	1.45
8.	Indexing and abstracting services	200(20.7%)	128(13.2%)	98(10.1%)	331(34.2%)	210(21.7%)	2.77	1.46
9.	Current Awareness Services	237(24.5%)	95(9.8%)	157(16.2%)	281(29.1%)	197(20.4%)	2.89	1.47
10.	User Education Services	234(24.2%)	136(14.1%)	117(12.1%)	302(31.2%)	178(18.4%)	2.94	1.47
11.	Bibliographic services	164(17.0%)	136(14.1%)	163(16.9%)	296(30.6%)	208(21.5%)	2.74	1.39
12.	Library exhibition	237(24.5%)	126(13.0%)	111(11.5%)	297(30.7%)	196(20.3%)	2.91	1.49
13.	Internet services	275(28.4%)	114(11.8%)	82(8.5%)	307(31.7%)	189(19.5%)	2.98	1.54
14.	Lending services	240(24.8%)	143(14.8%)	93(9.6%)	302(31.2%)	189(19.5%)	2.94	1.49
15.	Reservation services	232(24.0%)	112(11.6%)	103(10.7%)	326(33.7%)	194(20.1%)	2.86	1.48
Mean of the average							2.86	1.47

Table 3a shows that the frequency of use of library services of students in Tai Solarin University of Education is low. This is depicted by the average of the means score of 2.86. The table also revealed that the respondents frequently utilized Reference services ($\bar{x} = 3.02$), Circulation ($\bar{x} = 3.02$), and finally, Internet services ($\bar{x} = 2.98$).

Table 3b: Frequency of use of library services by faculty

	SERVICES	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Mean	Std. D.
1.	Reference services	39(18.3%)	21(9.9%)	22(10.3%)	27(12.7%)	104(48.8%)	2.36	1.59
2	Lending services	29(13.6%)	24(11.3%)	35(16.4%)	27(12.7%)	98 (46.0%)	2.34	1.48
3.	Internet services	17(8.0%)	33(15.5%)	19(8.9%)	38(17.8%)	106(49.8%)	2.14	1.38
4	Library exhibition	30(14.1%)	157.0%)	42(19.7%)	27(12.7%)	99(46.5%)	2.30	1.46
5	Selective Dissemination of	12(5.6%)	31(14.6%)	19(8.9%)	53(24.9%)	98(46.0%)	2.09	1.28

	Information (SDI) services							
6.	Bulletin Board Services	20(9.4%)	23(10.8%)	25(11.7%)	34(16.0%)	111(52.1%)	2.09	1.38
7.	Database search services	30(14.1%)	17(8.0%)	22(10.3%)	26(12.2%)	118(55.4%)	2.13	1.50
8.	Current Awareness Services	28(13.1%)	28(13.1%)	20(9.4%)	26(12.2%)	111(52.1%)	2.23	1.51
9..	User Education Services	20(9.4%)	29(13.6%)	29(13.6%)	31(14.6%)	104(48.8%)	2.20	1.41
10	Reprographic Services	36(16.9%)	30(14.1%)	10(4.7%)	32(15.0%)	105(49.3%)	2.34	1.59
11.	Inter library loan services	13(6.1%)		1(0.5%)	28(13.1%)	117(54.9%)	2.34	1.73
12.	Reservation services	28(13.1%)	27(12.7%)	27(12.7%)	33(15.5%)	98(46.0%)	2.31	1.48
13.	Indexing and abstracting services	23(10.8%)	17(8.0%)	29(13.6%)	39(18.3%)	105(49.3%)	2.13	1.38
14.	Document delivery services	27(12.7%)	23(10.8%)	32(15.0%)	25(11.7%)	106(49.8%)	2.25	1.47
15.	Bibliographic services	52(24.4%)	51(23.9%)	45(21.1%)	32(15.0%)	33(15.5%)	3.27	1.39
							2.25	

Table 3b shows that the frequency of use of library services by the faculty in Tai Solarin University of Education is low. This is depicted by the average of the means score of 2.25. The table also revealed that the respondents frequently utilized reference services ($\bar{x} = 2.36$), lending services ($\bar{x} = 2.34$) and finally, reprographic services ($\bar{x} = 2.34$). It is therefore concluded that the frequency of use of library services by students and faculty in Tai Solarin University of Education is low.

Research Question 4: What are the factors that hinder the utilisation of information resources and services by students and faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education?

Table 4: Factors that hinder the utilisation of information resources and services by students and Faculty

Hindering Factors	Students	Faculty staff
1. Inadequate skills for library and information science practice	417(43.1%)	129(60.6%)
2. Inadequate information and communication technology skills	404(41.8%)	115(54.0%)
3. Stories of unpleasant experiences in the library by students	410(42.4%)	96(45.1%)
4. Poor work performance of library staff	401(41.5%)	91(42.7%)
5. Lack of awareness of library resources and services	542(56.0%)	109(51.2%)
6. Inadequate conveniences	385(39.8%)	109(51.2%)
7. Too many stringent library rules and regulations	338(35.0%)	92(43.2%)
8. Absence of aesthetics in the library	315(32.6%)	92(43.2%)
9. Non proximity of the library to residence and classrooms of students	290(30.0%)	101(47.4%)
10. Inadequate library opening hours	357(36.9%)	86(40.4%)
11. Inadequate innovative services and practices	319(33.0%)	103(48.4%)
12. Inadequate access to personal computers	384(39.7%)	98(46.0%)
13. Insufficient seats in the library	354(36.6%)	106(49.8%)
14. Poor ventilation in the reading areas	414(42.8%)	105(49.3%)
15. Inadequate computers in the electronic library	391(40.4%)	90(42.3%)
16. Erratic power supply	420(43.4%)	97(45.5%)
17. Unpleasant attitude of library staff to users	504(52.1%)	108(50.7%)

Table 4 shows that the factors that hinder utilisation of library information resources and services by students of this university are lack of awareness of the available library resources and services 542(56.0%), attitude of library staff towards users 504(52.1%). It could be concluded that these are the major factors that affect effective utilisation of library resources and services by the by students. Table 4 also shows that the factors that hinder utilisation of library resources and services by the faculty are inadequate skills for library and information practice 129(60.6%), inadequate information and communication technology skills 115(54.0%), too many stringent library regulations and rules 113(53.1%), lack of awareness of library resources and services 109(51.2%), inadequate conveniences 109(51.2%) and attitude of library staff towards users 108(50.7%). It could be inferred that the major factors that hinder utilisation of library resources and services for students are: lack of awareness of library resources and services and unpleasant attitude of library staff towards users while the factors that hinder utilisation of the library by faculty are inadequate skills for library and information practice , inadequate awareness of library resources and services and inadequate conveniences

Results of Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

In the FGD, interview questions centred on the utilisation of library resources and services, and factors hindering their utilisation. The respondents noted that there was need to improve the available library resources. While the undergraduates specified provision of relevant books, the postgraduates and faculty preferred more journals. Generally, they indicated that availability of library resources and services was low in this library.

The respondents were also asked to rate their frequency of utilisation of the library resources and services, their responses confirmed that they hardly utilise the library resources and services. They affirmed that the materials were inadequate in terms of currency, quantity and relevance.

Question was asked on the inhibitions to the use of library resources and services. The respondents indicated that some of the library staff were a source of hindrance due to their unpleasant attitude. Other hindrances included absence of reservation or study rooms where serious study could take place in a private, conducive environment. This observation was very common among the faculty and post-graduate students. It was also revealed that there was no room for relaxation and small area where little coffee could be taken which is in line with international best practices. A great number of faculty said the library does not have adequate current journals and relevant electronic resources that could be accessed remotely. They disclosed that the solar system in the library does not provide power for the library; there is no air-conditioner in the library, no functional photocopier and lack of conveniences where one can ease themselves during a long stay in the library. Students complained about inadequate information skills derived from user education needed to enable patrons to optimally use library resources and services resulting in waste of so much time in accessing the library resources.

On the changes they would like to see in TASUED library, faculty and PhD students wished for a decentralised library system with a unit which will serve specialised information needs of lecturers and post-graduate students. The PhD students wished for the automation of the library resources and operations which will incorporate work stations on campus which could be linked through personal computers at home. On the other hand, the undergraduates said they would be glad if the library could start lending them laptops and access to electronic resources and free Internet through Wi-Fi within and around the university library.

The students also disclosed that they expected an extension of the library hours during week days and weekends. They showed their dismay for the situation where the university library closes at 6.00 pm on Mondays to Fridays and offers skeletal services on Saturdays for just four hours while the library is not opened at all on Sundays. All the categories of respondents agreed that the university library needs to vigorously market its services to students and faculty to create the required awareness needed for increased patronage. Provision of web-based services, availability and accessibility to electronic databases, e-journal, e-reference services, Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC) and the application of social networking tools in service delivery of the university library were unanimously advocated for by all the categories of users engaged in the Focus Group Discussion.

Test of Hypotheses

H01: There is no significant difference in the use of library resources among students and faculty.

Table 5: Significant Difference in the use of library resources among students and faculty

Use of Library Resources	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	DF	t	p value
Students	967	58.58	28.50	1178	9.506	.000
Academic Staff	213	38.88	21.53			

Table 5 shows that there is a significant difference in the use of library resources among students and faculty. The cal.t = 9.506 is significant at 0.000, since the significant probability value (p-value) of 0.000 is less than the alpha value of 0.05, therefore, the use of library resources surveyed has significant differences among students and faculty. There is a significant difference in the mean values ($\bar{x} = 58.58$) for students and ($\bar{x} = 38.88$) for faculty. It could be inferred that there is a significant difference in the use of library resources among students and faculty.

H0₂: There is no significant difference in the use of library services by students and faculty.

Table 6: Significant difference in the use of library services by students and faculty

Use of library services	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	DF	T	p value
Students	967	57.74	26.21	1178	6.864	.000
Academic staff	213	44.18	25.60			

Table 6 shows that there is significant difference in the use of library services among students and faculty. The cal.t = 6.864 is significant at 0.000, since the significant probability value (p-value) of 0.000 is less than the alpha value of 0.05. There is significance difference in the mean values ($\bar{x} = 57.74$) for students and ($\bar{x} = 44.18$) for faculty. This implies that students used library services more than faculty. It could be inferred that there is a significant difference in the use of library services among students and faculty.

H0₃: There is no significant relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources by students of Tai Solarin University of Education

Table 7: Relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources by students of Tai Solarin University of Education

Correlations		Mean	Std. Dev.	Availability	Utilisation
Availability	Pearson Correlation			1	-.150**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	44.5388	18.79160		.000
	N			967	967
Utilisation	Pearson Correlation			-.150**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	58.5835	28.50103	.000	
	N			967	967

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7 revealed that the r value is -0.150 which depicts a relationship between library resources availability and utilisation among students of Tai Solarin University of Education. The calculated significant probability value of (p-value) 0.000 was subjected to the alpha value of 0.05. Since the significant probability (p-value) of 0.000 is less than the alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a relationship between library resources availability and utilisation among students of Tai Solarin University of Education.

H04: There is no significant relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources by faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education.

Table 8: Significant relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources by faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education

		Correlations			
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Availability	Utilisation
Availability	Pearson Correlation			1	-.160*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	37.21	16.02		.019
	N			213	213
Utilisation	Pearson Correlation			-.160*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	38.88	21.53	.019	
	N			213	213

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 8 revealed that the r value is -0.160 which depicts a significant relationship between library resources availability and utilisation by faculty of Tai Solarin University of Education. The calculated significant probability value of (p-value) 0.019 was subjected to the alpha value of 0.05. Since the significant probability (p-value) of 0.019 is less than the alpha value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a significant relationship between library resources availability and utilisation by faculty staff of Tai Solarin University of Education.

Discussion of the Findings

The findings showed that the availability of library resources to students and faculty staff is low. This result revealed inadequacy of various library resources to students and faculty. This reported unavailability could be said to be partly responsible for the low utilisation of the library resources by the students and faculty. This finding is in line with the findings of Haruna(2015); Ijirigbo(2014) and it contradicts the results of studies carried out by Mbasir & Adeoti (2015); Obodo, Eze & Ani(2022);Salman, Okanla, Raheem and Pelero(2020) that reported high level of availability of library resources for staff and students in the academic libraries investigated.

The study further revealed that the frequency of library utilisation of resources and services by students and faculty is irregular. Also, the most frequently used resources by students and faculty were books, journals and internet based resources. These results are not surprising because of the inadequacy of the available resources to students and faculty. The low utilisation was supported by the FGD participants when they were asked to rate their level of utilisation of the library resources. The majority responded that: *They hardly utilise the library resources and services. They affirmed that the materials were inadequate in terms of currency, quantity and relevance.*

It is also quite critical to note that the same sets of library resources (books, journals and internet based resources) were frequently used by both students and faculty. This pattern of use could be attributed to belief that lecturers often influenced what the students consult in the library because the faculty are their lecturers and there is a tendency that the students would consult materials recommended by their lecturers. The result of this study aligns with the findings of Odu and Egbe (2016) which reported that the level of utilisation of library materials and services of undergraduates of university of Calabar, Nigeria was low. This finding also concurs with the findings of Obodo, Neka and Ani (2022) who also disclosed marginally- low utilisation of library by lecturers and students and on a very sad note according to them, this does not justify funds spent on acquiring library resources.

The findings also showed that factors hindering the use of the library by students and faculty included: possession of inadequate skills for library and information practice, stories of unpleasant experiences in the library by colleagues, unpleasant attitude of library staff, inadequate awareness of availability of library resources and services in the library, lack of conveniences, non- proximity of the library to residence and classrooms of student, inadequate library opening hours, lack of innovative services in the library, inadequate seats, epileptic power supply, lack of reserved area for serious research, too many stringent library rules and regulations, inadequate internet facilities, and inadequate computer systems were some of the reasons given by the respondents for not utilizing the university library. These factors were similar to what had been reported by studies of other researchers such as Onifade, et al (2013); Barfi, Afful-Arthur and Agyapong(2018); Auru and Sani (2023); Kiriri(2018); Olajide and Adio(2017); (Nicholas, Sterling, Davis, Lewis, Mckoy-Johnson, Nelson, Tugwell & Tyrell, 2015). Most of these hindrances were also pointed out by the respondents during the FGD. Students also confirmed this finding, as they complained among other things about the cumbersome procedure for registering to become a bona-fide user of the library. According to them:

The procedure was too cumbersome as they stayed on a long queue for many days just to register as bona- fide users of the library, They were of the opinion that the registration could be done online as is obtainable in other university libraries in Nigeria and other countries of the world.

The findings also showed that there is a significant difference in the utilisation of the library resources and services among the students and faculty. The study disclosed that students utilised the library resources and services more than faculty. This could be attributed to the inadequacies that characterised the resources in this library. Some of the faculty may have been subscribing for databases or have access to other online resources which the students could not be able to afford. This finding is congruent with the findings of Salihu (2019), Washington-Hoagland and Clougherty (2002) who confirmed that students constituted the majority of the users surveyed in their studies.

Moreover, it was also revealed in this study that there is significant relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources among the respondents. This result corroborates the findings of Unegbu and Lawal- Solarin (2017) who conducted a research to evaluate the Lagos State university library's resources availability and accessibility as factors influencing library use. This result has further buttressed the fact that there is a strong positive relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources by users, which means that before one could talk about the utilisation of resources, such resources have to be available and accessible in the library.

Conclusion and Implications

The results of this study revealed the inadequacy of library resources and services in Tai Solarin University of Education Library. This situation deterred the university library from performing its expected roles in the academic environment where the university library is pivotal to the accomplishment of the mission of the university. It is also evidenced that the frequency of utilisation of this library resources and services among the students and faculty is low. This stemmed from the inadequacy of library resources and services.

The finding further revealed that books, journals and Internet based services are the most frequently used library resources in this library. There is also significant relationship between availability and utilisation of library resources and services among the students and faculty. This suggests that library resources and services would be utilised by students and faculty if they are available in the university library. The findings also showed that there is significant difference in utilisation of library resources and services by the students and faculty. The result showed that more students use the library.

The findings of this study have implications for the university library. The university library needs to come up with strategies for promoting and marketing the library to the faculty and students. It is also expedient for the university library to carry out user studies periodically so that its resources and services could be evaluated from users' perspectives to increase its utilisation in meeting the information needs of the students and faculty. The findings also revealed some factors that hinder the utilisation of the library resources and services by students and faculty staff. These hindrances should be addressed to improve the utilisation of the library by developing a blueprint and for enhanced services delivery.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Students and faculty should be informed about the resources and services in the library. Creating awareness will definitely increase the utilisation of library resources and services.
2. Students and faculty should be given adequate training on how to access library resources easily. User education programme facilitates the retrieval of information from both print and electronic resources in the library. There is need to provide stable power supply to the library with supplemented solar system. The library should be given priority attention in this regard by the university management.
3. The library working hours should be extended during the week days and weekends while adequate logistics and security should be provided for both the library staff and users.
4. There is also the need for the university library staff to be more cordial with students and faculty. They should be customer friendly to enhance library patronage. The library should create a reserved /research section for the use of faculty and post-graduate students. The place should be made very conducive for reading and research.
5. There is also the need to strengthen Internet facilities within the library bui

References

- Adegun, A., Oyewumi, O., Oladapo, Y. & Sobalaje, A. (2015). Effectiveness of library service and resources in an African university. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(3), 54-59.
- Anhwere1, B. K., Afful-Arthur, P. & Manu, A. E. (2018). Utilization of library resources by lecturers in university of cape coast. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 10(1), 10-16, DOI: 10.5897/IJLIS2017.0775. Retrieved from <https://academicjournals.org/IJLIS>
- Auru, F., & Sani, O. J. (2023). Availability and utilization of information resources by undergraduate students of Federal University Lokoja, Kogi State. *Niger Delta Journal of Library and Information Science*, 1(1), 84–94. Retrieved from <https://ndjlis.fuotuoake.edu.ng/index.php/journal/article/view/4>
- Barfi, K. A., Afful-Arthur, P. & Agyapong, E. M. 2018. Utilization of Library Resources by Lecturers in University of Cape Coast. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 10(1), 10-16.
- Chimah, J. N., M. Nwajei, & Akom, C. (2015) Library anxiety and intervention strategies: review of conceptualized antecedents in public service librarianship. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 10 (1), 1-8.
- Egberongbe, H. S. (2011). The use and impact of electronic resources at the University of Lagos. *Library Philosophy and Practice*.
- Emezie, E. (2018) Internet resources and productivity in scientific research in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Information Science*, 29(2), 107-115.
- Haruna, I. (2015). The role of libraries in information provision to legal practitioners in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Afr. J. Educ. Inf. Manage.*
- Housewright, R. Schonfeld, R.C. (2010). *Faculty Survey 2009: Key Strategic Insights for Libraries, Publishers, and Societies*. Ithaka: Strategic Consulting and Research.
- Hussain, A., & Abalkhail, A.M.(2013). Determinants of library use, collections and services among the students of engineering: a case study of King Saud University [Electronic Version]. *Collection Building*, 32(3), 100-110.
- Ijirigbo, M.A. (2014) Faculty expectations of libraries: A comparative study of Covenant University and the University of Lagos. *Library Philosophy and Practice*.
- Julien, H., & Barker, S. (2009). How high-school students find and evaluate scientific information: A basis for information literacy skills development. *Library & Information Science Research*, 31(1), 12-17
- Isah, A. (2010). Electronic library use by academic staff at the University of Ilorin, Nigeria. *Journal of Library and Information Science (JOLIS)*, 7(1&2).
- Kiriri, P.N (2018).Service delivery: The perceptions of users' of library services in a private university in Africa. *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(4), 221-231.
- Kumah, C. (2015).A comparative study of the use of the library and the internet as sources of information by graduate students in the University of Ghana. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286489608>.
- Kumar, K. G. (2017). Use of information resources and services available in the Library by the postgraduate students and research scholars of University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad: A Study. *International Journal of Digital Library Services*, 7 (3), 1-12.

- Lateef, E.B, Omotoso, A.O., & Owalabi, K. A. (2013). A survey of postgraduate students' perception of university library resources in selected Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Library and Information Science*, 3(1), 23-37.
- Lippincott, J. K. (2006). Linking the information commons to learning. *Learning Spaces*,
- Mbashir, A.L., Adeoti, V.F. (2015). The usage of library by faculty staff: Kogi State University, Anyigba in perspective. *Nigerian Libraries*, 41, 41-54.
- Miller, F. (2010). Preservation and access to records and research data in Canadian society. *Canadian Issues*, 24-28.
- Nicholas, P., Sterling, J., Davis, R., Lewis, J.C., Mckoy-Johnson, F., Nelson, K., Tugwell, Y., & Tyrell, K. (2015) Bringing the library to you! [Electronic Version]. *New Library World*, 116(5/6).
- Nilsen, K. (2006). Comparing users' perspectives of in-person and virtual reference [Electronic Version]. *New Library World*, 107 (3/4), 91-104.
- Obodo, A. C., Eze., J. N., & Ani, M. I.(2022).Library resources utilization by lecturers in Nigerian Universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 7100. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7100>
- Odu, O. & Egbe J. O., (2016). The environment and reading habits in Nigeria: A study of Calabar municipality. *The Information Technologist*, 12 (1), 87 -96.
- Okonoko, V. N., Sambo, A. S. & Ejoro, B. (2018). Challenges of utilizing library resources by students in Collage of Education, Agbor. *Covenant Journal of Library and Information Science*, 1(2), 71-85
- Okunu, H. O., Akalumhe, K. O., & Monu, J. O. (2011). An evaluative study of academic library services to users in Nigerian universities: A case study of Fatiu Ademola Akesode Library, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos. *International Journal of Research in Education*, 8(1), 74 – 80.
- Olajide, O. & Adio, G. (2017). Effective utilisation of university library resources by undergraduate students: a case study of Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 1503. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1503>
- Onifade, F. N., Ogbuiyi, S. U., & Omeluzor, S. U. (2013). Library resources and services utilisation by postgraduate students in Nigerian private universities. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*,5(9) 289-294. Retrieved on 29/04/2016 from <http://www.academicjournals.org/IJLIS>
- Onuoha, U. D. Ikonne, C. N, & Madukoma, E. (2013). Perceived impact of library use on the research productivity of postgraduate students at Babcock University, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 1(1). Retrieved from: <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jrme/papers/Vol-1%20Issue-1/C0111116.pdf> on September 22, 2023.
- Oyedipe, W. J., Adekunmisi, S. R., Ajiboye, B. A., Olanrewaju, F. T., & Adesoye, E. A. (2018). Use of library resources and services by part time undergraduates in Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ogun State, Nigeria. *University of Dar es Salaam Library Journal*, 13(2), 114-129.
- Panle, P.P., Akhimien, A.J. & Mang, K.C. (2021). The availability and utilization of print information resources for research by final year Library and Information Science students in University of Jos Library. *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods* (IJARESM), 9(7), 3821-3929., available @ www.ijaresm.com

- Poynder, R. (2014). Open access: Could defeat be snatched from the jaws of victory? *Information Today*.
- Preston, H. & O'Dell, F. (2013). Exploring factors in non-use of hospital library resources by health care personnel [Electronic Version]. *Library Management*, 34(1/2), 105- 127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01435121311298315>.
- RUSA. (2008). *Guidelines for implementing and maintaining virtual reference services*. America: Reference & User Services Association, America library Association.
- Salihu, B. (2019). Assessment of the use of academic library system and services by staff and students of Adamawa Polytechnic Yola. *Information Impact: Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 9(4), 83-90. Retrieved from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijikm/issue/view/17798> on October 12, 2023.
- Salman, A., Ahmed, A., Raheem, R., & Pelemo, G. (2020). Availability, accessibility, and use of electronic information resources among undergraduate students in Fountain University Library, Osogbo. *Journal of Library and Information Sciences*, 1(10), 100-110
- Salubi, O. G., Ondari-Okemwa, E., & Nkehweha, F. (2018). Utilization of library resources among Generation Z students: facts and fiction. *Publications*, 6(16), 1-12. DOI: 103390/publications6020016.
- Sarantakos, S. (2012). *Social Research*, 4th Ed. Palmgrave: Macmillan.
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. MIT Press.
- Unegbu, V. E., Lawal-Solarin, E.O., & Ladan, M.U. (2017). *Library resources availability and accessibility as determinants of undergraduates library use in Lagos State University, Nigeria*. *Gateway Library Journal*, 1-18.
- Usman. H. (2016). An assessment of availability of information resources and services in Kashim Ibrahim Library, Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria. *International Journal for Innovation Research in Multi-Disciplinary Field*, 2(10).
- Tenopir, C. (2003). Use and users of electronic library resources: An overview and analysis of recent research studies. Council on Library and Information Resources.
- Washington-Hoagland, C., & Clougherty, L. (2002). Faculty and staff use of academic library resources and services: A University of Iowa Libraries' perspective, *Portal Libraries and the Academy*, 2(4), 627-646.