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Branch libraries are a feature of library and information services in six of the Nigerian universities located at Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, Ile-Ife, Lagos and Benin City. The study was undertaken in order to point up the resources and services of branch libraries in the context of the overall library and information services in the six universities.

To gather the data for the major part of the work, two separate questionnaires were formed and used. One required essentially factual information. The other was a Likert-type questionnaire designed to discern the attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians towards branch libraries. Usable responses were received from 46(71.9%) of the branch libraries, 146(71.2%) heads of academic units and 90(71.4%) librarians from the six universities. Considerable reliance was also placed on documentary materials, particularly for background information about the library situation in the universities.

A majority of the branch libraries were founded in isolation in response to the special information needs of the academic units to which they belong. Most of the branch libraries were in separate rooms in the same building as their parent academic units. The funds for the branch libraries were provided by the universities as part of the budget of the main library or the academic unit that administered the particular branch library.

The accommodation, reader places, information resources and services of the branch libraries were widely distributed: in aggregate terms these, if effectively harmonized, can ameliorate the existing constraints of the main libraries in many of these matters. It was also shown that access to a majority of the branch collections was hampered by restrictive regulations, limited opening hours, inadequate linkages and staffing constraints.

The work explores and offers ways and means of evolving university-wide library systems out of the existing arrangements and future possibilities.
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CHAPTER ONE

MAPPING THE FIELD OF STUDY

1.1. Background to the Problem

There are today twenty-eight universities and university libraries in Nigeria, established at various periods between 1948 and 1983. University education in the country is thus a relatively recent phenomenon when viewed in the context of similar institutions in Europe or the United States. However, the development of the universities has been remarkable. Since the attainment of political independence in 1960 there has been a steady widening of university education in the country. In 1960 the only seat of university education in Nigeria was the University College, Ibadan: by 1962 four fully autonomous universities had been founded. In 1975, seven new universities were established. With the re-introduction of democratic rule in the country in 1979, the number of universities rose to twenty-eight as both the Federal and State Governments were equally vigorous in establishing new ones (see section 2.5.1).

An important component of this development is the provision of library and information resources in the universities. There is the worthwhile realization by high level policy makers in the universities that the library is central in the development of universities as centres of learning and research. Thus both university authorities and library administrators invariably identify themselves with measures aimed at encouraging reading and study by making ample provision for library and information services in the universities. The first Principal of the premier University College in the country had such foresight that has resulted in the enhanced status which libraries enjoy in Nigerian universities. Before the librarian of the University College Ibadan was appointed, he made these oft-quoted remarks:
A proper library is an essential part of a university in any country, but in West Africa, it is even more important than, in a more developed country like Britain, where staff and students have easy access to other libraries to supplement those in their own colleges. (1)* - - - whatever else we do I am determined that we have at least a good library. (2)

Also, in British universities, the importance of libraries had never been in doubt. As early as 1921, the University Grants Committee made the following well-known declaration:

The character and efficiency of a university may be guaged by its treatment of its central organ—the library. We regard the fullest provision for library maintenance as the primary and most vital need in the equipment of a university. (3)

This concern with library development is perhaps a major consideration in favour of the existence of branch libraries in the universities. The first Ibadan University Librarian, John Harris, observed that as a university grows, "It needs a whole system of libraries to meet the diverse needs of its various faculties, institutes and schools, and to offer library service to different levels of reader, ranging from freshman undergraduate to high-level research in some obtruse branch of a special subject." (4) This view, apparently shared by other university librarians of the time, would seem to have given considerable impetus to the development of branch libraries in the universities. Both university authorities and librarians seemed to have adopted a laissez-faire approach to the issue of branch libraries. Various academic units decided whether or not to establish branch libraries and acted accordingly.

This dimension of the university library (branch libraries) which has been acknowledged as "one of the most persistent and difficult organizational issues of academic libraries" (5) is the central interest of the present investigation.

* Bibliographic references will appear at the end of each chapter.
1.2 The Problem

Branch libraries in the universities, different though they are in source of support, staffing, extent of collections and many other respects, emerged in response to the felt need for library and information resources to enrich the academic programmes of their parent academic units. Traditionally, they have existed as special collections or information units in universities. They provide specialists (university teachers, scholars and students) with special library and information services of their discipline. Branch libraries are usually in the same vicinity as the classrooms, offices and laboratories of their users. Materials such as books, journals and slides which are often separated by general classification schemes or forms of material in the main university library are placed together in the branch library. There is also the regular mutual contact between the users and staff of branch libraries. In his paper on "National and university libraries - special services for special readers," P. Havard-Williams shed considerable light on this phenomenon:

In my experience branch libraries have frequently been able to offer a more comprehensive service, not only in terms of book selection, but also in terms of reference assistance and other services because the clientele is more manageable - readers are personally known to the library staff, and vice-versa - and the book stock smaller, allowing for greater knowledge of its content by the staff. (6)

The progenitor of the modern branch library was formed by the university teacher or as a result of pressure from him. This underscores an early awareness and concern of university teachers, scholars and students that the overall achievement of academic goals in universities can, to a large extent, be a matter of the quality and quantity of library services available for intellectual activity. Thus while the realization that information is a fundamental resource in economic, scientific and technological development is a recent but rapidly spreading concept, the university teacher and scholar have for long addressed themselves to the provision and utilization of available information. Such information may
be contained in manuscripts, official documents, books, periodicals, slides or in other formats. There is probably no exaggeration in Wilfred Ashworth's observation that "Faculty and departmental libraries are extremely popular with the teaching staff especially where there has been a tradition of local control." (7)

At the same time the existence of branch libraries in the universities has over the years created organizational and role conflicts. They usually exist side by side with central university libraries with functions and services often similar to those of branch libraries. Variations in resources and services exist, but these are sometimes in terms of intensity. University authorities and library administrators address themselves to this situation and often seek solutions in terms of centralizing the library services.

The interest of librarians and information workers in this matter has in some countries gained the attention of professional associations. For instance the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries (8) and the Association of College and Research Libraries of American Library Association (9) have each developed codes of standards for branch libraries in their respective universities. Although these standards are essentially applicable to the university environments where they were produced, they contain very useful guidelines that have wider applicability. The documents also show that the issue of branch libraries extends beyond isolated university communities where such library units exist.

The university library concern in this matter seems to have received considerable fillip from developments in librarianship and in other angles. Some of these may be mentioned. There has been increasing emphasis on service to the library users, sometimes reflected in subject approach to organization in university libraries. There is also the interdisciplinary nature of modern fields of study which often makes it difficult to isolate one discipline from other related disciplines.
there is the phenomenal growth in the amount and variety of information materials (sometimes tagged information explosion); these resources require specialist handling for productive use. At the same time, developments in technology have created media for large scale and specialist information processing, storage and availability.

Armed as it were with these developments and guidelines where they exist, university libraries often seek avenues for harnessing the library units of the university under one umbrella in the interest of better services to the reader.

However, there appears a fundamental dilemma in the whole exercise. There is the inherent difficulty in any effort to provide special services for very many specialist groups in a university. Sometimes in a bid to do this the university library ends up in providing good services to no one. This reasoning is amply clarified in the following viewpoint:

But the university library is still a general library, and the sheer weight of acquisitions and of numbers of readers to be served inhibits efforts to provide special services, because if such services are provided for one sector of the university community inevitably they have also to be provided for other sectors too. (10)

From the above point of view, the university library's intentions and moves in the matter of branch libraries have not always been well received by the academic units. As K.W.Humphreys recently put it, the problem of branch libraries "has been responsible for conflicts between academics and librarians which at times have threatened and indeed undermined the position of the university librarian." (11) Thus the issue of branch libraries in the universities remains largely an unresolved problem. In some cases branch libraries are a veritable source of concern to both university administrators and librarians from the point of their location, infrastructure, information resources, services and other angles.
Sometimes the matter of branch libraries, like some other aspects of library and information studies is generalized as if situations were universally the same. But these are hardly so. Varying academic environments and circumstances of different countries often present peculiar characteristics. These differences require the investigation of the global phenomenon (branch libraries) from the point of view of institutional, national and sometimes regional perspectives. Louis T. Ibbotson remarked that any realistic discussion of branch libraries must reflect local factors. According to him, "A general panacea is impossible. In practice, local conditions and personalities inevitably enter into the equation upsetting any fine generalities or pet technicalities upon which the librarian may have set his heart." (12)

Against this general overview, the present investigation of branch libraries in the Nigerian setting was formulated. The study will examine the structure and character of branch libraries in Nigerian universities in the context of overall library and information services of the universities. Empirical in nature, the work seeks to:

- Examine the branch libraries raisons d'être and their infrastructural characteristics.
- Determine the users and the nature of information resources of branch libraries.
- Investigate the administrative arrangements for branch libraries with regard to their parent academic units and the university libraries.
- Identify the human resources and services of the branch libraries.
- Examine the existing linkages between the branch libraries and their respective main libraries.
- Articulate the felt dispositions or attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians towards branch libraries.
Based on information generated in the study, a conceptualized framework for systematic university-wide library and information services is provided. A major concern of this study is to seek understanding of the existing situation. By understanding clearly the position of branch libraries as they are one will be able to explore explicitly the possibilities and options available for future improvements.

1.3 Study Proposition and Research Questions

In quantitative research in library and information studies it is sometimes the practice to begin with careful formulation of hypotheses. Such hypotheses serve as building bricks which provide objective guide to the investigator in his search for information, data collection, analysis and research report. However, the core of the present study does not lend itself to formulation and testing of hypotheses in the scientific sense of verifying the relationship deemed to exist between two or more variables. On the contrary the study is concerned with examining the character of branch libraries in the framework of university-wide library and information services. On the basis of the findings and in the light of current trends and future possibilities, attempt is made to articulate more effective arrangements for use of branch library resources.

Based on experiences in university library and information matters, the following general proposition is formulated:

Library and information services in universities with branch libraries will be more effective where the library units are appropriately linked-up as library and information systems than where such libraries exist and operate as isolated units.

Two basic assumptions are implicit in the proposition:
(i) Common information and services may exist in a number of academic units with separate branch libraries;
(ii) University-wide access to these information resources and services improves and in no way limits the quality and
and quantity of information available to users.

With the foregoing broad statement in view the study will empirically seek answers to the following inter-related questions:

Why were branch libraries established? Where do they exist in the universities and for what users?

What type of information resources are available in the branch libraries and how are those resources organized for use?

What type of personnel work in branch libraries?

What administrative arrangements exist for branch libraries both from the point of view of their parent academic units and from the point of view of university libraries?

What services do branch libraries provide?

What are the attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians towards branch libraries?

In what ways can branch libraries and their resources be arranged in the overall interest of library users in the university?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the work are four in number:

(i) The study will identify and aggregate the features of branch libraries in Nigerian universities.

(ii) It will give considerable help to the efforts of librarians in planning for complete access to library and information resources in the universities.
(iii) The work will provide conceptual insight into the nature of future branch libraries resulting largely from advances in library and information services as well as in technology.

(iv) By a judicious extrapolation, the model evolved in the study can be applicable to other university library services in developing countries where conditions are considerably similar.

1.5 Definitions

1.5.1 Branch Library

It is perhaps of great importance that there should be no doubt concerning the interpretation given to the term "branch library" in this study.

The seventh and latest edition of The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English, based on the Oxford English Dictionary and its supplements defined "branch" as follows:

Limb springing from tree or bough; lateral extension or subdivision of mountain-range, river, road, railway, genus, subject of knowledge, or argument; local establishment of library, bank or other business. (13)

The same dictionary defined "department" in the following manner:

Separate part of a complex whole, branch especially of municipal or state administration, university, shop;

department store: large shop supplying many kinds of goods from various departments. (14)

A close look at the above shows that in some respects "branch" and "department" can be used interchangeably. Both can be used as lateral extension or subdivision of knowledge or organization. In the literature of library and information studies "branch library" and "departmental library" are often
used as synonyms in this sense. This practice is adopted in the present work. Departmental library is used in the same sense as branch library except where the context shows otherwise.

Several writers on academic librarianship in general and branch libraries in particular have offered definitions of branch libraries. Typical definitions are provided by Randall and Goodrich (15) and Kay Birula. (16) However, a critical examination of these definitions reveals that they have tended to reflect individual perspectives of respective writers. Lawrence Thompson (17) and the Parry Report (18) supplied a useful taxonomy of various library units that may form part of a university-wide library system. This differentiation of libraries within a university is pertinent in the present context because definitions of branch libraries invariably incorporate one or more aspects of these units. The library units include:

1. Departmental library*
2. Collegiate library
3. Laboratory library
4. Sub-library
5. Sectional library
6. Class library
7. Institute library

To the above list one may add the quasi-departmental library (19) and satellite library. (20)

For the present study the term "branch library" is employed and interpreted in an operational sense to mean:

A unit of university-wide library and information resources physically separate from the main university library. Such libraries usually provide resources and services of varying levels for the teaching and/or research work of one or more academic units.

* The various types of branch libraries are explained in Appendix I.
The foregoing definition tallies with the interpretation given by Arthur T. Hamlin; "Library literature sometimes draws fine distinctions between college libraries, departmental libraries, seminar collections and divisional libraries. Aside from that academic distinction they are here considered one and the same provided they are located in quarters other than the central library building and are serving one or several connected disciplines." (21)

1.5.2 Attitude

Like many concepts in behavioural science there is no one generally accepted definition of attitude. Many users of the word are inclined to define it in their own ways to suit their specific purposes. As early as 1939, Nelson had identified thirty separate definitions in use, (22) and considerably more have appeared ever since. Melvin L. De Fleur and Frank R. Westie analyzed the various definitions in twenty-three simple terms. (23) A close look at the analysis leaves no one in doubt that attitude is essentially concerned with "positive or negative affective reaction toward a denotable abstract or concrete object or disposition." (24) Attitudinal studies are essentially concerned with the measurement of expressed feelings of pro or con, favourable or unfavourable with regard to specific object, action or abstract concept. Gordon Allport's rather robust definition of the term with which this work associates itself appears to be more widely used than any other:

An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all situations with which it is related. (25)

Gordon Allport's definition is adopted in the present study because it recognizes the weight of accumulated knowledge and experience on an individual's attitude to any given situation or phenomenon.
1.5.3 **Academic Unit**

This is employed in its conventional meaning to refer to the teaching and research units of a university. "Heads of academic units" include heads of academic departments, directors of institutes and deans of faculties in a university.

1.5.4 **Librarian**

As used by UNESCO, a librarian is a library personnel who has acquired appropriate training and recognized qualification in librarianship. (26) For the purpose of the present work, such a person must be occupying a professional library position in a university.

1.6 **Scope and Limitations**

The overall classification of libraries developed by UNESCO places the scope of this work in proper perspective. According to this classification, libraries are grouped as follows:

A. National Libraries

B. Libraries of Institutions of Higher Education
   1. University Libraries
   2. Libraries attached to University Institutes or Departments
   3. Libraries which are not part of a University

C. Other major non-specialized libraries

D. School Libraries

E. Special Libraries, open to the public

F. Special Libraries, reserved for their primary users

G. Public (or Popular) Libraries, financed by the public authorities. (27)

Branch libraries (B.2 above) are part of library and information resources of the university in which they exist. This point is necessary because a study of branch libraries can hardly be isolated from the mainstream of library and
information services of the university. While the central concern of the work is branch libraries, this is done from the perspectives of the university library resources and services.

The study was limited to six university campuses established in Nigeria between 1948 and 1970. These were the University of Ibadan, established in 1948; University of Nigeria, Nsukka (1960); Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria (1962); University of Ife, Ile-Ife (1962); University of Lagos, (1962); and University of Benin, Benin City (1970).

The six universities were chosen for this study because they possessed the academic climate relevant to the investigation. The academic climate implied here had a direct bearing on the stage of the development of university resources and facilities, particularly libraries. Each of the six universities had, at the inception of this study, moved into a permanent site, had a permanent main or central library and in addition was known to have a number of branch libraries as defined in this work.

On the contrary, most of the newer universities and their libraries were still operating from temporary sites at the planning and data gathering stages of this work. This is borne out by the following observation communicated to Benzies Boadi by the Librarian, University of Sokoto (Nigeria) in November 1979:

> This library has not got much to offer you in your investigation as it has come into being recently and is struggling hard to establish itself on its temporary Campus. Unless we move on to the new campus, construction of which has yet to start, it might not be possible for it to grow as planned in the programme of the university. (28)

Raphael U. Ononogbo encountered very similar experience in his work. (29)

Without a permanent main library and permanent university structures, one is inclined to believe that they have not established branch libraries.
In another sense the six university communities covered by this study have a common feature which makes them somewhat different from those established after them. They emerged before the notion of centralized planning and control for universities was conceived. Each of them evolved its academic environment, buildings and programmes without much central control. This pattern was altered in 1975. The rather sudden addition of seven new universities in that year probably prompted the National Universities Commission (NUC), the Nigerian counterpart of the University Grants Committee of Great Britain, to issue guidelines for the development of the new universities. The relevant portion of this document, The standard guide to universities, states that university library services should be operated from a central location and that branch libraries should not be encouraged.

Since the National Universities Commission is the body which determines the level of funding for each university and through which the Federal Government of Nigeria channels funds to the universities, its views on this and other matters will seem to carry the stamp of authority. As the physical structures in some of the universities are just springing up, it is rather too early to discern the effect of this stipulation on the whole issue of library and information services in these universities. Meanwhile several university librarians have expressed serious reservations about the success of this stipulation as the criteria laid down for building new university libraries did not reflect envisaged student populations. (30), (31) A detailed discussion of this matter is given in the next chapter. (2.5.2.2)

Although the present work centres on branch libraries in Nigerian universities, it is borne in mind that an investigation of this nature must reflect international trends. The issue of branch libraries in the universities is more or less a world-wide phenomenon. As such the situation in other environments are brought in for comparative purposes.
The decision to limit the attitude survey to heads of academic units and academic librarians is because they appear to be the groups who are most directly involved with matters concerning branch library development and problems. In the words of Maurice Tauber, branch libraries "present a basic problem besetting both librarians and university administrators." (32)

The nature of their official engagements and associations in the university communities would equip heads of academic units and librarians with exposure pertinent to the present study. While it is true that not every academic unit possesses a branch library, it is reasoned that heads of academic units would have acquired reasonable conception and knowledge of branch libraries by the nature of their official operations and associations in the universities. As heads of academic units they deal with library matters of their units on their own initiative or when prompted by the main library or other university body. They also participate in discussions and sometimes policy decisions concerning libraries at senate, planning, finance or other university committees. In the universities with dispersed library units, these academic or management committees will naturally and as the need arises deliberate on the matter of branch libraries. This reasoning would seem to be in consonance with the approach of Broberg and Dunbar who mailed copies of their questionnaire on "Current status of departmental libraries in chemistry" directly to heads of chemistry departments whether or not such chemistry departments possessed branch libraries. (33) An individual is most likely to have well-structured conception of a subject in a situation where he is familiar with the subject matter of the questionnaire.

The academic librarians included in the study were presumed to possess relevant exposure and knowledge concerning branch libraries. By training, they were exposed to issues concerning branch libraries. This knowledge is updated by experience, continuing education programmes, exposure to professional literature and such other activities that are normally part of a professional life.
There were specific exclusions from this study. College or sub-libraries such as the College of Medicine Library, University of Ibadan, and the Enugu Campus Library, University of Nigeria were not included. This was as a result of the advice of their respective librarians on the grounds that such libraries are higher in status than the library units included as branch libraries.

Also research libraries for institutes or centres not under university administration were not included. These libraries belong to autonomous institutes that share the same campus with the university library: they form part of category B3 in the UNESCO classification of libraries shown above. These include the Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (N.I.S.E.R.) Library and the National Archives Library, both on the campus of the University of Ibadan.

1.7 Related studies

Some studies that are closely related to the present one are briefly highlighted below. This undertaking helps to show the context within which this work was formulated and carried out.

In 1968 Khalil Mahmud, Acting Librarian, Ibadan University Library, wrote a paper in which he reviewed developments at the University of Ibadan libraries. He revealed in the paper that there were increasing collections in some of the branch libraries namely, Institute of African Studies Library and the faculty libraries in Agriculture, Education and Social Sciences. He hoped that at some future date "-- a network of libraries within the University" would emerge. On the growing number of branch libraries in the University he wrote:

"-- decentralization is a phenomenon to be witnessed in many universities throughout the world. It has its advantages where universities are extremely large"

Khalil Mahmud's brief account is important in two respects. It recognized that branch libraries are part of university
library and information resources. The paper also realized
the need to evolve an arrangement for effective utilization
of library resources in the academic units of a university in
the overall interest of library users.

Perhaps the first comparative survey of branch libraries in
Nigerian universities was done by B.O. Adediran. His paper
on "Centralization of university library services: some
compelling factors in Nigeria" embodied the result of his
investigation of aspects of branch libraries in the universities
at Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, Ile-Ife, Lagos and Benin City. The study
indicated that there were some twenty-one branch libraries in
the six universities. Part of his findings was that:

With the exception of the University of Nigeria,
Nsukka, other libraries within the universities
operate independently of the main libraries. The
hiring of staff, development and processing of
stock, services to readers, etc. are virtually
left to the various faculties or schools, institutes
and colleges. (36)

With this situation, Adediran devoted the rest of his paper
on argument in favour of operational centralization of
university library resources in Nigeria. According to him the
factors that make centralization imperative include the need
for judicious use of limited funds, planned growth, inter-
library cooperation, and effective deployment of staff.

There are obvious limitations in a paper of less than four sides.
These limitations meant that several aspects such as the reasons
for the existence of the branch libraries, their resources and
services were not examined.

At the invitation of the Vice-chancellor, Ahmadu Bello University
(A.B.U.) Zaria, Dr. F.W. Ratcliffe carried out an appraisal
of the activities of the library in that University. As part
of his study, he also visited other university libraries at
Ibadan, Nsukka, Ile-Ife, Lagos and Benin City. His report on
the library situation at A.B.U. Zaria contained his impressions
about branch libraries in the university. He wrote:
It is my belief that money spent on these local libraries is as a rule money well spent, and in my own university these collections are seen as essential corollaries of the main library, providing important additional supplementary reference working areas. The question is whether the money could be more advantageously spent as part of a coordinated university policy. The object is not, as some of those teaching staff with whom I spoke in A.B.U. suspected, to curtail such libraries but rather to promote them where necessary as part of an overall university library strategy. It is easy to see here how large branch libraries can develop an autonomy which leads to a disjointed rather than a unified system . . . the time is opportune for considering and coordinating of library growth within universities. Each university is developing departmental libraries outside the sphere of University Library's administrative responsibility. (37)

Dr. Ratcliffe brought his vast experience in university library administration to bear on his report. It is noteworthy that his overriding concern was with maximum utilization of library and information resources in the university.

Christian C. Aguolu's doctoral thesis presented to the University of California in 1977 centred on Libraries of learning and research in Nigerian higher education - - - As part of his work he examined a number of departmental, institute and faculty libraries and interviewed the managers of such libraries on aspects of their work. Pages 490 to 493 of his thesis reported the characteristics of branch libraries as he found them. He noted: "The rationale for establishing all these types of libraries is that, through their proximity to the classrooms and laboratories and their ease of access, they provide a better service than the monolithic central library." (38)

While Dr. Aguolu realized the need to give attention to branch libraries in a study of university library and information resources, his treatment of the subject was rather peripheral. Since he was primarily interested in the main university libraries and the National Library of Nigeria, he was unable to devote considerable attention and space to branch libraries.
In consequence such aspects as their resources, personnel, services and relations with central university libraries were not touched.

Recently at Loughborough University, Raphael U. Ononogbo completed a doctoral thesis. This very elaborate and useful work surveyed the development of scientific and technological information systems in Nigeria. He used the data derived as a basis for formulating a conceptualized framework for smooth flow of scientific and technological information in developing countries with specific reference to Nigeria. His work included scientific and technological resources of the universities in Nigeria but excluded branch libraries in science and technology. He explained:

The survey sample has tried to be as comprehensive as possible. At the same time, certain institutional "Libraries" where some degree of scientific and technological information resources may be lurking have been left out. Prominent among them are a number of university science departments. . . The omission is deliberate because in the case of the new universities campuses are started in institutions that have hitherto had no definite libraries . . . Some university science departmental libraries represent a cluster of antique books or undergraduate dissertations which though in themselves may be significant if surveyed, may not supply information enough to make a questionnaire response usable. (29)

It would seem that the main reason in the foregoing viewpoint that Dr. Ononogbo was unable to go beyond university libraries was because of the nature and scope of his research design. Otherwise there are worthwhile library and information resources in some science and technology faculties and departments.

A number of succinct points emerge from the studies examined above. Branch Libraries are a feature of library and information services in the universities at Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, Ife, Lagos and Benin City. However these library units have not formed the object or central theme of any research. Also such expressions of desire for a "system of libraries" and a "network of libraries", with reference to libraries within the universities,
show that there is a felt need for attention to be given to the ways of harmonising the library units within universities in the interest of improved services to readers. The scope of the present work includes these aspects as shown in the statement of the problem.

1.8 Arrangement of chapters

The rest of the work is presented in the following manner.

Chapter two examines the organization of university libraries with an eye on how this is related to branch libraries. The same chapter also focusses attention on some features of university libraries in Nigeria. This helps one understand the environments in which the branch libraries exist.

Chapter three explores the literature of branch libraries. The aim is to show, through comparative examination of published materials, the extent of work already done in this area at various periods and from different geographical areas.

Chapter four will discuss the research design and methods employed to gather data for the work. This approach is placed in the context of survey method of research in library and information studies.

Chapters five to seven inclusive will present the character of branch libraries in Nigerian universities. This is based on data collected by the researcher through questionnaire, observation and interviews.

Chapter eight looks at the issue of branch libraries from the broader perspectives of overall university library and information services. This is done by appraising the findings from the wider angles of (i) organizational design and changes in university libraries, (ii) access to information. Incorporated in the foregoing discussion are two conceptual models of university-wide network of libraries, which are sufficiently generalized to meet the needs of similar situations in developing countries. Recommendations for further studies conclude the chapter.
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CHAPTER TWO

ADMINISTRATIVE PATTERNS AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is in two parts. The first centres on differences and relationships between departments in university libraries and branch or departmental libraries. Also the concept of centralization and decentralization is explored. The second part of the chapter deals with some elements of university library resources and administration. The overall objective is to give a reasonable insight into the extent of library and information services in the universities where the branch libraries exist.

2.2 Nature of Departments

Organizations usually exist to perform specific tasks. These tasks are usually grouped into similar or related areas to form departments. As Carzo and Janouzas explained, the arrangement of functions means "the grouping of specialized activities into departments or subunits of an organization." (1) This conception tallies with the view of Stephen Robbins who went forward to provide a rationale for creating departments in an organization. According to him, departments in an organization are formed in answer to the span of administration. "... since no one person can administer an unlimited number of subordinates, it is necessary to group activities into some homogeneous formation." (2) Stephen Robbins implies here that the number of persons working in an organization is the sole determinant of the number and extent of departments in that establishment. The pattern appears to be that several elements, some of them inter-related, come into vogue when considering how far an organization should departmentalize. Such factors as the size of the organization, nature of services or products, geographical location of the organization as well as the quantity and quality of employees come into the plan. It is perhaps in consonance with the complexity of the
issues involved that Arthur McAnally stated that forming departments involves "the grouping of work into operating units, including the placement of both personnel and materials." (3)

Departments in organizations have two dimensions and a clarification of these will reveal how they apply to the present investigation. Often the term department refers to a certain unit of an organization or library. In libraries as in some other organizations, departments usually exist as one of the functional units of the main library of any size. "The term department . . . is applied in libraries to a major unit of certain size . . ." (4)

Traditionally this form of arrangement was based on various functions performed in libraries such as cataloguing and circulation but later on came to incorporate forms of materials such as manuscripts, Africana and audio-visual materials. This connotation is succinct in the following statement which also depicts the organizational structure of most university libraries in Nigeria. "In most university libraries there are two broad administrative divisions: technical services and readers services." (5) These departments are examined in the context of their relationship and implications for branch libraries.

In another sense, departments are used to characterize offshoots of the parent organization which exist in physically separate locations or buildings. In this sense departments mean much the same as branches (see Definitions 1.5.1). This connotation implies that the parent body or main library has or should have a hand in the existence and running of such library units. Lucien W. White shows why this development is sometimes necessary: "Departmental libraries may also be established in an effort to disperse the increased load of centralized services, which in time may have become too complex and impersonal as a natural consequence of size." (6) Highly centralized administrative pattern is usually the corollary of this system of campus-wide libraries.
This system is self evident from the organizational chart of a typical university library in Nigeria. (Figure 1) The schematic shows that in highly centralized systems, branch libraries are controlled from main libraries, in this instance, through a senior professional member of staff designated "Coordinator of Departmental, Faculty and Institute Libraries."

J.L.Schofield and L.Gilder had given further insight into the nature of library units that may exist in academic environments. In their work on staff development in a multi-site polytechnic library, they clarified the difference between "split-site" library and "multi-site" library. According to them, "The split-site library may have a number of service points under one roof or on the same campus whereas the multi-site library may have service points scattered throughout a city or region."

The situation is amplified in Figure 2. It is shown that various sites of an institution of higher learning may have varying degrees of library units. In one site there is just one library unit, the second has one site-library and four additional service units, while in the third there is one site-library and three additional service units. It is noteworthy, as shown in the diagram, that the various site libraries are appropriately linked with one another. It is this linkage that in fact makes the difference between isolated library units of one academic institution and library systems of another. An insight/the background that gave rise to the multi-site situation is pertinent. According to Wilfred Ashworth:

As a result of the 1966 White Paper, the polytechnics were formed very quickly and in most cases, by amalgamation of a number of separate and sometimes rival colleges. Their libraries thus inherited a multi-site condition which had no basis in design or common sense -- -- Some polytechnics have been fortunate enough to be able to build new libraries even on a green field campus, but most still have more than one library site to administer, often with very different standards of building and facilities. In some cases the units are miles apart. Some -- -- have widely separated "precincts"
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PHYSICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EACH SERVICE POINT OF THE TOTAL LIBRARY SYSTEM.

which are themselves centres of groups of satellite libraries. Some have been subject to further disorientation by compulsory merger with colleges of education which often are large in comparison with other colleges already in the system. (8)

It must be added that branch libraries can come about in other ways. While the centralized model is true in certain cases and appears to conform with the views of librarians on this matter, it is not a universal approach. Many branch libraries have come into existence and are run without reference to the main university library. Sam E. Ifidon recognized this dichotomy in his recent paper. He observed, "In some cases the university librarian has jurisdiction over only the main library while the faculty and professional school libraries are autonomous — — in others still the university library is defined as all the collections of university books wherever located." (9)

Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber have described such libraries established and run by academic units as "autonomous units" of university-wide pattern of libraries. (10) They went further to provide a conceptual rationale for the existence of such libraries:

The existence of autonomous units may stem from lack of cooperation at some earlier point, from the burgeoning growth of a particular unit with which the library system could not or would not cope with at some time, from accreditation "requirements," from independent development at another geographical location, or for other reasons of campus politics and finance. (11)

Perhaps a major dimension of these "other reasons", though hardly measured, is the convenience of branch libraries to their users. In a recent study Shunith Shoham observed that users preferred existing convenient branch libraries, even to the prospect of using cost savings for additional services with centralized provision. (12)

The present investigation centres on all the foregoing aspects of branch libraries in so far as they are physically separated from the main university library.
2.3 Determinants of Departments

An insight into considerations that come into vogue in determining the nature of departments seems pertinent since these exigencies shade considerable light on issues prompting the existence of branch libraries in universities. Lucien W. White explained that "... the reason for the development of subject-departmental libraries may parallel those leading to the development of functional divisions such as circulation and reference departments; the development of form-of-material units such as map libraries, document collections, newspaper libraries, and microfilm libraries, and recently the development of separate libraries for undergraduate students." (13)

Table 1 shows how four works on management issues had tried to categorize these considerations.

A close look at the table shows that most of the various categories can be subsumed under Wight's six bases which were arrived at from the point of view of libraries, namely, function, activity or process, clientele, geography, subject, and form of material.

2.3.1 Function or Purpose

This involves forming departments on the grounds of similarity of work or functions performed. The two usual functional divisions in a university library are technical services (comprising cataloguing, classification, acquisitions, etc) and readers services (circulation, reference service, etc). This mode of arrangement is emphasized where there is need to develop a high degree of specialization in certain skills. This has been the conventional pattern of grouping work in libraries with a view to developing expertise in those areas.

Like many traditional elements fears are often expressed that this form of organization is hardly suitable for fulfilling the information needs of the present-day university. Considerable flexibility of arrangement reflecting user or subject approaches often enables university libraries to contain changing information needs of readers. It is this sort of reasoning that had probably led Maurice B. Line to quibble:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms Used in Four Works to Describe Bases of Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wight (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity or Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clientele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Information derived from the four works cited above.
There are even some librarians who say proudly "I am a cataloguer" or "I am an accessioner" as if they were some special blood-group which was incompatible with others. (18)

2.3.2 Activity or Process

This is in vogue where it requires a series of identifiable and specialized steps to be followed to produce a result or satisfy a user. Since the steps require specific skills, this method offers a basis for the homogeneous grouping of activities. It enables similar types of equipment and labour with similar training and skill to be brought together. Demarcation of departmental lines is purely on technical considerations. Examples include ordering processes and book accessioning.

2.3.3 Clientele or Customer

This requires differentiation and grouping of activities according to the special needs of the persons or customers dealt with. In universities, library users normally include undergraduate students, postgraduate students, university teachers and research workers. Some categories of users rather peculiar to Nigerian university environment require a mention. Many universities admit pre-degree students to prepare them for university admission. There are also non-graduate diploma and sometimes certificate programmes. All these have implications for library and information provisions. In some universities, library and information services are segmented on the basis of the nature of users. Sometimes there are separate library provisions for pre-degree programmes, undergraduate and research users.

2.3.4 Geography or Place

There are situations where activities or services are grouped on the basis of the location where duty is to be performed or an area to be served by the organization. Departments on the basis of geography may occur in an organization where there are purpose and functional departments. Librarians generally agree...
that there is need for branch libraries where the academic unit is far removed from the main university library. Jeffrey Raffel and Robert Shishko expounded the concept of market orientation of libraries, implying that their location is sensitive to the location of their users. They further emphasized the inherent "cost in time, energy and decreased use resulting from locating the library a longer distance from users."(19)

2.3.5 Subject

This has a special application to libraries and involves creating departments or branches on the basis of subjects (for example, economics, or chemistry) or group of subjects (humanities, engineering, social sciences).

The idea of subject organization in university libraries is a relatively recent development. This is as a result of increasing awareness that libraries are perhaps in a better position to meet the needs of users if they are subject-oriented. This pattern is user-centred since most university people usually approach their libraries from the point of view of subjects. W.L.Guttsman had shown the nature of this arrangement in his own university library:

All members of the senior library staff act as subject specialists and are responsible, wholly or partially, for book selection in their field of specialization, or for the appropriate co-ordination of acquisitions where, in the sciences, this is primarily done by the faculty. Subject specialists will also deal with specialist bibliographical enquiries and give instruction to undergraduate or graduate students in bibliographical or information retrieval aspects of the subject whenever we can gain the support of the schools and others concerned. They also classify, but do not catalogue all books in their subjects and assign subject entries to them. In addition, they share a range of administrative tasks, but this is often more by way of consultative advice and general oversight of certain areas of library activity than by extensive part-time involvement. Conversely, certain areas of library services, e.g. the issue desk, ordering department and periodical accessions are under the day-to-day control of senior library assistants, who control the activities of the junior staff assigned to the departments. (20)
2.3.6 Form of Material

Again, this has a special, though not an exclusive application to libraries. Often departments exist for such special information materials as maps, manuscripts, serials, patents, government documents, oriental materials and Africana. As John Dean explained:

Special collections are normally inaugurated when a library wishes to preserve a unique relationship between certain books, a relationship which cannot be demonstrated by integrating the books within the main classified sequences of the library. (21)

In university libraries in Nigeria it is sometimes the practice to form departments for such special materials as maps and manuscripts, Arabic materials, Africana, audio visual materials and government documents. Invariably these departments exist within the main libraries.

It is evident from the foregoing discussion of the rationale for departments in organizations that the issues involved are not mutually exclusive. Stephen Robbins drives this point home. "A point of frequent confusion is the assumption that an organization selects only one of these methods — The truth is that in most complex organizations, all the methods are found." (22)

A detailed examination of the organization chart of a typical university library in Nigeria (Figure I) shows that forms of materials, functions, subject, and place or geography are integrated in that single system.

Since the focus of the present investigation is on units of university-wide library system physically separate from the main library (see Definitions 1.5.1), it appears relevant to reflect on how forms of departments fit into the context of branch libraries. Branch libraries, as already seen, can be established for reasons of geography. There seems to be consensus among librarians that there should be branch libraries for academic units that are distant from the main
university library, particularly where the academic unit does not share the same physical campus as the main library. The work of J.L. Schofield and L. Gilder was essentially based on this notion of dispersed library services. (23) In 1967 the Parry Committee on Libraries had examined this matter in some detail and summed up its feeling thus, "We appreciate that, wherever there are large and important departments -- which are a considerable way from the main library, they will require libraries." (24) Where such libraries exist, they are usually designed to cater to clearly defined clientele, and they in fact centre on specific subject(s).

Leading on from the foregoing observation is the fact that branch libraries can and do exist primarily on the basis of client or subject even where the academic units served are a few minutes' walk from the main library. In such situations, geographical consideration was not an important factor in taking the decision. The viewpoint of D.A. Wells appears noteworthy in this connection. He wrote:

--- a departmental library serves in a general sort of way the same kind of purpose as any other tool with which you do research and that to have to go to some other building to get your tools is a very undesirable situation. The crux of the matter is this: specialists in a field (students, teachers, researchers, etc.) do not make effective use of a library if they must go far (especially in another building). (25)

It is also theoretically possible to have branch libraries on the basis of forms of materials, for example rare books, documents and audio-visual materials. A typical example of this is the Houghton Library for rare books and manuscripts at the Harvard University.

From the foregoing, it appears worthwhile to empirically explore the location determinants of branch libraries in Nigerian universities. Do these libraries exist in academic units that are distant from the main libraries? Or are reasons other than distance inherent in the establishment of such
libraries? How are they administered and what services do they provide? What are the felt dispositions of heads of academic units and librarians towards them?

2.4 Centralization and Decentralization

A study of branch/ies is to a large extent concerned with centralization and decentralization in libraries. In fact several writers on branch libraries often include the phrase "Centralization and Decentralization" in the titles of their papers. (26, 27)

In a literal sense to centralize means to "come or bring to a centre; concentrate (administration) at a single centre." (28) The analogy is something of a hub with adjoining units which are linked and interact with the centre.

In library and information studies, centralization can mean different things depending largely on the adjective used to qualify it. These differences are lucidly shown in the explanation given by Maurice F. Tauber during his introductory talk at a symposium on centralization and decentralization in university libraries. According to him:

--- we have "administrative centralization" which generally has meant control of a number of library units by a central officer. Or, we may have "physical centralization" of a system of libraries, in which all units are located either in a single building or a restricted number of locations. Or, we may have "operational centralization" in that certain operations are performed in a single place by a single personnel for various units of a system. (29)

The Parry Report employed the two terms in a similar sense, "As applied to academic libraries, the terms 'centralized' and 'decentralized' may refer to the housing of the book-collections or to the administering of them. The book-collections of a university may be housed either in a single repository or in a number of separate repositories." (30)
As a result of local conditions, historical factors and sometimes personality interests various aspects of centralization and decentralization are often combined. For instance it is possible to have administrative centralization in a university with decentralized library services.

Conceptually the relationship between branch libraries and main university libraries can be generalized in terms of centralization and decentralization. The library services of a university with a large number of branch libraries can be said to be physically decentralized. According to Stephen Robbins " organizations that are geographically dispersed are usually decentralized in nature." (31) In some cases physical decentralization goes along with administrative decentralization. This is illustrated by the point made by Snunith Shoham that departmental libraries on the basis of subject often involve "geographical decentralization as well as organizational decentralization." (32) The reason for this phenomenon seems obvious. The more remote an arm of an organization is from the centre, the more difficult it is for the branch to keep in touch with it. For reasons of distance, local conditions and emergency, organizations have found it expedient to leave the subordinate in charge of such outpost with substantial authority.

A common university library practice is to evolve operational centralization for units that are geographically dispersed. For reasons of economy and uniformity, ordering, cataloguing and classification are sometimes done in a central location for all the units in a library system.

Firuzeh Broomand-e- Sarkardeh has observed that centralization can be complete or partial. This distinction was based solely on geographical grounds. Complete centralization is feasible "in universities whose faculties and professional schools are concentrated in a single area -- " Conversely, there would be partial centralization "when different departments and faculties of a university are spread out in much larger area." (33)
2.5. Aspects of University Libraries in Nigeria

2.5.1 Origins and Development

Some historical accounts tend to associate the beginnings of libraries in Nigeria with the establishment of the University College, Ibadan in 1948. This notion is suspect in a number of respects.

The general development of higher education in the country began with the opening of the Yaba Higher College. During its life span, 1930 to 1947, this College prepared its students for the Yaba Diploma. The fields covered include science, engineering, survey, agriculture, forestry, animal health, medical sciences and education. The Elliot Commission on Higher Education in West Africa made a detailed description of the academic programmes of this college. (34)

The nature of courses offered at the Yaba Higher College would seem to reflect considerable academic activity. The college had a library. But the story of that library was somewhat different:

--- the library of this first Nigerian College was hardly considered its vital part. Poorly financed, it stocked a few outdated students' textbooks and reference works --- In 1945, after ten years of existence, the library possessed only 3,600 volumes. By 1947 when it was transferred to Ibadan to form the basis of the University College Library, it had grown to 10,000 volumes, chiefly duplicates. (35)

It seems obvious that the academic programmes of the Yaba Higher College were not matched by corresponding library and information resources.

There were again libraries of other sorts before 1948. Ogunsheyie described the scene as follows:

It would be wrong to assume --- that libraries were first introduced in Nigeria in 1948. The
history of libraries in Nigeria can be traced back to the old Arabic collections that had existed in various parts of the North for centuries, as extensions of the Timbucto centre of learning. The inhabitants of Lagos have had some form of library service in the Tom Jones Library founded between 1910 and 1920. This library by 1932 had become an established subscription library. There were also the collections of individuals like Henry Carr, estimated at 11,000 (volumes) in 1948, and the Herbert Macaulay collection. (36)

These instances give insight into the sort of libraries in Nigeria before 1948. Such library services now belong to the realm of history. However, in placing the scene in its proper perspectives it is necessary to add that before 1948 there was no professional librarian and no national library in the country. The absence of librarians meant in part that there was no professional library association to stimulate action for library development.

With this rather very low level of library scene, one will probably appreciate the importance of 1948 in the history of library and information services in Nigeria. In that year the University College, Ibadan, was founded as an affiliate of University of London. With it the first university library in the country came into existence. This event marked the take-off of real library and information services in Nigeria. Ogunsheye herself emphasized that that event marked the beginning of "proper library history." (37) John Harris had reflected on the emergence of libraries in Nigeria and noted:

--- it was only with the establishment of the University Library of Ibadan that Nigeria acquired a library in the fullest sense, equipped for reference and research, permanently established, professionally directed and staffed, and provided with assured budget and an appropriate building. (38)

Once established both the University College, Ibadan and its library made rapid growth. A useful account of the development of the University including that of its library has been published in book form. (39)
Between 1948 and Nigeria's attainment of political independence in 1960, there was no other library of much significance. What would have been a gap in the library and information scene during this period was remarkably contained by Ibadan University Library, thanks to the foresight and ability of its pioneer librarian. The library played the role of a national library and stimulated library development in other angles.

Two developments between 1948 and 1960 are important in an account of university library services in Nigeria. By the late 1950's it was clear that Ibadan University College alone was inadequate for the university education needs of Nigeria. Already the Ibadan student population was exceeding the available facilities in the institution. The University College itself could not offer admission to a greater proportion of candidates who qualified for university education. (40) There was the feeling prompted by the nationalist zeal of the time, that its "orientation was British rather than Nigerian, and that its general pace of development was too slow for a Nigeria moving towards political sovereignty." (41) These apparent limitations of the University College, Ibadan in a way provided the impetus for the establishment of four additional universities and university libraries in the 1960's (see Table 2).

Since the early 1970's, there has been considerable widening of economic activities in the country largely as a result of increased development of petroleum oil industry. In the sphere of higher education this relative economic buoyancy has greatly facilitated the establishment of new universities. This process seems to be a continuing one even in the 1980's, which has witnessed considerable economic recession resulting largely from the oil glut. Both the Federal and State Governments give considerable priority to the establishment of new universities. Table 2 illustrates this trend.

Another development that is relevant in the present context was the establishment of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka in 1960. This University was autonomous from inception. It was also conceived essentially as Nigerian oriented university.

* For a full account of these matters, the reader is referred to the booklet, Harris, John. Ibadan University Library: some notes on its birth and growth. Ibadan: University Press, 1968.
Nevertheless, the University learned to the United States of America for financial and technical assistance: "A contract was signed designating Michigan State University to render technical assistance and advice." (42) This meant American influence. The first vice-chancellor, the first librarian and some other senior officials of the university were from that source.

With the foregoing brief background, it is perhaps understandable why British and American influences are easily discernible in Nigerian university education and university library patterns. Sometimes conflicts occur in an attempt to rely on one or the other, or relate either to the Nigerian situation. Such conflicts had probably led a professor of education to ask:

Are the Nigerian universities aiming to emulate Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Yale or Moscow, and priding themselves on being replicas of these institutions, or are they to develop as authentic African universities, with their own personality and uniqueness? (43)

In the sphere of library and information services, these influences have largely been wholesome. With them have come aids from international organizations and cultural agencies such as UNESCO, the British Council, the Inter-university Council for Higher Education Overseas, Ranfurly Library Service, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller and Carnegie Corporation. Such helps are in form of funds, staff, services, exchange of information, donation of information materials, fellowships and scholarships. These aids have facilitated the development of not only the university libraries but also library education, some public and other types of libraries. Saliu A. Ajia has in his recent doctoral thesis focussed attention on the nature and patterns of British aids to library and information services in Nigeria with particular reference to the activities of the British Council, I.U.C. and Ranfurly Library Service. (44)

At the same time there has been considerable adaption of British and American patterns by university and other libraries to suit the Nigerian environment. In his paper on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Ibadan, Ibadan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Nigeria, Nsukka</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria; Universities of Ife and Lagos</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Benin, Benin City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bayero University, Kano; Universities of Jos, Maiduguri, Sokoto, Ilorin, Port Harcourt and Calabar</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anambra State University of Technology, Enugu; Federal University of Technology, Bauchi; Federal University of Technology, Makurdi; Federal University of Technology, Owerri; Benue State University, Ekpoma; River State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Imo State University, Etiti; Federal University of Technology, Minna; Federal University of Technology, Akure; Federal University of Technology, Yola.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cross River University, Uyo; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ado-Ekiti; Ogun State University, Ago-Iwoye; Federal University of Technology, Abeokuta.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lagos State University, Lagos</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Organization and services of university libraries in West Africa", A.J.E. Dean observed:

-- -- it should be stressed that all these institutions under consideration are now achieving their specific identity, and, while maintaining close relations with Europe and America, are tending to adapt rather than to adopt the library patterns of the metropolitan world. (45)

2.5.2 Standards and Guidelines

In planning university libraries or appraising their resources, it is becoming conventional to do so in terms of established standards. Also studies of university libraries are often linked with appropriate standards of practice. It is, therefore, necessary to examine standards as they relate to university libraries as well as to branch libraries in the universities.

According to the Concise Oxford Dictionary, standard can mean

- -- - measure to which others conform or by which the accuracy or quality of others are judged; thing serving as basis for comparison; degree of excellence etc required for particular purpose; thing recognized as model for imitation; average quality.(46)

The foregoing shows that standard can be interpreted in a number of ways depending on how it is used. For instance, it can represent a model, a measure of accuracy or degree of excellence for a specific matter. Because of the diverse interpretations that could be given to the term, most writers on standards give considerable space to their detailed clarification. One of the most helpful definitions of standards given below illustrates the interpretation of the word in library studies:

Library standards may be defined as criteria by which -- -- library services may be measured and assessed. They are determined by professional librarians in order to attain and maintain the objectives they have set themselves. Standards may be interpreted variously as the pattern of an ideal, a model procedure, a measure for appraisal, a stimulus for future development and improvement and
as an instrument to assist decision and action not only by librarians themselves but by laymen concerned indirectly with the institution planning and administration of library services. The adoption of standards does not imply a loss of individuality, a curb to initiative or a pattern to which all library development must conform (47).

A common concern relating to application of standards is the fear of librarians that minimum standards may come to be interpreted by university authorities as maximum standards. There is no doubt that library growth would suffer where this situation is allowed to develop. On this Robert B. Downs and John W. Heussman had tried to calm the fears of library and information workers: "There can be little doubt, however, that the overall effect of standards has been to upgrade libraries, providing substandard institutions with yardsticks by which to measure their deficiencies." (48)

There is also the consideration that standards are usually pragmatic and tend to lose their validity outside the environments for which they are designed: K.W. Humphreys made an excellent review of standards for university libraries in several countries and noted, "It will be evident to all readers of this essay that almost all the standards I have quoted have little or no validity outside the environment for which they were invented." (49) Nevertheless, some standards such as those relating the percentage of seating to student enrolment and space per FTE undergraduate appear to be more or less the same in different parts of the world. Also several techniques developed for determining the standard of information resources in university libraries are widely applied for comparative purposes.

Perhaps the overall importance of library standards can be appreciated from the following personal testimony of an American librarian: "The development of national standards for each type of library has had a dramatic impact on library improvement throughout the country. Librarians, trustees, educators—have used these standards to upgrade libraries..."
and library service everywhere." (50)

Interest in standards of university libraries had often been a feature of various national professional bodies, group efforts and individual studies. Signe Ottersen's compilation, "A bibliography of standards for evaluating libraries" (51) is a very useful source of information on this topic.

One of the earliest standards was produced by the Association of College and Research Libraries of American Library Association in 1959. (52) This standard was designed for college libraries supporting academic programmes up to the master's degree level. Although this standard contained a few quantitative elements it was essentially qualitative in character. This limited its application since value statements are hardly amenable to exact interpretation. According to John Dean, in formulating standards, "The emphasis is upon quantitative guidance, since measurements are rather more helpful than pious exhortations." (53) A revised version of the standards which were intended to extend to libraries serving universities granting fewer than ten doctoral degrees annually was published in 1974. (54)

In 1968 a joint ad hoc committee of the Association of College and Research Libraries and the Association of Research Libraries was appointed to develop university library standards in North America. This joint ad hoc committee adopted a strictly pragmatic approach to its assignment. "Instead of attempting to prepare a statement of ideal standards, it was agreed that a set of criteria for excellence for university libraries, based on the best current practices, should be developed." (55) Consequently the Committee selected as control group fifty leading university libraries in the United States and Canada. These universities were among those classified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as "doctoral granting institutions" with emphasis on graduate study, professional education and research. (56)

The data collected from this control group came under seven categories: resources, personnel, finances, space, public
service, administration, and professional school libraries. Tables containing these facts have been presented by Robert B. Downs and John W. Heussman. (57) The overall intention is that any interested university library can compare itself with the situation in these fifty eminent university libraries.

In Britain no professional association of librarians had produced standards for university libraries. However, much of this was reflected in the document submitted to the 1967 Committee on Libraries by the Subcommittee on Standards appointed by the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries (SCONUL). The aspects covered in the evidence included finance, staffing, size of collection and services. (58)

There has been interest in standards for libraries in Nigeria. In 1967 a Seminar on Standards of Practice for West African Libraries was held at the University of Ibadan. Papers presented at that Seminar covered the character of standards as well as standards for specific types of libraries — public, special, school and university. Jonathan O. Dipeolu, then a deputy university librarian, presented the paper on standards for university libraries. That paper covered eight aspects of university library matters, namely, functions, structure and government, budget, staff, library collections, building, quality and evaluation of service, and inter library cooperation. (59) A close examination of the paper reveals that much of the quantitative data it contained were derived from the existing situations in the metropolitan countries of Europe and America. In fact much of the contents of that paper had not been put to use in Nigerian universities. There is also the criticism that the standards presented at that Seminar were somewhat faulty because they were construed "as definitive measures of a library's excellence rather than as guidelines to achieving a higher quality of library service." (60) In any case the Nigerian university environment of today is remarkably different from the situation in 1967. Part of this difference has resulted from expansion of university programmes. The situation requires standards that would reflect the widening scope of university education in the country.
In an apparent bid to produce acceptable standards for Nigerian libraries, the 1978 annual conference of the Nigerian Library Association was devoted to the matter. The conference held at Ilorin had as its theme, "Standards for Nigerian Libraries in post military era." During the Conference the paper supposed to deal with the critical problem of standards for university libraries was presented by Adebimpe Ike. (61) However, the paper contained no quantitative or comparative analysis and merely reflected the writer's viewpoints on university libraries in general.

University librarians in Nigeria had also paid attention to the matter of standards. This was done through the aegis of the Committee of University Librarians of Nigerian Universities. This Committee started as a subcommittee of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors of Nigerian Universities. According to its present chairman, O.O. Ogundipe, the Committee of University Librarians is now autonomous although in matters involving representation to the Government, it still has to go through the Committee of Vice-Chancellors.

The university librarians formulated the objectives of their Committee as follows:

(1) To advise and make recommendations to the Nigerian Universities Commission (National Universities Commission), the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and any other bodies on general policy and development of university libraries in Nigeria.

(2) To formulate standards for Nigerian university libraries.

(3) To review and formulate policies that will facilitate inter-library cooperation.

(4) To keep under review the work of other bodies interested in the development of librarianship and allied fields and make necessary recommendations.

(5) To consider other matters referred to it by the Nigerian Universities Commission, the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and other bodies. (62)
Formulation of standards for university libraries in Nigeria is thus in the minds of the chief executives of the libraries. In October, 1981, the Committee organized a Seminar on "Nigerian University Library Standards." Papers presented at the Seminar covered aspects of university libraries including building, personnel and book collection.

However, the papers were written from point of view of their respective writers and were essentially qualitative in character. One of the university librarians recently reviewed the development of standards for Nigerian university libraries and (including the 1981 Seminar) summarized the situation in this manner:

Thus, the series, of seminars on library standards which began in the 1960's through the 1970's to the 1980's have produced no results after about twenty years efforts. (63)

At other times, individual librarians had focussed attention on aspects of standards for university libraries in Nigeria. B.U. Nwafor had written on standards for Nigerian academic library buildings. (64) Perhaps, the most definitive treatment of the matter is reflected in the paper on "Establishment of Standards of book stock in West African university libraries." (65) The paper offered a statistical formula for determining the adequacy of book stock in the university libraries. The elements used to formulate the formula include a basic collection of 50,000 volumes, the number of students for various non-graduate diploma and certificate courses, the number of under-graduate and post graduate students, the duration of each programme and the number of various categories of the teaching staff. While the formula reflected considerable thinking it has not been subjected to test. The author admitted this. (66)

As it is, at the moment the matter of standards for university libraries in Nigeria remains largely unresolved.
2.5.2.1 Standards for Branch Libraries

Branch libraries in universities have not been subjected to rigorous examination for determination of standards as has been the case with main libraries. In fact some university library standards ignore or omit branch libraries altogether. However, there are useful examples. The Guide to Canadian University Library Standards issued in 1967 contains standards for branch libraries. (67) In 1972 the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association, viewed branch libraries in academic institutions as "a very real problem" and undertook "to develop a set of guidelines that would provide constructive criteria for all institutions of higher education regarding the establishment and maintenance of branch libraries." The outcome of this undertaking was published in 1974. (68) Also the Parry Report gave considerable space to the matter of branch libraries and offered helpful guidelines for their establishment, administration and maintenance. (69) For comparative purposes, relevant aspects of these standards and guidelines will be reflected at the appropriate stages of this work.

2.5.2.2 N.U.C. Guidelines.

As noted in chapter one (1.6), the National Universities Commission (N.U.C.) had issued the document; Standard Guide for Universities. The Guide sets the general standard for university development and covers such matters as environment, design and construction, services, space needs, cost limits, furniture and equipment. The relevant aspects of the Guide for university libraries are as follows:

1. Optimum student enrolment into the new universities will be 10,000.

2. Staff/student ratio will be 1:10.

3. The central university library will have capacity for 500,000 volumes.

4. Total usable area of the library will be derived from the application of the formula of $1.25 \text{ m}^2$ per FTE (Full Time Equivalent) student.
5. The central university library will seat 1,500 readers.

6. The annual rate of acquisition should correspond to the annual rate of weeding.

7. The student common rooms attached to halls of residence will have a library component (Total area of 186 m² to include TV lounge, Quir lounge and library.)

8. Faculty libraries are disallowed.

9. The central university library will be amongst the facilities to benefit from central air-conditioning, and the services of a stand-by generator.

10. Total non-assignable or balance area of 35% of the entire library space is permissible.

11. After allowing for variations in cost brought about by the geography of this country, cost calculation of the total library building will be on the basis of 535 (approx. £451.50) per m².

12. Cost of shelving is excluded from the cost of the library in 11 above. (70)

The first clause of the above policy guidelines makes it clear that they are designed for the newer universities, that is, those established from 1975 onwards. In other words, they hardly apply to the older universities that form the basis for this work. This observation is further borne out in Table 3: most of these older universities now have more than 10,000 given as the ultimate number of student enrolment. Also, with the authority of the same N.U.C., a new library designed to accommodate 1,000,000 volumes and seat at least 4,000 readers is now under construction at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. (71)

Even for the new universities, the given guidelines are suspect in several respects. Since the authors of the Guide stated that they derived their stipulations from "current U.K. practice" there seem to be no doubt that they were based on the controversial self-renewing formula for university libraries contained in the Atkinson Report of 1976. (72) This conception has been rejected by virtually all Nigerian librarians who had commented on the matter. The grounds of this objection can be summarized thus:
Apart from the fact that the report (Atkinson Report) was not an unqualified success to the British Librarians for whom it was originally prepared, the principle of a "self-renewing" library is impractical and unrealistic for universities in Third World countries. Few modern universities in Black Africa are more than twenty-five years old. Therefore, to talk about developing the collection at the same rate as weeding it is premature. (73)

The seating capacity proposed for the new libraries is another point of criticism. According to G.B. Affia, Librarian of University of Port Harcourt, seating is required in university libraries for a "minimum 25% potential readers." (74) Since the projected student population is 10,000, seating would be needed for at least 2,500. In effect, the seating capacity proposed in the new guidelines falls short of the minimum requirement by 1,000.

The foregoing defect of the Guide viewed in the context of its stipulation that branch libraries would not be encouraged in the new universities presents a rather doubtful picture. Minimum space requirement is not met in the proposed libraries: at the same time branch libraries would not exist. In any case, the issues prompting the existence of branch libraries are complex as shown in section 2.3 above and in chapter five. It seems that without adequate and detailed attention to the fundamental reasons for their existence, it would be difficult to evolve permanent approaches to their control. After all, in many cases, branch libraries are founded without authorization from the top.

2.5.3 Functions and Services

University libraries differ from other types of libraries. These differences arise largely from the character of users of the libraries. The users include undergraduate students, graduate students, teaching staff, research workers and outside people. As these users differ in their academic backgrounds and pursuits, their library and information needs are also different. In determining their functions and services, university libraries aim at reflecting the information needs of various categories of users.
P.Havard-Williams had presented these functions and services in a very helpful graphic form as shown in Figure 3. By a close look at the schematic and the analysis of the functions of university libraries rendered by Rutherford D.Rogers and David C.Weber in their University library administration, (75) one can outline the functions and services of university libraries as follows:

1. The selection of materials and their acquisition by various methods; materials include books, periodicals, manuscripts, rare books, microtexts, films, sheet maps, and so on.

2. The organization of these materials - cataloguing and classification.

3. The circulation of materials; some under various degrees of controlled access.

4. The provision of assistance to readers in the use of these materials-reference service, instruction to users.

5. The provision of study facilities in a useful variety of accommodations and locations - seats, carrels.

6. The binding and protection of these collections.

7. The relations with other libraries and institutions having library collections for the mutual benefit of the university library and some other comparable user elsewhere.

Views are often expressed that while these conventional functions and services of university libraries are suitable for the universities in the metropolitan countries of Europe and America, they require considerable modification in a developing country like Nigeria. Conditions in developed industrial societies differ from those in underdeveloped or developing countries where the per capita income is well below the world average. Universities and their libraries must identify themselves with the realities of their wider environments. A university librarian, Adebimpe Ike, reflected on this matter in a recent paper:

African universities not only have to seek and impart truth for its intrinsic value, but because of the general state of under-development of their countries,
they also need urgently to seek and impart truth for its utilitarian value for the social and economic development of these countries and for the improvement of the standards of living of their communities. (76)

In the same paper the writer expressed the need for the university libraries to "give new dimensions to their services to their communities." (77)

Views such as the foregoing have come about following the examination and clarification of the role of university education in Africa. In September 1962, the first UNESCO Conference on the Development of Higher Education in Africa was held in Tananarive. In addition to their normal teaching and research functions, the Conference stressed the need for African universities to identify themselves with the social, cultural and economic development of the continent. This would be achieved by evolving over the years "a truly African pattern of higher learning dedicated to Africa and its people . . ."(78)

Ten years later, in 1972, a workshop of Association of African Universities was held in Accra, Ghana, largely to redefine and articulate the role of higher education in Africa. The Workshop participants in part reviewed the priorities and overall university development in the continent. It stated, in part:

... the emergent African university must, henceforth, be much more than institution for teaching, research and dissemination of higher learning. It must be accountable to and serve the vast majority of the people who live in rural areas. The African university must be committed to active participation in social transformation, economic modernization and training the total human resources of the Nation, not just of a small elite. (79)

In response to these declarations, universities in Nigeria have broadened their programmes to accommodate the needs and aspirations of various communities. Specifically, various programmes and institutes are formed, for example, predegree programmes, institutes of education including adult education, African and Nigerian Studies, rural agriculture and so on.
**FIGURE 3**

**SERVICES OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES**

**LIBRARIAN**

(General administration, planning, committee work, overall purchase policy, relation of library to university and library matters outside the university)

**DEPUTY LIBRARIAN**

(Acting for Librarian when necessary; general supervision of library departments and coordination within the library; staff matters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty library (eg. medicine)</th>
<th>Acquisitions department (orders and accounts, exchanges and gifts)</th>
<th>Reading room services, (borrowers' records; interlibrary loans; supervision of microphotocopying; preparation of binding)</th>
<th>Special collections, if any, (rare books and manuscripts)</th>
<th>Faculty library (eg. Social sciences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(reference and reading room services; suggestions for purchase; bibliographic checking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty library (eg. science)</td>
<td>Cataloguing department (including classifying)</td>
<td>Reference services (including instruction to readers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty library (eg. applied science)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implication of this situation is that university libraries have to view their functions and services from the wider perspectives of the information needs in their environments. If the society demands that universities carry out these functions, the library must devote its resources to supporting them. Sam Ifidon had explored this theme and represented the functions of university libraries in Nigeria in form of concentric circles. (80) A close look at the diagram shows that in addition to the conventional functions and services outlined above, the Nigerian university library will also reflect the following in its information resources:

Sub-degree level materials for non-degree diploma, certificate and associateship programmes of the universities. In the metropolitan universities, such programmes are usually covered at polytechnics and colleges.

Inter-disciplinary materials for social and economic modernization. Such resources are extensively used by research units in economic, cultural and other matters.

The functions and services of university libraries have obvious implications for branch libraries. Although branch libraries exist as special units their functions and services are sometimes reflections of practices at the main library. In some cases, the main library performs some functions centrally for branch libraries. In others branch libraries stay on their own and replicate, at varying levels, the functions and services of the main library.

Also the issue of special responsibilities brought about by active involvement of the universities in the development of the society raises some questions. Should library and information resources for such programmes form part of the main library? Or are they organized as separate resources in the vicinity of primary users of such materials? Solutions vary from one university to the other and sometimes depend on the prevailing situation and the perceptions of the individual or authority who takes the decision.
2.5.4 The Book Stock

The book size is often an important yardstick for assessing the extent to which a university library fulfils the information needs of its users. Universities provide varying degrees of academic programmes. These programmes require at least basic information materials (books, periodicals, microforms, etc) to support them. Christian C. Aguolu noted:

While the size of the university library collection alone may not be an index of its quality and relevance, there is a relationship between the size of a library collection and its adequacy. A library must own a minimum number of books, and journals in certain subjects to be able to satisfy the basic information needs of students and faculty in those subjects. (81)

Table 3 gives insight into the book stock, periodical holdings and bona fide users of the six university libraries during the 1981-82 academic year. The table shows that Ibadan University Library, the oldest, had the highest number of books. Incidentally, the University of Nigeria Library, Nsukka, which was the next to be established had the next highest number of books. However, there were considerable variations in the quantity of books held by the three university libraries founded in 1962. Benin, the youngest, had the lowest number of books. The total number of books in the six university libraries was 1,507,000 volumes. The mean figure was 251,166.7 volumes.

The column for periodical holdings shows that the University of Ibadan Library with 5,894 current periodical titles, had the highest number. This time the University of Ife Library with 4,592 current titles came next after Ibadan. Again, Benin University Library with 2,000 titles had the lowest number.

The last two columns of the table show the number of books in the university libraries per FTE student and the teaching staff.

A useful knowledge of the extent of the adequacy of the book stock of the university libraries will better be gained by relating them to a tested yardstick for determining collection
### TABLE 3

**USERS AND SIZE OF SIX NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, 1981-82**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY LIBRARY</th>
<th>YEAR ESTABLISHED</th>
<th>STUDENT ENROLMENT *</th>
<th>TEACHING STAFF *</th>
<th>BOOK STOCK IN VOLUMES*</th>
<th>PERIODICAL TITLES*</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BOOKS PER STUDENT USER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BOOKS PER TEACHING STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBADAN</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>9,416</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>10,281</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>362.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N.N. (a)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>10,915</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>11,327</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>410.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.U. (b)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,783</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>14,806</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>285.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFE</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>255.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGOS</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>11,452</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>12,198</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>347.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENIN</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>226.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,213</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>62,974</td>
<td>1,507,000</td>
<td><strong>23,659</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,868.8</td>
<td>752.2</td>
<td>10,495.7</td>
<td>251,166.7</td>
<td>3,943.2</td>
<td>319.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) University of Nigeria, Nsukka

(b) Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

* Sources: Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, 1983

World of Learning, 1982-83
size. Section 2.5.2 above has discussed the nature of standards. In the specific area of standards of information resources for academic libraries, several approaches are in use or proposed. George Bonn made a very helpful examination of the various techniques of evaluation. These include compiling and comparing statistics on library holdings against standard, authoritative lists, catalogues and bibliographies; obtaining opinions of the regular users of the collections, examining the collections directly on the shelves, and applying standards for library service recommended by various professional library bodies or associations. (82)

It is perhaps out of place to relate the book stock of Nigerian university libraries with standards developed for American university libraries as rendered by Downs and Heussman. (83) The total book stock of 1,507,000 volumes held by the six university libraries in Nigeria in the 1981-82 academic session bears no relationship to 7,920,387 books held in one single United States university library in 1968. In the circumstance, there is no basis for comparing the book holdings of individual Nigerian university libraries with those of the U.S. university libraries.

A somewhat similar observation can be made with reference to British trends. The SCONUL Sub-committee on Standards in University Libraries had given expert consideration on this matter. With considerable regard to the varying circumstances of universities (financial, student enrolment, etc), the Sub-committee arrived at a model library of 500,000 volumes and 3,000 current periodical titles in a university with 3,000 undergraduate students, 1,000 research students and 500 teaching staff. (84) The book stock and student enrolment in the Nigerian university libraries (Table 3) show that Nigerian trends cannot be compared with the guidelines for British university libraries. For instance, while the mean student enrolment in the six universities was 10,495.7, the mean book stock of their libraries was 251,166.7 volumes.
A helpful approach is perhaps to apply the formula developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) of American Library Association published in December 1974. (85) The ACRL formula was designed for assessing the adequacy of libraries in colleges with programmes at the bachelors and masters degree levels, and can be applied to libraries in universities which grant fewer than ten doctoral degrees a year. In this sense, it does not exactly apply to Nigerian universities since they are all at a higher level than colleges. With the exception of the University of Benin, the five others contained in Table 3 have wide-ranging postgraduate programmes and usually grant more than ten doctorate degrees in a year. Nevertheless they are still far below the size of universities described by Downs and Heussman. (86) Application of the ACRL formula will therefore help to illustrate trends. The treatment here is essentially for comparative purposes.

Ray L. Carpenter has demonstrated the application of Formula A of the ACRL standards in assessing a library collection. (87) A basic collection of 85,000 volumes is assumed. To this would be added 100 volumes per teaching staff member, 15 volumes per FTE student and 350 volumes for each field at undergraduate level. The application of this model to the book stock of six Nigerian university libraries is contained in Table 4.

The computed totals in the table show that the book stock of two university libraries were reasonably adequate in terms of the criteria employed in the analysis. These are the Ibadan University Library and the University of Nigeria Library, Nsukka. The book stock of the other four university libraries were below the minimum requirement for their various academic programmes. The situation at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria with 275,000 volumes seems to be the most critical one: in terms of the ACRL Standards, the University Library would require a basic stock of 357,090 volumes.
# TABLE 4

**BOOK STOCK OF SIX NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES IN TERMS OF ACRL STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>IBADAN</th>
<th>U.N.N.(a)</th>
<th>A.B.U. (b)</th>
<th>IFE</th>
<th>LAGOS</th>
<th>BENIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic collection of 85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE students at 15 vols. each</td>
<td>10,281 x 15 = 154,215</td>
<td>11,327 x 15 = 169,905</td>
<td>14,806 x 15 = 222,090</td>
<td>10,362 x 15 = 155,430</td>
<td>12,198 x 15 = 182,970</td>
<td>4,000 x 15 = 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching staff members at 100 vols. each</td>
<td>975 x 100 = 97,500</td>
<td>763 x 100 = 76,300</td>
<td>964 x 100 = 96,400</td>
<td>847 x 100 = 84,700</td>
<td>720 x 100 = 72,000</td>
<td>442 x 100 = 44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate major and minor fields at 350 vols. each</td>
<td>101 x 350 = 35,350</td>
<td>91 x 350 = 31,850</td>
<td>86 x 350 = 30,100</td>
<td>103 x 350 = 36,050</td>
<td>85 x 350 = 29,750</td>
<td>53 x 350 = 18,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume no other special or graduate field</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295,565</td>
<td>286,555</td>
<td>357,090</td>
<td>284,680</td>
<td>293,220</td>
<td>131,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>IBADAN</td>
<td>U.N.N. (a)</td>
<td>A.B.U. (b)</td>
<td>IFE</td>
<td>LAGOS</td>
<td>BENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295,565</td>
<td>286,555</td>
<td>357,090</td>
<td>284,680</td>
<td>293,220</td>
<td>131,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare with book stock, 1981-82</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>313,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) University of Nigeria, Nsukka
(b) Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
2.5.5 Special Collections

While the size of the book stock gives indication of the character of a university library, it is not a sufficient element for an understanding of the importance of different libraries. The nature of special and research materials held is often an important factor that distinguishes one university library from the other. Indeed, some university libraries are famous because of the rich materials they possess in one area or the other. Sometimes these materials are highly rated not in terms of their quantity but in terms of their uniqueness and quality.

In this matter, Ibadan University Library enjoys a pride of place in the Nigerian academic scene. Margaret Amosu studied the resources of the library and wrote:

The Library of the University of Ibadan is the Nigerian equivalent of the Bodleian or the Cambridge University Library, even though it is several centuries younger. It is the oldest in Nigeria . . . it is the leading, most prestigious library of the country, and is widely known and highly thought of outside it. (88)

Dr. F.W. Ratcliffe, after his study tour of six university libraries in Nigeria, was also firm in recognizing the special status of Ibadan University Library. According to him, "The quality which this library represents took some twenty-five years to achieve and it can compare with any institution of comparable age in Britain or anywhere else despite huge initial difficulties. It has grown gradually in response to Ibadan's special needs and in many ways is a model library of its kind." (89)

This stature which Ibadan University Library enjoys is largely due to the provision of Africana materials early in its life:

The collection of Africana materials received attention very early and the library can rightly claim to be a pioneer in this field. This was at a time when outsiders showed little or no interest in things African, and the rush to start African studies programmes in learned
Institutions abroad had not yet begun. The Africana collection was designed as the research centre of the Library. It was to include everything Nigerian, and where possible, everything significant that relates to West Africa and to other parts of Africa. (90)

In addition to the normal library purchase, the building of the strong Africana collection was vigorously pursued from other angles. There were notable unique materials that were received as gifts. Prominent among these include: (i) Dr. Henry Carr private collection of 18,000 volumes which reflected the donor's activities as an educator, lawyer, churchman and civil servant; (ii) Herbert Macaulay library, rich in manuscripts, government and business documents, private papers, maps and plans; (iii) Edward Reginald Jerrim collection, containing typescripts, very unique newspaper cuttings and photographs built up from 1921 to 1939 when the collector was Associate Editor of West Africa magazine. A moving account of how this collection was retrieved from the village of Hindon, Wiltshire and sent to Ibadan was given by Margaret Pretty. (91)

Also, the Nigerian Publications Ordinance of 1950 provided added impetus to Africana collection at Ibadan. The law stipulated that two copies of every material published in Nigeria must be deposited in the Ibadan University Library. When the law as amended in 1970 vested the legal deposit obligation to the National Library of Nigeria, provision was made for Ibadan University Library to continue to receive one copy of every published material in the country. In effect the Library of Ibadan University is perhaps the only library in the country with a complete holding of Nigeria's book output since 1950.

There is also the fact that early in its life the Ibadan University Library showed interest in acquisition of Arabic manuscripts, a major aspect of indigenous literature in pre-colonial period. This venture was greatly enhanced by the appointment, in 1953, of a deputy librarian who was also an Arabic scholar.
Apart from Africana materials, the library is also strong in materials in tropical agriculture and nuclear science. The collection of materials in nuclear science received stimulus following the original donation of 20,000 volumes of books and 75,600 microforms on nuclear science by the United States Atomic Energy Commission to encourage research in the field. Since the receipt of this notable donation, the University Library has continued to acquire materials in the field. (92)

Other university libraries in the country are also fairly rich in varying aspects of special materials. Some of these libraries have shown considerable initiative in developing resources in depth in specific dimensions of African Studies. As A.J.E. Dean observed, "In fact, every (university) library collects Africana with considerable enthusiasm." (93) The University of Lagos Library is particularly rich in materials on African law. It also "has a unique gramophone record collection designed to preserve all recordings of Nigerian musicians." (90) Further, it is a depository library for all publications of UNESCO, the World Health Organization (W.H.O) and Food and Agricultural Organization (F.A.O.)

The Ahmadu Bello University Library is quite rich in Arabic manuscripts and literature. It also has unique Africana materials, notably the C.L Holte African Collection. (94)

Ife University Library has special collection in tropical agriculture. It is also a depository library for all materials published in Oyo, Ondo and Ogun States of Nigeria, United Nations Organization (U.N.O), the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U.), the Economic Commission for Africa (E.C.A.) and W.H.O.

2.5.6 Reader Places (Seats) in the Libraries

Seating is usually an important element in planning the surface requirements of university libraries. In fact, in some situations it is used to argue for or against the existence of branch libraries.

Conceptually, seating provision depends on the librarian's notion of the purpose and function of the university library.
P. Havard-Williams believes that the overall provision for seating and book stacks depends on how the librarian perceives the use of his library. Two of the questions he put forward to the librarian in this context are pertinent:

Does it (library) appear to him (librarian) as a collection of volumes, manuscripts and microforms to be stored on the premises, with limited use in the building, or to be read elsewhere...? Or does he see the function of the library as an active participant in the teaching programme of the university at all levels providing reading accommodation for the consultation of books from the library's collections together with those possessed by the readers themselves. (95)

Different answers to the above questions will obviously lead to different approaches to the provision of seating in a university library. Indeed, it is possible for the librarian to avoid the two questions and steer a middle course. This again will have its effect on the number of seats provided in the library.

In determining the number of seats to be provided in university libraries in West Africa, Jonathan O. Dipeolu had suggested that the following three factors should be considered:

1. The nature of the university, whether residential or non-residential.
2. Reading room facilities available elsewhere.
3. The population of the academic community. (96)

Dipeolu also observed that university libraries in West Africa would require generous provision for seating since they are essentially residential. In Nigeria, it is not just that they are residential. The students' halls of residence are overcrowded. In many cases a room designed for one student is occupied by two. This means lack of facilities for private studies in the halls of residence. The on-the-spot observation made by Dr. F. W. Ratcliffe when he visited Nigerian
universities drives this point home in a subtle manner:

The universities aim to be self-sufficient as far as possible in terms of accommodation. This is ideal in meeting one need of over-riding importance, but of the residences I saw, few could hope to provide ideal conditions in terms of study. This throws a particular obligation on the libraries to make their facilities available and effective to as many as possible for the maximum time. (97)

Against this background, Dipeolu considered that seating for 20-35 per cent of total student enrolment would be adequate. Guidelines suggested by other librarians are more precise. Affia's recent contribution on this subject suggests that university libraries should provide seating for 25 per cent of student enrolment. (98) This figure has a wider application. John Dean had made a similar observation with respect to West African university libraries. (99) Seating for 25 per cent of student enrolment is also the standard recommended for university libraries in the United States. (100)

Table 5 relates the number of seats in the university libraries to student enrolment in the context of 25 per cent requirement. Data in the table shows that seating provisions in the main libraries presents a real problem when viewed from the perspectives of acceptable standards. True, the situation has not reached the dimensions observed at the University of Santo Tomos, Philippines, where students "must have an identification card if they want to join the queue of people waiting for an empty seat." (101) Nevertheless, the number of reader places in the university libraries means that seating is under considerable pressure.

The computed figures show that none of the libraries is able to provide seats for 25 percent of the university's student enrolment. However, some are better than others in this matter. In Ahmadu Bello University Library, Zaria, is 81.0 per cent of the basic requirement. This relatively high level of accommodation was achieved when the library recently moved into a new and spacious building. In the University of Benin, the student population is still
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IBADAN</th>
<th>U.N.N.</th>
<th>A.B.U.</th>
<th>IFE</th>
<th>LAGOS</th>
<th>BENIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolment</td>
<td>10,281</td>
<td>11,327</td>
<td>14,806</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>12,198</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Seating Requirement (25% of enrolment)</td>
<td>2,570.25</td>
<td>2,831.75</td>
<td>3,701.5</td>
<td>2,590.5</td>
<td>3,049.5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Seats Available</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Seats as % of Basic Requirement</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparatively small. This helps to account for the 78.0 per cent level it has achieved in this matter. The number of seats at Ibadan, Nsukka, Ife and Lagos is really low in relation to student enrolment. The number of seats at Ife University Library is not available.

The rather low level of seating accommodation in the university libraries helps to account for the fact that most of those libraries are embarking on extension of present accommodation or building new university libraries. At the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, a new library building that will probably be the largest of its kind in Nigeria is under construction. According to the university librarian, "It is envisaged that the building will house approximately 1,000,000 volumes, and provide accommodation for at least 4,000 readers."(102) The librarian, University of Benin, informed the investigator that plans are underway to extend the university library to accommodate up to 1,200 readers. At Ife University, a new library building which is nearing completion will seat about 900 additional readers.

2.5.7 Resource Sharing

Resource sharing or inter library cooperation is a phenomenon that is perhaps as old as libraries. It is a device evolved by libraries to improve their services to the library user by broadening the base of information availability. Like an individual who requires interaction with others as integral part of living libraries require cooperation at some level in order to fulfill the needs of users. The dictionary meaning of cooperation emphasizes the notion of working together in producing an effect. Therefore, when viewed in general terms, cooperation involves joint action of two or more entities to achieve the desired goal.

In his paper, "Library cooperation: the ideal and the reality," Michael M. Reynolds elaborated on what are involved in resource sharing:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia*</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>247,000</td>
<td>264,000</td>
<td>123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>364,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>546,000</td>
<td>568,000</td>
<td>684,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not including China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Democratic Republic of Vietnam

Cooperation is both a process and a means through which two or more separate entities accommodate to each other to approach a mutually satisfactory condition. As a process, it is an ongoing activity involving interactions; as a means it is intended to produce an outcome or product. Further, cooperation is a voluntary association in which each of the participants retains the right to determine the extent of its accommodation, the appropriateness of the accommodation of those involved, and the option to dissociate from the collective without direct penalty. (103)

In recent times inter library cooperation is receiving increasing attention from librarians, information scientists and other interested parties. The reasons are not far to see.

Since the end of the World War II, there has been unprecedented growth in the volume of published materials. In part, this situation has come about as a result of growth in universities and research institutes with emphasis on expansion of knowledge and publication of research activities. The rather exponential growth in the world production of books is illustrated in Table 6. In aggregate terms, the world's book production was 285,000 in 1955, 450,000 in 1965 and 684,000 in 1979.

The obvious implication of this trend is that no library can attempt to be self-sufficient in meeting the information needs of its users. The experience in a very big university library illustrates this. Quoting the librarian, Harvard University, De Gennaro wrote:

Research interests have become so broad and the quality of printed material useful to research has increased so greatly that the Harvard Library today, with its 7,000,000 volumes, is more frequently reminded of its inadequacies than it was 60 years ago when it had only 1,000,000. It is less nearly adequate now than it was then to meet all the demands of Harvard professors and students. (104)

At the same time that information is growing at an exponential scale, the cost of published materials is on the increase. This phenomenon can be illustrated with trends in Great Britain.
Since 1974, the Centre for Library and Information Management (CLAIM), Department of Library and Information Studies, Loughborough University, has been carrying out studies and publishing the prices of current British academic books. The latest in the series of these reports contains a summary of the trends from 1974 to 1982 under broad subject headings.

### TABLE 6A

**AVERAGE PRICES OF BRITISH ACADEMIC BOOKS, 1974-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Price £.d.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6A presents the annual average costs of British academic books during this period. The table shows that in general there has been a steady increase in the average prices of British academic books since 1974. The rising prices have clear implications for university libraries in Nigeria since over 90 percent of information materials are imported and most of these are from Britain.

When the pattern of book prices is viewed in the context of increasing volume of published materials, the ability of any library to acquire adequate information materials for its users is really slim.

At the same time that the need for cooperation is increasing, advances in technology is giving great impetus to resource sharing activities. Application of relevant facets of the new technology for communications, electronic files, data handling, mechanical translation, etc has created conditions for rapid information transmission in any form to a requesting user in a distant location. This dimension has in fact created network
of libraries. Libraries are able to give as well as have access to other information resources that are part of the system for the benefit of users.

In Nigeria the earliest form of resource sharing was interlibrary lending. This can be traced to the emergence of academic libraries in the second half of the present century. At the initial stage, this development took the form of private arrangements contracted by two libraries to improve their resources through reciprocal interlending. This was on the basis of personal contacts and no formal agreements were involved. For instance, there had been this form of interlending of information materials between the University College Library, Ibadan and the Central Medical Library in Lagos.

From the outset this approach to interlibrary lending based on personal contact was fraught with problems. As it developed in different parts of the country these problems became considerably accentuated. Oyeniyi Osundina described the scene as follows:

--- time and effort were wasted either because the requesting library did not know where to contact, or because the lending library did not have the material requested, or worse still, if it had it, it might not be favourably disposed to lend it . . . The record of transactions between 1968 and 1973 showed that since there was no effort to boost interlibrary dependence, interlibrary lending transactions diminished faster than they had grown in the previous years. (105)

This was the state of affairs when the National Library of Nigeria stepped into the matter with considerable initiative and plan of action. K.W. Humphreys in his paper "The principles of relationship between national and university library collections as a basis for a network" gave sound theoretical insight into the role of a national library in promoting and coordinating cooperation involving university libraries. He also reported that Nigeria is among ten countries in which "their national library was the focal point for promoting and maintaining nationwide resource sharing networks," specifically with university libraries. (106) There is no doubt that the
activities of the National Library of Nigeria in this regard receive considerable impetus from IFLA'S Universal Availability of Publications (UAP) programme.

The National Library of Nigeria's effort was first focussed on inter library lending. Its overriding concern was to evolve arrangements that would have adequate guarantees for participating libraries of certainty and effectiveness. In April 1974, it sponsored a workshop on inter library lending at the University of Ife, Ile-Ife. Five papers including a model for inter lending transactions in Nigeria formed the basis of discussion and reflection at the Workshop. (107) The Workshop reached consensus on five issues which were subsequently adapted by the National Library of Nigeria as a policy for implementation. The five points are as follows:

(a) the establishment of a National Bibliographic and Lending Centre (N.B.L.C.) at the National Library;
(b) the creation of inter library loans unit in participating libraries;
(c) the addition of a network of courier service which would supplement the postal system;
(d) the production of a national union catalogue of books and periodicals and the inclusion of ISBN on all cards sent to the N.U.C.pool; and
(e) the N.B.L.C. should serve as the control point in all matters relating to the programme and take any actions necessary for the implementation of the programme. (108)

The National Library had initiated actions along the lines outlined above. It appointed an Advisory Committee on Inter-library Lending to monitor and appraise inter lending activities. The National Library also reactivated the National Union Catalogue which was started in 1964. Inter library loan forms modelled on the pattern recommended by UNESCO were also produced and sold to libraries at a cost of N 5.00 (approximately £4.00) for a pack of fifty. The comprehensive procedure for inter library lending in Nigeria, including arrangement for proper documentation of transactions, is contained in a booklet issued by the National Library. (109)
In May 1980, the National Library took another initiative and organized a workshop on cooperative acquisition for libraries in Nigeria. (110) The workshop examined various ramifications of cooperative acquisition and formulated a plan for action. The emphasis was on comprehensive acquisition of Nigerian and African materials, although other areas outside Africa were included in the arrangement. Libraries in the cooperative arrangement were grouped into zones to achieve this. S.B. Aje had in fact explained the plan:

"It is intended to cover the African continent comprehensively, as this, ironically is a point of palpable weakness in library holdings. For Nigeriana it is proposed that each state library should set up a machinery for the collection of and preservation of all government and institutional publications emanating from its state. In this connection it devolves on the National Library of Nigeria to collect all Federal Government publications... Broadly speaking other subject areas outside Africana, which constitute the second block will be shared between the state (public) libraries and other major (academic and special) libraries. (111)"

University libraries in Nigeria have on their own worked out arrangements for resource sharing. There is, however, no conflict between these and the efforts of the National Library of Nigeria. As shown above (2.5.2) formulation of resource sharing policies is one of the stated objectives of the Committee of University Librarians of Nigerian Universities. Specifically the Committee had worked out arrangements for cooperative acquisition of African government documents and cooperative inter library lending based on courier service.

The rationale for the agreement on cooperative acquisition was to ensure that the government publications of all African countries are available in one university library or the other in the country. Under the arrangement, each of the six older university libraries would acquire comprehensively the government publications of specific African countries. Table 7 shows the details of this agreement.

The cooperative acquisition scheme also cover materials published by intra-continental organizations such as Organization
of African Unity (O.A.U.), Economic Commission for Africa (E.C.A.), and the Economic Community of West African States (E.C.O.W.A.S.). Under the arrangement, each university library is to collect the publications of at least one of these. Also each university can acquire publications of international, commercial, study, research or training centres. This is to enable each library meet the information needs of its parent university.

In this connection, it is worthwhile to mention the cooperative agreement between the University of Lagos Library and the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs Library for their joint acquisition of British Parliamentary Papers. (112)

In Nigeria considerable attention is given to courier service in any consideration for inter library lending. This has come about largely as a result of the rather endemic communications and transportation problems in the country. According to J.K. Esezobor, "a courier service can be defined as service communication by the use of vans and/or messengers. And when considered as network it presupposes a structured programme between parties located in a geographic area."(113)

The courier service was introduced in Nigeria by Benin University Library in 1971. The objective was to enable the young university library expose itself to the relatively rich information resources at Ibadan, principally the Ibadan University Library and Bookshop. It was later extended to cover Ile-Ife and sometimes Lagos as well. This Benin experiment was essentially successful:

The most obvious advantage is speed. The Benin (courier) system to Ibadan through Ile-Ife is a weekly service yet it is faster than the postal service between the two towns . . . The academic worth of the loan service is invaluable. Considering our (Benin University Library) newness at the time, the service gave us access to the main book resource centre in the country (i.e. Ibadan) . . . (114)

Partly as a result of the success made of this arrangement at Benin, several researchers have focussed attention on the
TABLE 7

COOPERATIVE ACQUISITION OF AFRICAN GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY LIBRARY</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS IN ENGLISH</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS IN FRENCH</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBADAN</td>
<td>South Africa Swaziland</td>
<td>Central African Republic Guinea Ruanda</td>
<td>Mali (Arabic/ English) U.A.R. (Egyptian/ Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N.N.</td>
<td>Ghana Somalia (Italian)</td>
<td>Republic of Benin Mauritania Upper Volta</td>
<td>Algeria Liberation Movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.U.</td>
<td>Lesotho Tanzania Botswana</td>
<td>Madagascar Morocco</td>
<td>Sudan (Arabic/ English) Liberation Movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFE</td>
<td>Gambia Malawi</td>
<td>Chad Ivory Coast Senegal</td>
<td>Equitorial Guinea (Spanish) Angola Guinea Bissau Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGOS</td>
<td>Mauritius Sierra-Leone Uganda</td>
<td>Congo Brazzaville (Zaire) Congo Kinshasa Togo</td>
<td>Ethiopia (Amharic/ English) Tunisia (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENIN</td>
<td>Kenya Liberia Zambia</td>
<td>Cameroon Gabon Niger</td>
<td>Libya (Arabic/ English)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

matter and offered proposals for the formation of country-wide courier service. Nat. M. Adeyemi in his doctoral work on "Cooperation among libraries in Nigeria: a pilot study." had preferred the courier service to the use of telephone and mail systems in inter lending arrangements in the country. (115) In his own work, Christian C. Aguolu offered two models of a national courier service network. (116) Doris O. Bozimo's doctoral work focussed specifically on cooperation among university libraries in Nigeria. (117)

The Committee of University Librarians of Nigerian Universities considered the matter and produced an arrangement for inter library lending based on courier service. The plan linked the various universities that were in existence in 1979 as follows:

Lagos - Ibadan - Ilorin - Zaria

Zaria - Kano - Maiduguri - Jos - Sokoto

Ibadan - Ife - Benin - Port Harcourt - Calabar - Enugu - Nsukka

Zaria and Ibadan were to serve as switching points.

Unfortunately, the foregoing imaginative plans for resource sharing in Nigeria have not yet yielded commensurate results. Indeed, much of the plans had remained on paper. In July 1983, O.G. Tamuno, Deputy Librarian, University of Ibadan, reviewed cooperative arrangements among university libraries in Nigeria. On the present stage of the scheme for cooperative acquisition of African government materials and the nation-wide courier service, she wrote:

Financial considerations have prevented many institutions from carrying out their responsibilities under the cooperative acquisitions programme. The courier service, first proposed during the 1977/78 academic year . . . was abandoned after three years of planning and discussion because most member libraries were unable to provide funds for the project and maintenance. (118)

Writing from the standpoint of the efforts of the National Library of Nigeria to evolve an inter library lending system
for the country, Oyeniyi Osundina lamented that "the whole idea had died." According to him, much of the blame for this unsavory situation should go to the chief executives of libraries in Nigeria. "The performance of Nigerian libraries and their attitude to the problem of interdependence leave much to be desired." (119)

To fully grasp the reasons for the difficulty in implementing the rather robust plans, it is necessary to view the resource sharing arrangements from the broader angle of infrastructural, transportation, communications, professional commitments of librarians and other problems of the society. P.Havard-Williams in his paper on "The wider implications of resource sharing" discussed seven such problems from the point of view of developing countries. (120) The reality of these problems in Nigeria can be illustrated with communication difficulties and the problem of producing a national union catalogue.

There is perhaps no better way of relating the transportation and communication situation than the following experience of a British university librarian:

The difficulties of communication unfortunately extend to many other extra - University areas beyond language, which British Librarians take simply for granted. Just how much the telephone, parcel and letter post, telex, speed of transport and the like are an essential ingredient in our (British) library service is only fully appreciated when you are deprived of them. I went to Nigeria hoping among other things to expedite our acquisition of Nigerian materials, expecting for example to plug once and for all the gaps in delivery of Nigerian Government publications. I discovered in fact that Nigerian University Library experience in this respect was hardly different from ours. (121)

The above account is largely collaborated by another observation written from a different angle. In an information brief on business transactions in Nigeria, Erica Andersen explained "Nigerian post is too slow for business purposes..." and advised visiting businessmen to make use of a number of commercial courier services operating in the country. (122)
The transportation and communication impediments mean that any plans for resource sharing must incorporate extra dimensions that would normally be part of public utilities in the industrialized countries. Such provisions invariably make the resource sharing schemes very involving. In view of the size of Nigeria, these difficulties are remarkably heightened as more libraries join the cooperation arrangements.

Inter library lending presupposes an accurate knowledge of the information resources of libraries in the cooperative scheme. The union catalogue is the normal device for achieving this goal. Silvere Willemin in his *Technique of union catalogues: a practical guide* had explained the bibliographical functions of a union catalogue:

The main function of the union catalogue is unquestionably to locate publications in order to facilitate access to books. It is a tool for the rationalization of interlibrary loans.

The second function derives from the foregoing and is to transform the union catalogue into the nucleus of a bibliographical research centre by reason of the identification work required for the sound operation of both inter-library and international loans.

Thirdly, the bibliographical centre which is essential to the sound operation of the union catalogue tends ultimately to become also a bibliographical information service carrying out a variety of tasks. (123)

The potential of a national union catalogue has never been in doubt in Nigeria. As already shown, the National Library has been collecting cards reflecting the information holdings of participating libraries since 1964. The plan has been to issue them in a book form. The serials union list was recently published as *National union list of serials* (N.U.L.O.S.), reflecting the serial holdings of fifty-three libraries. This publication has given considerable fillip to inter library borrowing in the country.

However, the problem of issuing a union catalogue of books remains unresolved. There are well over one million items
reflected in the union catalogue housed in the National Library of Nigeria. Apart from the enormous space occupied by the catalogue cabinets, there are difficulties in manually operating, processing and filing incoming cards from libraries involved in the scheme. Some of these are highlighted in a recent letter from the National Library to Mrs. Elemide:

... We receive thousands of catalogue cards every week from 53 libraries participating in the NUC project. This involves employing an army of filing clerks, searchers, and librarians to edit the cards being sorted daily. It is a time consuming exercise and very tiresome for those employed to do such a work. As a result staff are reluctant to stay in the unit and there is always a high turnover of staff in that unit. (124)

There are of course plans to computerize the national union catalogue and have the bibliographic information in a data bank.

As it is at the moment, university libraries in the country have once again resorted to direct visits to other university libraries they presume would fulfil their specific information needs. The newer universities turn to the older ones. Thus the University of Jos often sends vans to Ahmadu Bello University Library, Zaria to pick up information materials. Ilorin University Library directs its requests to Ibadan University Library. Sometimes, requests are rooted straight to the British Library Lending Division at Boston Spa, Wetherby.

Summary

Certain general observations emerge from the foregoing discussion of elements of university libraries.

The question of fulfilling the information needs of universities has been the time-honoured concern of university libraries. In a bid to do this, university libraries are continually appraising and evolving helpful approaches to the organization of their resources and services.

The conventional organizational structure of university libraries
reflects the various functions performed in them. However, in some cases, the structure is based on subject or form of information material. There is considerable relationship between the factors in the existence of branch libraries and those in the main library administrative structure. Some elements that lead to the formation or adoption of one administrative pattern or the other can also lead to the establishment of branch libraries. It is also shown that the relationship between the main library and branch libraries in a university can to a large extent be explained in terms of centralization and decentralization.

Examination of functions of university libraries reveals that university libraries in Nigeria are increasingly obliged to identify themselves with the wider needs of the community. The situation requires that in addition to the usual functions of university libraries, they must respond to the wider information needs for national development. At the same time, this raises the question of where such information materials should be organized — in the main library or in close vicinity of their primary users.

The information holdings of the university libraries vary considerably in size and quality. While in some cases they are marginally adequate in numerical terms, in many cases the indication is that they hardly measure up to the basic level required for the academic programmes of the universities.

Aspects of deficiencies in the information holdings of university libraries are normally remedied by judicious interlibrary borrowing where there are effective resource sharing arrangements. Successive attention given to this matter by the National Library of Nigeria, the university libraries and researchers have produced imaginative proposals, robust plans and conceptual models. However, implementation of these impressive designs has never proved effective largely on account of the rather intractable communication, transportation and other infrastructural problems in the country. In different
situations, application of these elements have in fact enabled libraries to operate as library and information networks for the purposes of giving and receiving required information.

The overall situation lends considerable support to the viewpoint that the university libraries have an obligation to make the information resources in the universities effectively accessible for the maximum time. Viewed from this angle, branch libraries in the universities should be seen as positive components of library and information resources of the universities. In other words, they are a part of "whole". And where any part is isolated, neglected or detached the "whole" can no longer be complete. Various dimensions of this theme are developed and articulated in this work.
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CHAPTER THREE

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

3.1 Introduction

Branch libraries or departmental libraries as one often finds in the literature is a subject that has generated considerable investigation. Nor would there be an end to interest of librarians and researchers in this matter. As Metcalf observed in his rather prophetic dictum:

As long as there are large universities with large libraries, the question of centralization or decentralization will be a live topic for discussion; and, if I am not mistaken, the question will never be settled permanently one way or the other. (1)

Arthur T. Hamlin accepts this viewpoint and adds that the problem is not confined to any one country. According to him, "It is world-wide except as one point of view gains clear ascendancy over the other for a period . . . like poverty, the controversy will apparently be always with us." (2) This chapter is intended to provide an overview of previous studies and research on the subject of branch libraries in universities.

3.2 Sources and Search Terms

A systemic search of possible sources was conducted for relevant information materials. Naturally perhaps, the first port of call was the indexing and abstracting services in library and information studies. Further, sources on broad aspects of education and management were searched.

The source that yielded the highest number of relevant citations was the Library Literature. (3) Substantial materials were also identified through the Library and Information Science Abstracts (4) and Dissertation Abstracts International. (5) Further, references in a good number of periodical articles and bibliographies at the end of theses on related subjects were valuable sources of information.
The search was conducted manually. The manual approach, though time-consuming was nevertheless very helpful because it permitted scanning adjacent and sometimes very useful citations.

During the search some of the signal terms (key words) employed in order of productivity were the following: departmental libraries, branch libraries, divisional libraries, special libraries, special collections, university libraries, college libraries and quasi-departmental libraries. The exact terms were often dependent on the source used.

For ease of treatment and discussion, the rest of this chapter is rendered in sections as follows: origins of branch libraries, location of branch libraries, administration of branch libraries, information holdings, functions and services of branch libraries.

3.3 Origins

Lawrence Thompson provided a sound historical background to the whole issue of branch libraries. He employed the use of quotations from the literature of library studies to elucidate the meaning of different libraries that are categorized as departmental libraries: seminar libraries, collegiate libraries, and laboratory collections. He then devoted considerable space to what he termed "the chain of cause and effect." (7) that gave rise to the development of branch libraries. According to him, in the nineteenth century, it was an accepted norm to have branch libraries as part of the professional schools of law, medicine and theology. Thompson also found answer to the spread of branch libraries in German universities. This was in consequence of the exigencies of the seminar mode of higher education in Germany. In his recent paper, Sumith Shohan traced the beginnings of the seminar library to an eighteenth century German librarian at Gottingen, Christian Heyne, who gave a course in Latin poetry. (8)

K.W. Humphreys amplified the circumstances that led to the spread of such libraries:
The problem arose in Germany in the nineteenth century when the doctorate became a necessary qualification for an academic post. Professors began to teach postgraduates in a variety of subjects which were not covered in the university library collections. They therefore found it necessary to amass personal libraries and, as these were inadequate to initiate separate institute, faculty and departmental libraries without regard to the material available in the central library. (9)

The influence of seminar method of learning on branch libraries in Germany has had salutary effects on similar establishments in England, the United States and elsewhere. As explained by Arthur T. Hamlin, "The departmental libraries commonly found in American universities are very similar to the seminar or institute libraries which developed in German universities in the early nineteenth century. They are also found in many French, Italian, English, and other European universities in variant forms and under variations of administrative control." (10)

J. Hubert Morgan traced the beginnings of departmental libraries in English universities to the custodian posture adopted by earlier university librarians to the information needs of students. (11) According to him the unreasonable jealousy with which older librarians guarded their books caused instructors to begin to keep them in their offices and lend them privately to students. Gradually such collections grew until it was necessary to organize and recognize them as true branch libraries. The Parry Report's account of the same phenomenon will seem to make Morgan's observation an over simplification of a complex problem. Rather than a straightforward answer to the question of origins, the Report attributed the development of branch libraries in British universities to "varying circumstances." (12) These exigencies which include distance of the academic unit to the main library, benefaction and facilities in a new building are amply illustrated in the account of the origins of the libraries of the University of London. (13)

The recent case study of the historical development of branch libraries at the University of Edinburgh illustrates the matter
of distance as a reason for founding branch libraries. According to Margaret D. Bell:

From mid-nineteenth century onwards, pressure on space in the Old College led to the dispersal of some Faculties and Departments to outlying sites - a process which has continued until the present day. (14)

Inevitably, she observed, this situation gave rise to the need for departmental libraries to be readily available for teaching staff and students in those departments which had moved from the vicinity of the library in its original site in Old College.

In his work, D.W. Butcher showed the influence of donations and bequest of information materials or money in founding many of the departmental libraries (as distinct from college libraries) at Cambridge University. (15) Other conditions can lead to dispersed library situation. Wilfred Ashworth has predicted that the controversial self-renewing principle of the Atkinson Report can unwittingly lead to some sort of dispersed library units. According to him:

... there is growing evidence that the stability of many university libraries is under threat. Their collections continue to grow but, supported by the Atkinson Report, the University Grants Committee and the Government have indicated that money for large-scale expansion of buildings will not be forthcoming. The self-renewing principle has been offered as one possible solution in this predicament. If university librarians and senates continue to resist this particular solution then inevitably make shift accommodation will have to be found most probably in a multiplicity of sites not determined by user demands but by force majeure. (16)

In his paper, Louis T. Ibbotson linked the seminar method of instruction and the inability of university libraries to adapt to changing academic demands with the development of branch libraries in the United States universities:

And so, when the seminar method of instruction, introduced from Germany and first practised here (United States) at the University of Michigan in 1871, was recognized as the most effective mode of
teaching and widely adopted... books became imperative. The university library without adequate funds to buy books, or buildings to house them if bought, possibly not blessed with an administrator with sufficient vision and initiative to see trend and grasp the opportunity, was found wanting. The departmental library was the solution. (17)

Ibbotson's observation was to a large extent collaborated by the work of Margaret Parry. According to her, "A combination of an unavailable and/or inadequate collections in the main body of the library, and an imitation of the seminar libraries in Germany, allowed for the development of departmental libraries before a name was given to the phenomenon." (18) Shunith Shohan noted that the seminar library was first introduced in the United States in 1869 by Charles Kendall Adam at the University of Michigan for his English constitutional history class. (19)

At Boston University, physical decentralization of libraries developed as a result of geographical dispersal of the component schools and colleges of the University. "These fourteen libraries mostly grew up independently of one another, because the schools to which they belonged were isolated, scattered all over Boston, even with one in Cambridge." (20) Similarly, according to Arthur T. Hamlin, "... at Columbia (University) both the School of Law (founded in 1858) and the School of Mines (founded in 1864) were at locations remote from the central 'college' and they soon established libraries which were, for a time, superior in many ways to the ineffective central library." (21)

Benefaction and crowded library buildings were also early factors that favoured the growth of departmental libraries in the United States. (22) However, the factor of crowded library buildings was considerably reduced from the 1920's when many a U.S. library was provided with a suitable building. In a recent case study of the quasi-departmental libraries at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus, David C. Genaway established that the major factors in the origin of
those libraries were receipt of gifts and deliberate planning. (23)

There were situations where the interdisciplinary nature of research institutes compelled them to establish branch libraries. Richard W. Dougherty's account of the experiences and frustrations of the Behavioral Science Institute of the University of Colorado illustrates this phenomenon. According to him:

Researchers of this Institute require materials now housed in four libraries: (i) economic systems, located in the business library, (ii) computer science located in the maths/physics library, (iii) psychology located in the science library, and (iv) materials relating to anthropology which are now housed in the main library. (24)

Dougherty further revealed that this material dispersion was viewed with considerable concern by researchers of the Institute. In consequence, they planned and established their own branch library.

Sometimes, form of material can be a major consideration in establishing separate library units in a university. The work of J. Michael Bruno shows that Harvard's Houghton Library, Yale's Beinecke Library and the Lilly Library at Indiana University were based on form of material such as rare books, manuscripts, government documents, map collections and so on. He explained further:

The above is merely illustrative of the early tendency to decentralize library holdings by form of material. The prime advantage of housing such materials in separate quarters lies in the specialized service offered scholars who use these collections. Service is more personalized and tailored to individual need. Another advantage is that collections consisting of rare books and manuscript material that are housed separately will attract more donors. There are three obvious disadvantages: (i) operational problems (ii) a necessary duplication of some reference and a large amount of bibliographical material, and
(iii) possible user frustration over access to the collection. However, due to the very nature of these materials, libraries will continue to create special areas for their preservation and service. (26)

In some universities, it is sometimes the practice to provide space for a branch library in any plan for faculty or institute building. The director of the University Library, Bergen, gave insight into this phenomenon:

When a new building for the Physical and Mathematical Institutes is ready in the autumn of 1968, the library will be given its own offices for the staff of the Natural Sciences Faculty Service, besides different reading-rooms and necessary book-stacks. (27)

The historical background of branch libraries in Nigerian universities has not attracted much published attention. However, aspects of this are sometimes found in studies of specific branch libraries or university libraries. P.M.J. Edwards (28) devoted some space to the origin of the Institute of Agricultural Research Library, Ahmadu Bello University, Samaru, Zaria. According to this account, that branch library was established in 1925 by the then Northern Region of Nigeria Ministry of Agriculture to contribute to the research programmes of the Samaru Research Station of the Ministry. However, when Ahmadu Bello University was founded in 1962, it annexed the station and reconstituted it as its Institute of Agricultural Research. Following this development, the library assumed its present character. This report is to a large extent collaborated by Wilfred J. Plumbe's survey of Ahmadu Bello University libraries. (29) The fact is also implied in the observation made by Christian C. Aguolu, "The Ahmadu Bello University has the most decentralized library organization among Nigerian universities, primarily owing to the history of the University, which developed, in its formative years, by the integration of four independently administered and widely separated educational institutions." (30)

John Harris's account of the situation at the University of
Ibadan seems to suggest that branch libraries are a logical consequence of the widening of the academic programmes of the University. According to him once the main library was consolidated, the University needed a system of libraries in order to meet the information needs of a wide range of academic interests in the University. (31) This need for a "a whole system of libraries" was again emphasized in a later account which examined the history, growth and development of library services at the University of Ibadan. (32)

Jonathan O. Dipeolu viewed the issue of establishing branch libraries from a somewhat different angle. He felt that branch libraries would be necessary where the central library had overgrown. According to him:

A point is reached, however, where the main library becomes inadequate to perform its functions due probably to overcrowding. This is the time to hive off a section of the library containing specialized material that can conveniently be separated to form the nucleus of a new departmental or faculty library. (33)

while the issue of bequeath or donation was hardly mentioned in early studies of branch libraries in Nigerian universities, in one or two cases it has been identified as the major factor in the establishment of branch libraries. The founding of the Economic Development Institute Library of the University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, was in consequence of "funds received from the Ford Foundation." (34) Quite recently at the University of Ibadan, a postgraduate branch library for the social sciences is planned in consequence of a notable donation. (35)

It seems obvious that issues other than the specific ones reviewed in this section come into play in accounting for the origins of branch libraries. Some of these were discussed in chapter two of this report. (2.3) Further, Morris A. Gelfand as Unesco consultant on university libraries for developing countries described the situation that gives rise to branch libraries thus, "Their need for convenient
access to library resources undoubtedly motivated faculties to build their own collections." (36) Robert R. Walsh while accepting that some unmet need could lead to the existence of branch libraries emphasized that in many cases "... departmental politics and policies may create needs, whether real or imagined for separate libraries." (37)

3.4 Location of Branch Libraries

Perhaps the thorniest problem about branch libraries is the extent to which they should be allowed in a university community. Part of this difficulty which is invariably expressed in studies of location of branch libraries, arises from the conflicting character of campus interests:

Librarians are caught between conflicting pressures for centralization and decentralization of collections and, consequently, facilities. University administrators desire to hold duplication of collections and dispersal of services to a minimum. Faculty and graduate students press for decentralized departmental libraries . . .

The issue of centralized versus decentralized facilities poses major management problems for university librarians. In planning new construction, and considering changes in existing space utilization, the library must decide whether it is more efficient and effective to decentralize or to centralize operations. Librarians indicate that little data are available to assist them in making such decisions. (38)

The matter of central location is often a major consideration in choosing the site for a new university library. According to Jonathan O. Dipeolu, quoting the resolution of the Lever-hulme Conference on university library buildings, "... in planning a new university library care should be taken to ensure that the site is large enough for future expansion, that the building is centrally situated in relation to halls of residence and academic buildings, and is physically separated from other buildings." (39) However, with time, new departments, faculties or institutes may emerge which could not have been included in the original plan of the university.
These may be far from the main library originally designed to be at the centre of the university academic life. Sometimes there is pressure to have branch libraries for such distant units.

Several studies have centred on this matter and some have come forward with possible solutions. The Parry Report made a detailed study of the situation in the United Kingdom. Its views on this matter would seem to be guided by financial considerations: "No library should be set up outside the central library unless there are sufficient funds to support both the initial purchase of its stock and its continued maintenance." (40) The Report also recognized the need to have branch libraries "... wherever there are large and important departments ... which are a considerable way from the main library ..." (41) What seems in doubt is what can be considered as optimal distance from the main library for the purposes of establishing branch libraries.

In an apparent endeavour to provide an answer to this problem, Jeffrey Raffel and Robert Shishko studied the matter of location of branch libraries from the point of view of location analysts. The writers summed up the central concern of their paper thus:

Locating university libraries near classrooms, offices, and dormitories requires a larger budget than combining these libraries into a centralized faculty. Yet there is a cost to the university community which does not appear in the university budget - a cost in time, energy and decreased use resulting from locating the library a longer distance from users. (42)

Raffel and Shishko analyzed such variables as the location of the main library, academic units, offices, residence of users and transportation costs. They then employed matrices to formulate theoretical models for the guidance of decision makers in the location of one, two or multiple branch libraries in universities. (43)

However, the technique offered by Raffel and Shishko is
essentially conceptual and can hardly be of practical use in harmonizing the rather complex academic, financial, personality and other issues involved in locating branch libraries. Thomas J. Waldhart and Leroy G. Zweifel studied the models and commented as follows: "Although Raffel and Shishko provide a methodology based on location theory, which may provide library administrators with some guidance in the location of centralized or decentralized library systems, the methodology provides little hope of resolving the essentially psychological problem related to the point at which distance makes a library inaccessible to the point of noneuse." (44)

David C. Genaway and Edward B. Stanford in their survey of some branch libraries at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities reported, as already seen, that the major elements in the location of those libraries were receipt of books and "needed special materials not provided by the university library system." (45) In this particular situation, distance from the main library was hardly a strong factor in deciding where to site such branch libraries. (46) J. E. Broberg and R. E. Dunbar in part covered the issue of location in their survey of departmental libraries in chemistry in the U.S. colleges and universities. The result of that survey is worthy of note:

In 72 percent of the total replies the department library was located in the chemistry building while in 13 percent of the cases it was located as a separate section in the main library; 15 percent indicated the location elsewhere. (47)

Equally noteworthy were typical comments made on this matter by some of the heads of chemistry departments who answered the questionnaire: "To be effective the chemistry library should be in the chemistry building." "We consider proximity to research labs an important factor." "No place satisfactory but in the chemistry building." (48)

Paul Kaegbein has shown the initiative and rationale of the central library at the Technological University Berlin, in deciding to site branch libraries where none existed before:
These branch libraries are so placed as to be adjacent to the working areas of their users, i.e., in the buildings of the faculty or department. Only in this way can they really carry out their main function which is to satisfy the readers' needs as quickly as possible. The presence of an efficient special library in the vicinity of a department allows the department to limit its own collection to reference works. (49)

3.4.1 Consolidated versus Single-subject Libraries

In recent years considerable attention is focussed on the feasibility of combining various departmental libraries, particularly in the sciences, into bigger units. A major factor in favour of this move seems to be the interdisciplinary nature of academic disciplines. This is amply illustrated by the following observation based on patterns of branch library use:

Though the engineers and physicists tended to go most frequently to the departmental library serving their field of interests, there was a considerable amount of use of all of the science libraries by each group. The engineers particularly showed strong use of the Physics and Mathematics libraries, and even some use of the Psychology and Business libraries. (50)

The foregoing observation is amply supported by a more elaborate examination of patterns of branch library use conducted by Richard M. Dougherty and Laura L. Blomquist. On this matter they noted, "The data collected in the investigation support the conclusion that library materials of potential relevance to individual faculty researchers are likely to be scattered among several locations in the campus library system." (57)

Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber gave insight into this phenomenon:

The major university libraries are turning more and more to combining smaller departmental libraries into major complexes situated in the centre of a cluster of academic departments that use the collection. Examples include a Central Science Library, Social Science Library, Health Science library and
They also argued that this move would "... justify a higher quality of service under more expert direction, lessen unnecessary duplication of materials, and offer long hours of service." (53) In his paper, Jesse H. Shera provided a very lucid argument in favour of consolidation of individual departmental libraries into larger units. His argument was in six parts, namely,

- convenience for students, as opposed to considerations of faculty alone
- interdisciplinary relationships of modern fields of study
- economic advantage
- improved service
- improved book collection
- revolution in librarianship brought about by the introduction of modern technology into library service. (54)

Marianne Cooper (55), Jean Legg (56), and Guy R. Lyle (57) have elaborated aspects of the foregoing reasons in favour of consolidation with specific examples of consolidated branch libraries. Robert Vosper as university librarian reviewed the situation at the University of Los Angeles. He was clearly convinced that "the overall needs of the University ... would be best served if we could somehow develop a single, physically centralized library to serve engineering and physical services." (58) At the Technological University, Berlin, Paul Kaegbein reported "the fusion of smaller Institute and departmental libraries into larger entities in such fields as Agriculture, Medicine, Law, Theology, Economics and Social Sciences." (59)

The foregoing observations seem to give credence to the assertion of J. Michael Brunno that "Consolidation of small units into larger divisions will continue to take place. This constitutes partial decentralization or partial centralization,
depending on one's point of view."(60)

The whole issue of consolidation of small library units into larger ones has not gone unchallenged. University teachers are perhaps most vocal in opposing the scheme. "Faculty members of academic departments, in contrast to library administrators, often argue for subject decentralization to the departmental level" on the grounds of accessibility of needed information materials in close physical proximity to the greatest number of potential users.(61)

The foregoing concern of university teachers is amply reflected in the survey conducted by D.A. Wells. The situation that prompted his investigation is noteworthy. While at the University of Cincinnati, Ohio, as the head of Physics Department he was aware of moves in several U.S. universities to consolidate physics, chemistry, biology, and other science libraries into large units housed in separate buildings. "Since certain members of the physics department as well as members of other science departments, here at the University of Cincinnati are strongly opposed to consolidation, believing that we stand to lose a great deal and gain nothing, it was decided to make a nation-wide survey of opinions of physicists regarding the matter."(62) Consequently, he sought the views of one hundred and twenty-six heads of physics departments on the matter. One hundred and four replied.

The responses were summarized as follows:

(a) 84 were strongly in favour of departmental libraries - many of these expressed bitter opposition to the consolidated type.

(b) 17 made no positive commitment one way or the other.

(c) 3 were in favour of consolidation. (63)

Equally noteworthy are some of the comments made by some respondents:
We do not know who is responsible for the idea of a central science library, but presumably it is someone who does not really understand how a science library is used.

We are unanimously of the opinion that having the physics departmental library located anywhere other than in the physics building would be detrimental to student and faculty use. (64)

In a rather sharp reaction to the foregoing comments, Jesse H. Shera wrote his often quoted paper, "How much is a physicist's inertia worth?" in which he expertly replied the viewpoints contained in Prof. Well's paper. (54) Shera, however, conceded that "No one will disagree that a book in the hand is more convenient than twenty down the hall . . . intensity of scholarship in physics is much like that of light - it varies with the square of distance." (65)

At other times, university teachers are inclined to reject any move to integrate departmental libraries into a larger unit on different grounds. They suspect that such a move would erode the benefits and services they had come to derive from their own libraries. Joan Barry illustrates this concern from her experience as coordinator of branch libraries, University of Sydney, Australia:

Frequently any move to incorporate it (branch library) within the university library system, or to amalgamate several branch libraries into a larger single unit, is viewed with suspicion, sometimes even hostility, by the teaching staff. This is a defensive attitude and stems, I believe, from an understandable fear that the personal service provided by the small, familiar and usually informal library will completely disappear to be replaced by a large, rigid, impersonal library unable to cater for specialized subject interests. (66)

In this context, a rather unusual demand reported by Harald L. Tveteras might be mentioned. In Germany, "several scholars have proposed, quite seriously, that their university library be broken up into a series of special libraries, on the grounds that this would benefit research work." (67) While this sort of demand is rather uncommon, it does indicate the extent to
which some university teachers are academically attached to "their" libraries. The situation that gave rise to the demand bears testimony to this line of thought. "Many a keen librarian has come to realize that an alarming number of scholars consider the institute library as their library. Their research work is based on the institute library and their aim is to depend as little as possible on the comprehensive university library, which fortunately, so they say, plays a more and more subordinate part on their work." (68)

Two rather clearly opposing views are thus discernible from the foregoing observations on separate subject libraries and consolidated branch libraries. Harvey Marron made the demarcation as follows:

The lines of difference are fairly clear. Library administrators claim that centralization is required for economical, efficient acquisition and management of the huge numbers of publications involved in an up-to-date, well-stocked library. Users, on the other hand, argue that they cannot read and study efficiently and effectively unless frequently used documents are within easy reach. (69)

The matters raised in these arguments can be seen as aspects of the broader issues of centralization and decentralization of library and information services in universities. These are summarized in Table 8.

The way out of the dilemma will seem to depend on the academic environments of specific universities. The experience of Mary O'Mara with practical experience in single-subject (music) and in a consolidated branch library (architecture/music) would seem helpful. She felt strongly that single-discipline libraries "are far too costly and inefficient in terms of staff resources." (70) Thomas J. Waldhart and Leroy G. Zwiefel emphasized that taking a decision one way or the other requires careful consideration of such factors as projections of student enrolment, university growth and costs. (71) There is, of course, the rather unfortunate reality that sometimes in important matters such as this decisions "are based exclusively
upon the subjective judgement of individuals possessing a strong bias either for or against centralization."(72)

3.5 Administration of Branch Libraries.

Most studies of academic libraries usually devote some space to arrangements formulated for administering branch libraries. Often the issues and findings revolve around administrative centralization and decentralization of library services. Sometimes mention is made of shared administration.

James Thompson in his very useful work on university library administration observed that "it is essential that the main library exercise a degree of control over departmental collections," either as semi-autonomous entities or requiring them to operate within a given framework. (73) He reasoned that this arrangement is necessary in order to ensure that the university library resources are accessible to the entire university community and that standards are maintained. Rutherford Rogers and David Weber also favour some form of central control: "It is folly to hold to the view that there is no justification for departmental libraries; it is equally unwise to honor every request for a new campus library irrespective of merits of the case." (74) Rogers and Weber also offered a model policy guideline for the control, establishment, services and, when the situation demands, the discontinuance of branch libraries. (75)

The Canadian University Library Standards Committee was even more blunt on this matter: "A departmental library should be administered by the University Librarian."(76) Brian Southwell specified some elements of branch library service that should be linked with the central library. "It (branch library) should be part of the system from a staffing viewpoint, so that staff may (though most in fact won't) move from one part of the system to another, and must have at least part of its processing done centrally, to take advantage of economies of scale where they best apply."(77)

The foregoing observations make it evident that librarians who had explored this subject favour some form of or complete central
### Table 8

**(+)** ADVANTAGES & (-) DISADVANTAGES IN CENTRALIZED AND DECENTRALIZED LIBRARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRALIZED LIBRARY</th>
<th>DECENTRALIZED LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The librarians must consider the needs of the total academic community and not the specific department.</td>
<td>The faculty has more control and involvement over matters of library policy and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted loan policy</td>
<td>Flexible loan policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal and sometimes mechanized attention</td>
<td>Continuing and personal attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The search takes more time because of the size of the catalog and stacks.</td>
<td>The search takes less time because the catalog and the stacks are smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special services available such as terminals to data bases, document delivery service, interlibrary loan</td>
<td>Do not have expensive services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open more hours</td>
<td>Open fewer hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference service all open hours</td>
<td>Limited reference service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All materials in one place</td>
<td>Related subjects’ materials in other libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: see next page.*</td>
<td>More difficult access to other groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
control of branch libraries in the universities. Empirical studies of this matter, however, have not demonstrated a uniform pattern in the administration of branch libraries.

Hwa-wai Lee conducted a survey of the status of branch libraries in Thai universities. His findings revealed that most of the branch libraries he studied were not under the aegis of the university librarian. He elaborated that university librarians had no control over acquisition and cataloguing arrangements of the branch libraries, that union catalogue of books and union list of serials were in most cases non-existent, that the branch libraries were run by non-professional staff and that most of those libraries opened for relatively short periods and restricted their services only to members of their academic units. (78) Nejla Al-Tahan in her recent dissertation reviewed, in part, the nature of branch libraries at the University of Baghdad. Her study revealed that "... there is no administration or supervision at one central point of the departmental libraries." (79)

Lucien W. White explored the situation in the United States and reported in part, "In most universities in the United States, the administrative direction of the departmental libraries is centralized in the main library." (80) He also explained that staffing of departmental libraries is centralized in the main library and in most cases "Professional librarians are generally employed to administer departmental library units. . . ." (81) The liaison with the academic unit served is usually effected through an advisory library committee consisting of faculty members nominated by the academic unit and to which the branch librarian is an ex officio member. (82) White's account, while true of many a situation has not presented a complete picture of branch library administration in the United States.

Broberg and Dunbar in their report on chemistry departmental libraries in the United States would seem to place such

libraries under the control of heads of chemistry departments. They further pointed out:

A full-time paid professional librarian was employed in 35 percent of the schools reporting. The secretary-librarian combination was found in 33 percent of the departmental libraries, while 29 percent used staff members to supervise the library. (83)

David C. Genaway made a survey of some branch libraries in the University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus and observed that, from the administrative point of view, there were two types of branch libraries in that University. There were official departmental libraries which were supported by university library staff and generally have their holdings listed in the union catalog. . ." (84) At the same time there were "quasi-departmental" libraries which he characterized as "a collection or library initiated by and for faculty and students of a given department or combination of departments and not supported by university library budget or operated by university library staff." (85)

A detailed study of the situation at Harvard University was made by Douglas Bryant. The administrative structure of the University itself is essentially decentralized. This basic feature is reflected in the administration of the ninety library units at Harvard University. The situation can be summarized as follows:

1. The central collection, housed in Widener, Houghton, and Lamont buildings and administered directly by the librarian of the Harvard College.

2. The nine house libraries (generally of eleven thousand to fifteen thousand volumes) of the upper class dormitories, administered by the house masters with the collaboration of the librarian of the Lamont Library.

3. The thirty-two departmental libraries within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, administered primarily by the department chairmen and the heads of the libraries all of whom work in varying ways and degrees with the librarian of Harvard College.
There were also some twenty advanced-study and research libraries such as the Dunnbanton Oakes Research Library, and libraries belonging to graduate schools. (86)

The foregoing diverse library units at Harvard are headed by librarians who maintain varying degrees of relation with the director of university libraries but are primarily responsible to the heads of their academic units "... their primary line of authority is the deans, the department chairmen, and the directors of institutes, who head the units to which their libraries belong." (87) Inspite of this administrative decentralization, the ninety library units "... form a whole and work together in supporting the teaching and research programmes of the University and its scholars." (88) This is achieved principally by forming a union catalogue for all books in the libraries. Additionally, there are informal contacts between the director of libraries on the one hand and the branch librarians and heads of academic units on the other.

The situation at Cornell University is somewhat similar. This is evident from the academic climate of the University. According to Stephen A. McCarthy, "All the colleges of Cornell have a high degree of independence in determining their programs, standards of performance, selection of staff, admission of students, development of resources and sources of support, etc, within the broad policies of the University." (89) However, in specific areas, the main library at Cornell had evolved flexible arrangements to share in the administration of such libraries. For instance, a college librarian would be responsible jointly to the director of university libraries and the dean of the College."In practice, it is expected that this will mean that in the normal operation of the college library, the college librarian will be responsible and will report to the director of libraries. Annual reports will be addressed to the dean and the director." (90)

The general pattern in the United Kingdom was explained by K.W. Humphreys:
In the United Kingdom, the university librarian is usually responsible for all libraries in his university. Library staff are permanently in charge of faculty and institute libraries, with some library assistance given to other smaller collections. (91)

However, the exact position varies from one university to another. The administration of branch libraries at the University of Leeds during Richard Offor's tenure as university librarian was rather fluid. According to Richard Offor himself, the branch libraries were "more or less connected with the main library, the Librarian being technically responsible to the Council for all books belonging to the University although in practice many of them are but little under his control." (92) At the University of Exeter, some branch libraries are administered by the university library while others "are under the administration of the heads of departments concerned." (93)

In the older Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and London, the libraries are essentially administered in isolation, largely on account of the history, constitution and federated nature of these universities. The situation at the University of London was put thus "... there is no University body specifically charged with the responsibility for libraries, and the libraries themselves have grown in unplanned independence." (94)

D.W. Butcher made an informative survey of some fifty faculty, departmental and special libraries (as distinct from College libraries) of the University of Cambridge. He explained how they are administered:

Although nearly all these libraries belong to the University, and hence the University as a body is responsible for their maintenance, the responsibility for their management really lies in the hands of the faculty board, department, institution, or professor concerned. In some cases, the professor of the faculty acts as a librarian. Very few of these libraries are now without a full-time assistant librarian. (95)

In Germany, university library services had been on the "pattern
of strong specialist libraries attached to the departments as the focus of reading . . . "(96) This situation produced a somewhat fluid condition. In some cases the aggregate information holdings of branch libraries in the university were higher than the book stock of the central library. In many cases they operated independent of each other and without connection to the central library. (97) This rather unsavory condition prompted the German Research Society (Deutsche Forschungs­gemeinschaft) to evolve a series of guidelines aimed at improving access to these resources. These guidelines have been summarized as follows:

1. The university library should be the main centre of library coordination.

2. All personnel engaged in library work (throughout the whole library complex) should be placed under the supervision of the professional staff of the university librarian.

3. Smaller stocks should be concentrated in order to form larger, more efficient, administrative units.

4. Techniques should be unified under the direction of the staff of the university library.

5. The acquisition departments should be coordinated so as to avoid multiple processing.

6. Joint information centres should be created at universities, including union catalogues of books and periodicals. (98)

What obtained in Germany was somewhat similar with the position at Oslo University. In that University, the unsettled issue of whether the faculty librarian should be responsible to the faculty head or the University Library Director was resolved by Senate. "The Senate of the University therefore decided that the faculty librarian come administratively under the control of the Director of the University Library." Developments in library and information services at the University show that this decision had been a correct one. (99)

Firuzeh Broomand-e-Sarkardeh in her work, Centralization in university libraries in Iran, described the various adminis-
trative patterns of university libraries in Iran. These arrangements show that there are various approaches to the administration of branch libraries in the universities in Iran. Sarkardeh specified the approaches as follows:

a. A central library with departmental libraries administered by the central library. The Technical University of Arya-Mehr and the National University-both in Tehran-have this structure.

b. Individual faculty libraries together with a central library. They may or may not have some co-ordination. The Universities of Tehran, Tabriz, Esfahan and Ferdowsi(Mashad) follow this pattern.

c. Independent faculty libraries without a central library, central control or administration. At present it is only Jondi-Shaour University in Ahvaz, which still has this system.

d. University of Pahlavi in Shiraz has separate faculty libraries, but has started its project and works towards centralization. (100)

A number of published and unpublished documents give some insight into the administrative arrangements for branch libraries in some Nigerian universities. As indicated in chapter one, B.O. Adediran surveyed the status of branch libraries in some Nigerian universities and reported on the mixed administrative nature of such libraries. (101) Adediran's report is to a large extent supported by the observations of Christian G. Aguolu on this matter. (102)

Other studies have identified different forms of administrative arrangements for specific branch libraries. Shared responsibility was observed by two writers. With respect to the Law Library of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, "The responsibility for organization and administration of the Library was shared between the University Librarian and the Head of the College of Law." (103) Wilfred J. Plumbe as the University Librarian of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria experienced much the same arrangement:

Administratively a large measure of decentralization
exists as each of the libraries of the main campus has its own budget and the librarians in charge are responsible not only to the University Librarian but also at each Institute to the Director of the Institute... (104)

Although the position has probably altered in some respects since the foregoing reports were made, the writers had nevertheless shown the diversity of administrative arrangements for branch libraries in Nigerian universities. More recent documents give some indication of the nature of relationship which exists between some branch libraries and their respective main libraries.

At Ahmadu Bello University, the main library has formed the Departmental Libraries Unit as a body through which branch libraries of that University are co-ordinated. A document issued by this Departmental Libraries Unit gives indication of the nature of relationship which exists between the University Library and the branch libraries of that University. The manual specified that the Unit performs the following functions for branch libraries:

1. Keeps the Kashim Ibrahim Library units catalogue up-to-date with new acquisitions in Faculty/Departmental Libraries which have already been catalogued.

2. Catalogues books and journals for the Faculty/Departmental Libraries.

3. Classifies books so catalogued.

4. Gives assistance and professional advice to the Faculty/Departmental Libraries when they request for them. (105)

At the University of Ibadan, a somewhat more precise arrangement can be discerned from an internal memorandum issued by the University librarian to academic units on the status of branch libraries:

The entire collections of the faculty/departmental libraries, i.e., books, journals, and non-book material
belong to the University Library System and not to the individual department, faculty, or member of staff; access to them is on the same basis as access to Main Library Collections ... It is important to stress that books and other materials borrowed from the faculty/departmental library are as far as possible subject to the same regulations which apply to materials borrowed from the Main Library. (106)

A detailed description of the background to the above memorandum and a general overview of the administration of branch libraries at the University of Ibadan has been given by A. Faniran (107) According to her "... the Ibadan University Library operates on the basis of a centralized administration but decentralized services. The ultimate authority as stipulated in the guidelines for both administration and services was vested in the University Librarian."(108) The recent paper by Sam E.Ifidon was concerned with conditions for establishing branch libraries and their control.(109)

3.6 Information Holdings of Branch Libraries

As shown in chapter two(2.5.4), university libraries provide books and other information materials to enrich the various instructional and research programmes of its parent body. Maurice F.Tauber had identified "five levels of completeness that could be used as the basis of faculty and library-staff appraisal of existing library collections and as a guide in establishing acquisitional policies."(110) These are as follows:

1. Basic informal collection, for a subject that falls outside the scope of present instruction, yet within readers may need minimal resources to aid their understanding of, or their work with, materials properly within the scope of their studies.

2. Working collection, which conveys existing knowledge of the subject in broad outline, including its main historical aspects, adequate for the needs of undergraduate courses.

3. General-research collection, adequate for the needs of graduate students in the subject, since it includes the major-portions of the materials required for dissertations and other independent research.
4. **Comprehensive collection**, which embraces all the materials in the general-research collection in addition to a wider selection of books, periodicals, and other materials having value for current research, and also the works needed for historical research in the subject, in all pertinent languages, though not necessarily in all editions, or in translations, with inclusion of considerable documentary and original resource material.

5. **Exhaustive collection**, which seeks so far as is reasonably possible, to include everything written on the subject, in all languages, in all editions and translations. (111)

The information holdings, of branch libraries tend to reflect aspects of the foregoing levels at varying degrees. Much depends on the nature of information needs which the branch library seeks to fulfil and the perceptions of those responsible for its collection development. James Thompson quotes the Report of the Cambridge General Board's Committee on Libraries as follows:

It is certain that, as a matter of historical development, the prime motive behind the creation of most departmental libraries was the provision of research material for senior academic staff in order that they might have such material immediately at hand, without the necessity of going to the university library. (112)

The nature of information materials in branch libraries of the foregoing setting would be quite different from those formed as recommended by the same Cambridge Report. According to this recommendation, departmental libraries in that university "should take on themselves the major burden of undergraduate provision and leave the university library free to concentrate solely on provision for research." (113) Sometimes branch library collections are viewed in broad terms. Joan Barry observed, "In my experience branch libraries are intended to cater mainly for senior undergraduates, post-graduates and researchers with some exceptions being necessary where lectures for all years are given off-campus."(114)

Views are also somewhat varied on whether or not branch libraries
should concentrate on the core information materials required for the academic programmes of its parent unit. Russel Shank observed that some branch libraries "have built up small collections of core texts, handbooks, mathematical tables." (115) In some cases branch libraries acquire fringe materials that may in fact be part of a core collection in another branch library. According to Paul Kaegbein, "In forming their collections larger special libraries (in universities) tend, once their core subject is well covered, to acquire considerable quantities of fringe material without consultation with neighbouring libraries." (116) This tendency seems to be a major source of considerable duplication of materials in the libraries of a university.

To mitigate this tendency it is, perhaps, necessary for branch libraries to concern themselves with information materials of specific need. Harvey Marron has suggested ways of limiting the holdings of branch libraries to items that are in constant use:

Departmental libraries . . . must be mercilessly limited to collections of current and frequently used documents . . . The criterion to be applied in deciding whether something belongs in the departmental or central library is usage. If documents are not being used often ("often" will have to be defined in each specific environment), they should not be in the departmental library. It also follows that all reference work, literature searching, and bibliography compilation are to be done by the central library staff. (117)

The size of information holdings of branch libraries vary considerably. This can be illustrated with a few specific examples.

The work of D.W. Butcher showed that at Cambridge University, the Departmental Library in Agriculture had 18,000 books and 850 periodical titles, Applied Economics had just 840 books and 112 periodical titles. (118)

At the University of Oslo, most institute libraries contain between 2,000 and 10,000 volumes. (119)
The University of Queensland branch libraries range in size from almost 6,000 to over 110,000 volumes (120)

Perhaps the largest branch library in terms of book size is the Harvard Law Library with nearly one and a half million volumes. (121)

In addition to books and periodicals, other types of information materials are acquired in branch libraries. Sometimes this is dictated by the nature of the academic programmes of the parent unit. Examples of such other information materials include:

- Working papers (typescripts) for academic staff and graduate students. (122)
- Music scores and discs. (123)
- Ephemeral and fugitive materials (124)

3.7 Functions and Services of Branch Libraries

The functions and services of university libraries were discussed in chapter two (2.5.3). The university library functions and services have obvious implications for functions and services of branch libraries. In general, the later are partly or in whole reflections and replications of what exists or should exist in the main library. The functions and services of branch libraries are often discussed in this context. However, the difference is that the functions and services of branch libraries are more specific. In this paper P. Havard-Williams has given a sound insight into the special character of the services of branch libraries. (125)

Lucien W. White observed that libraries of research bureaus, centres and institutes which employed subject specialist librarians provide writing and research assistance to the department. He also noted that in general acquisition, cataloguing, inter-library functions are carried on centrally in the main library. (126)
to include pertinent works from neighbouring libraries
and include the Central University Library itself. (134)

Summary

A number of points emerge from the foregoing review of the
literature of branch libraries in universities.

The names given to these libraries include seminar, departmental,
institute, faculty, collegiate, and quasi-departmental libraries.
However, they tend to exhibit considerable similarity in
character. Differences exist but these are not always explicable
in terms of type of branch library alone.

The first historical account of branch libraries in the West
linked their origins with the seminar method of instruction
which started in Germany. It later spread to the United States
of America, Britain and to other countries of Europe. This
attempt to attribute the origins of branch libraries to a single
factor was shown to be an over-simplification of a complex
matter. Recent works show that, in fact, branch-libraries
came into existence as a result of "varying circumstances."
(12) These factors include availability of funds, distance to
the main library, benefaction, convenience and proximity to
users. In one case or another, one or a combination of these
factors play significant role in the establishment of branch
libraries.

In recent years increasing interest is focussed on the possibili-
ty of combining smaller units of branch libraries into
larger entities for a number of related academic disciplines,
mainly in science and technology. In this matter two different
viewpoints were discerned. Library and information workers
advocate consolidated branch libraries for reasons of improved
services and economy. On the other hand, university teachers
frequently argue that their information needs would best be
served by single subject libraries in close vicinity of their
laboratories, offices and classrooms. Interestingly, the
arguments are with respect to means of achieving an end since
both parties are more or less concerned with effective library and information services. For solutions to be realistic, they must be based on the specific academic environment of each university.

As revealed in the literature, the problem of running branch libraries often revolves around the wider issue of administrative centralization and decentralization of library services in the university. Librarians who have written on this matter seem to emphasize administrative centralization of entire library services in the university. However, empirical studies of branch libraries have shown that this expressed standpoint of librarians has not become an accepted practice in universities. There are branch libraries that are administered solely by the heads of academic units. In some cases shared administration has been observed.

In Nigeria, branch libraries in the universities have hardly formed the subject of research. The only comparative paper devoted specifically to the subject (10) gave a rather general treatment of the matter and did not cover such details as the origins, location and services of such libraries. The present study in a way grew out of this felt need for a systematic investigation of branch libraries as part of library and information services in Nigerian universities.
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CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the methods employed in designing the research questionnaires, collecting and analyzing the data that form a major component of the work.

4.2 The Survey Method of Research

Conceptually the methods are within the scope of survey technique of research. The general background and application of survey research methods in library and information studies are treated in the works of Maurice B.Line (1), Charles H.Busha and Stephen P.Harter (2), Ernest W. Erickson (3), Maurice F.Tauber and Irene Roemer Stephens (4), and Nick Moore (5).

The survey method is often employed in studies of university library and information services. The usual pattern is to generate data which are analyzed and used to explain existing practices. On the basis of such findings and in the light of concepts as revealed in the professional literature, guidelines, models or recommendations are often offered for improving such library services. In some cases surveys are based on single university libraries and sometimes on specific aspects of such libraries. At other times, a number of university libraries are studied together, usually for comparative purposes or for pattern development. It is also usual to include the viewpoints, opinions or attitudes of specific university people in such studies. In fact, sometimes works are based solely on informed opinion of experts in the subject matter of the survey. A few specific examples of completed works are given below to illustrate these approaches.

Mohammed-Saleh Jamil Ashoor adopted the descriptive survey method in his study designed to "evaluate library resources and services through faculty and student opinions and reactions
toward these resources and services." The work covered three universities in Saudi Arabia: The University of Petroleum and Minerals (UPM), the University of Riyadh (UR), and King Abdul Aziz University (KAAU). The instruments he used included questionnaires to faculty and students and short interviews with librarians and heads of academic units. The results of this survey were presented in tables and discussed in the context of published materials on university library patterns, particularly in Saudi Arabia. Dr. Ashoor's work did not contain much in the way of guidelines for improvement although there were recommendations for further studies in order to have a better picture of university library phenomenon in Saudi Arabia. (6)

Libraries in the "new universities" in Britain: a study of selected institutions is the title of a work completed by James Eric Davis at the University of Technology, Loughborough. The dissertation was based on a number of university libraries "which were relatively accessible and could conveniently be visited and surveyed in depth." Seven universities established between 1961 and 1965 covered in the study were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Sussex</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of York</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Essex</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lancaster</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent at Canterbury</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Warwick</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the university libraries the elements examined included academic background and structure; library service development; stock, including special collections; retrieval systems and organization; research activity; mechanization; cooperation and extramural activities; and special services. On the basis of information collected from the university libraries, James E. Davis was able to evaluate and draw conclusions on pertinent management issues. (7)

Taofiq M. Salisu's doctoral work was concerned with the "involvement of Nigerian university libraries with the new media". To gather data for the thesis, he designed and
administered three questionnaires to thirteen Nigerian university libraries, a selected number of university teachers and students respectively. On the basis of his findings Dr. Salisu recommended that libraries are best placed for the procurement, organization and dissemination of the new media. An additional recommendation was that the university teachers and administrators should be educated on the potential of the new media in university education. (8)

David Carl Genaway based his study on quasi-departmental libraries of the University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus. To obtain data he designed and utilized a tripartite questionnaire which was sent to 167 heads of academic units in that University. The first part of the questionnaire was concerned with the respondent's awareness of services currently offered by the university library system. The second part dealt with the attitudes of the respondent towards such services while the last part sought specific data regarding existing quasi-departmental libraries. On the basis of information derived, Dr. Genaway constructed a model or typical quasi-departmental library in the university. He also recommended that "Possible ways in which quasi-departmental libraries and the university library system might be of more mutual benefit should be explored." (9)

4.3 The Questionnaires

The data for the present work were gathered by means of two separate instruments. One of the questionnaires was an attitude scale issued to heads of academic units and librarians to determine their attitudes towards branch libraries in the universities. The second questionnaire was devised to collect essentially factual information about branch libraries in the six universities.

4.3.1 Construction of the Attitude Scale (Questionnaire 1)

The statements included in this scale were Likert-type. This method was adopted because it was more widely used than any
other. Also it is easier to compute and "has been shown . . . to produce rather higher coefficients of reliability." (10) Rensis Likert himself has shown the technique for producing and scoring a scale. Essentially, emphasis is placed on the need to ensure that the statements on the scale are expressions of desired behaviour and not statements of fact, and that the statements make it possible to obtain the degree of intensity of the respondent's attitudes towards the object of interest. (11)

Along this conception, the investigator produced statements relating to different matters concerning branch libraries, bearing in mind the university library environment in Nigeria. These statements were edited following the criteria offered by Allen L. Edwards. (12)

The statements were in the form of propositions which the respondents were required to support or not to support. This approach made it possible to seek the viewpoints of heads of academic units and librarians concerning branch libraries in a relatively brief questionnaire. The overall intention was to make broad comparisons of the attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians towards branch libraries.

4.3.1.1 Panel of Experts

To enhance its validity, the questionnaire was submitted to a panel of six experts drawn from librarians and university teachers. The views of these experts were also helpful in deciding the numerical value assigned to each statement, that is, whether the statement would be weighted 1 or 5 at the "Strongly Agree" option or "Strongly Disagree" alternative.

The statements given the value of one at "Strongly Agree" option and five at "Strongly Disagree" alternative were numbers 1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 21. The numerical value for statements numbered 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 22 was five at "strongly Agree" and one at "Strongly Disagree".
4.3.2 Questionnaire on Branch Libraries (Questionnaire 11)

Questionnaire 11 (Appendix V) was designed to derive essentially factual information about branch libraries in the context of university library and information services.

Questions numbered in Roman numerals (I-IV) sought to know the official name of the branch library and the academic unit it serves. Also information was sought on the subject area(s) covered by the collection.

Questions one to three desired to determine the nature of the parent academic unit served by the branch library, whether or not the branch library was located on the same campus as the main university library and the distance from the branch library to the main library. The location and nature of accommodation for the branch library were sought in questions five and six. Question seven was designed to find out the relative importance of factor(s) that were responsible for the establishment of the library.

The number and categories of users of the library and reader places available were matters called for in questions eight and nine. General policy regarding access to the collection and circulation patterns were demanded in questions ten to twelve. The lending practice was split into two to determine the category of users that could borrow materials and loan periods.

Question thirteen sought information on sources of funds for the branch library. Question fifteen was devised to find out a broad picture of acquisition formula - the extent to which this was related to the curriculum of the academic unit. This is related to question twenty-seven which centred on the relative importance of various sources of acquisition - gift, purchase, exchange and so on. Question sixteen was concerned with arrangements for selection of materials.

The administration pattern and personnel of branch libraries
were the information requested in questions fifteen, seventeen and eighteen. Questions nineteen to twenty-three were concerned with library hours and holdings. Question twenty-three is, perhaps, quite important since it is worthwhile to know the extent to which unique materials were held in the branch libraries.

The relationship between the branch library and main university library in processing and organization of branch library materials were matters covered in questions twenty-four to twenty-six. Questions twenty-eight and thirty-one sought to find out the specific services provided by the branch library.

Questions twenty-nine and thirty required the respondent to estimate the overall value of the branch library to the academic unit. Question thirty-two was designed to find out if there were any published article(s) on the branch library. Question thirty-three, open ended, was included to give opportunity to respondents to make suggestions for improving branch library services.

Provision was made in the questionnaire for unanticipated responses with the use of "Other/s (please specify) ___". This device permitted the respondent to express his or her mind and to give additional information that the questionnaire builder had not anticipated.

This questionnaire on branch libraries was also submitted to the panel of experts. Their suggestions on the instrument were very helpful in revising and clarifying the questions.

4.4 Pilot Study

With the questionnaires in revised form following the comments of the experts, the stage was reached to pretest them. This was done in January 1981. The aim was to determine the reliability of the attitude scale and to smooth out problem areas by correcting any ambiguities and inconsistencies in the questionnaires. In the words of Fred N. Kerlinger, this step was to
provide an answer to the following question:

If we measure the same set of objects again and again with the same or comparable measuring instrument, will we get the same or similar answer? (13)

The attitude questionnaire was pretested with thirty respondents drawn at random from the Library and the Faculties of Education, Arts, and Agriculture of the University of Ibadan as well as from the Library of Ibadan Polytechnic. Care was taken to ensure that these respondents would not be involved in completing the final version of the questionnaire. Additionally, care was taken to ensure that they were comparable within possible limits to those who would complete the questionnaire in its final form. In view of these considerations, the pretest group included those who were known to have been heads or acting heads of academic units in the previous four years. A follow-up interview was held with most of these people in the pretest group with a view to improving the clarity of the statements.

The responses were analyzed to obtain the reliability of the questionnaire. The odd-even reliability technique was adopted. The responses were divided into odd-numbered and even-numbered items and scored separately.(14) The correlation coefficient of the odd and even numbered items was computed using the Pearson's r formula. The details of this formula are given by Ray L. Carpenter, (15) and Taverekere Srikantaiah and Herbert H. Hoffman.(16) The calculation yielded a correlation coefficient of .74 which is significant at the .05 level.

To enhance the final version of the questionnaire an item analysis was performed on the total scores of the thirty respondents. The pretest scores were divided into high and low thirds in terms of their total scores. The top and bottom groups were then compared on each of the statements. The six weakest statements were removed by rank ordering the statements according to the magnitude of the difference between the mean scores per statement of the respondents in the high and low
third of the entire group. Following this, the twenty-two strongest statements were retained for the final version of the scale.

The questionnaire on branch libraries (Appendix V) required essentially factual information. After the revisions made following the suggestions of the six experts (4.3), the questionnaire was given to four librarians (two at Ibadan Polytechnic and two in the University of Ibadan). Their answers and comments were compared in order to improve the clarity and validity of the questions. The final version of the instrument was an improvement on the original one as result of this exercise.

4.5 Administration of the Questionnaires

The two questionnaires were in their final form for administration in early February 1981. The recent calendar of each of the six universities was consulted for the purpose of identifying the study population, that is, the academic units, librarians and branch libraries in them. To enhance the representativeness of responses to the attitude questionnaire, stratified random sample (18), (19) was applied. This ensured that heads of academic groupings (faculties, etc) of each university were proportionately represented in the exercise.

Heads of academic units with branch libraries were all included in the sample. Also university librarians, deputy librarians and librarians in charge of branch libraries were included. Other respondents were randomly selected.

The questionnaire on branch libraries was administered on all such libraries in the universities (see "Scope and Limitations, 1.6). The branch libraries were identified in part from the calendar of each of the universities. The rest were located mainly through the help of librarians in the universities.

4.5.1 Visits to the Universities

The six universities were visited by the investigator at
different periods between March 1981 and June 1982. The visits were designed to reap the benefits of what Yorcese and S. Richer described as "captive audience situation" (20) and obviate communication and poor response problems usually associated with mailing questionnaires in Nigeria.

A fairly consistent pattern was employed in administering the questionnaires. In each university the investigator spent two days. The researcher first approached the university librarian or, in his absence, the deputy librarian, explained the purpose of the visit and solicited assistance in the exercise, particularly in recruiting local research assistants to help in distributing and collecting questionnaires.

Usually the investigator was referred to the circulation librarian who in turn introduced him to library assistants on shift duty. Those of them willing to assist during the hours they were not officially on duty were recruited, given a brief training on what the exercise was all about, and how to give out and collect completed questionnaires. The aim of this training was to standardize the distribution and collection process. Usually each assistant was assigned to specific faculties or other academic units of the university.

The investigator personally distributed and collected the questionnaires from librarians, branch libraries and some heads of academic units. Personal visits, particularly to branch libraries, were very rewarding. Such visits enabled the researcher to physically examine most of the branch libraries. In addition personal discussion with branch librarians and some heads of academic units provided helpful insight into the issues concerning branch libraries in the universities. It is perhaps worthwhile to state that most branch librarians were very interested in the exercise. Many of them in fact asked for extra copies of the questionnaire on branch libraries since, according to them, they required recorded information about their libraries as supplied in the questionnaires.
TABLE 9

INSTITUTIONAL DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRES BY HEADS OF ACADEMIC UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total number of Heads of Academic Units*</th>
<th>Number of Heads of Academic Units Sampled</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Heads of Academic Units Sampled as % of Total number of Heads</th>
<th>Number of Respondents as % of the Sample</th>
<th>Number of Respondents as % of the total number of Heads of Academic Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria, Nsukka</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadu Bello, Zaria</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers derived from calendars of respective universities.
TABLE 10

TOTAL NUMBER OF ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED TO AND RETURNED BY HEADS OF ACADEMIC UNITS

(a) Total number of heads of academic units in the six universities = 402
(b) Total number of heads of academic units sampled = 205
(c) Total number of respondents = 146
(d) Total number of heads of academic units sampled as % of the total number = 51
(e) Total number of respondents as % of the total number of heads of academic units = 36.3
(f) Total number of respondents as % of the sample = 71.2

4.6 Questionnaire Returns

Tables 9 to 13 highlight details of distribution and return of the questionnaires.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total Number of Librarians</th>
<th>Number of Librarians Sampled</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Librarians sampled as % of Total Number of Librarians</th>
<th>Number of Respondents as % of the Total Sample</th>
<th>Number of Respondents as % of the Total number of Librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria, Nsukka</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadu Bello, Zaria</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers derived from calendars of respective universities.
From Tables 9 to 12 one discerns the pattern of distribution and return of Questionnaire I. The return by heads of academic units varied from 42.4% at the University of Ife, Ile-Ife to 94.6% at the University of Ibadan (Table 9). The return of the questionnaires by librarians in the six universities varied from 56.7% at Ahmadu Bello, Zaria to 83.3% at the University of Benin, Benin City (Table 11).

Table 10 reveals that in all 72.6% of the heads of academic units sampled in the six universities returned usable questionnaires. The respondents represent 36.3% of the total number of heads of academic units in the six universities. Table 12 indicates that 71.4% of the librarians sampled returned usable questionnaires. The respondents represent 56.3% of the total number of librarians in the six universities. It is rather interesting that in the two sub-groups, the total number of respondents as percentage of the sample compares favourably; with the heads of academic units this was 71.2% (Table 10) while that of librarians was 71.4% (Table 12).

It is perhaps pertinent to note that the questionnaire responses indicated above were usable ones. These were those completed by heads or acting heads of academic units and
librarians. In some cases the questionnaires for heads of academic units were completed by academic associates of the heads, usually by the teaching/research members of staff who represented the academic units in matters connected with the library services of the academic units or of the university. These were accepted. However, ten of the questionnaires returned were rejected, (two from Zaria; three from Ife; five from Benin). These were rejected because they were not completed and signed by accredited officials: in most cases they were completed and signed by departmental secretaries or some other non-academic staff.

As can be seen from Tables 9 to 12, some heads of academic units and librarians in the study sample did not respond, even after a follow-up letter or visit. The reasons for this can only be speculated upon. It is possible that these people were on sabbatical or away at the time of the exercise.

Table 13 displays the institutional and overall picture of the distribution of the questionnaire on branch libraries. In all the questionnaire was distributed to sixty-four branch libraries in the six universities. Completed questionnaires were received from forty-six. This represents 71.9% response rate. Although the investigator personally visited the branch libraries with copies of the questionnaire, in some cases it was not possible to meet the staff member in charge of the library. Some returned the completed questionnaires later but others did not, even after a follow-up letter or visit.

4.7 Analysis and Presentation of Data

The responses to the two questionnaires were analyzed, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences - SPSS. After coding the responses, the researcher consulted the University of Ibadan Computing Centre on the use of the SPSS programme. The data were subsequently punched. Computation was accomplished in part with the help of the University of Ibadan Computer, IBM 370/153. Those remaining were completed on the Nottingham University ICL 2900 computer through the Midnet
network of Loughborough University Prime System. In a few cases, however, the analyses were manually accomplished.

TABLE 13

THE DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRE ON BRANCH LIBRARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number of Branch Libraries</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Respondents as % of the Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In compliance with/undertaking given in the letters accompanying the questionnaires, data in this report were rendered in aggregates. It is, perhaps, pertinent to observe that where percentages were used, they do not always sum up to 100 percent due to rounding of numbers.

The information derived from the responses are presented in chapters five to seven inclusive. The responses given to each item on the attitude questionnaire by heads of academic units and librarians are listed in Appendix II. To avoid redundancy, information shown in that table will not be repeated in the text. However, percentages will be employed and reference will be made to the specific item in the Appendix.
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CHAPTER FIVE

NATURE OF THE BRANCH LIBRARIES; BEGINNINGS

5.1 Type

The branch libraries covered in this work can be distinguished in terms of the academic units to which they belong in the universities. A departmental library is a component part of an academic department, a faculty library belongs to an academic faculty and so on. To a large extent the scope of the academic field is a mirror to its library and information resources.

In universities, fields of knowledge are usually divided and subdivided into disciplines, subjects, and sometimes into further specialized areas of interest. The basic grouping is into single-subject units, such as archaeology, economics or zoology. Such single subjects are usually the basis of academic departments, hence department of archaeology, department of economics and so on. For virtually all students and many teaching staff, the academic department is the core of the university. Their academic activities and resources (including library and information matters) are often viewed in terms of their academic departments, As explained by Graeme C. Moodie and Rowland Eustance, "For most students and many members of staff, indeed, it may not be an exaggeration to say that the subject-department is the university. And, in the sense that the job of the university is the actual carrying on of teaching and research, the subject-level bodies, such as departments are the essential university: everything else is no more than a supporting service or a practical convenience." (1)

Several academic departments are normally grouped into a faculty, usually on the basis of some affinity. Put differently, a faculty is a group of related academic departments. Moodie and Eustance had explained the bases for such academic groupings. According to them, it may be that such academic departments
provide courses which together constitute the preparation for a specific profession or vocational qualification (as with faculties of law, medicine or theology); or that they are believed to teach complementary subjects (as in faculty of arts); or their methods and data are closely inter-connected (as with the faculties of natural and possibly social sciences). (2)

In some of the universities in Nigeria, colleges have evolved as larger academic groupings in response to the widening of the academic programmes of some faculties. Each college, in the Nigerian context, then represents a grouping of a number of academic faculties. The best known is the college of medicine which can be found in most of the universities. At the University of Ibadan, for instance, the College of Medicine is made up of the Faculty of Basic Medical Sciences, the Faculty of Pharmacy and the Faculty of Clinical Medicine and Dentistry.

The nature of and the rationale for inaugurating research institutes in the universities were discussed in chapter two (2.5.3). Some of these institutes concentrate on research while others also offer courses in their specialized areas.

The details of the departments, faculties and other academic programmes of Nigerian universities are provided in the Commonwealth Universities Year-book. (3)

Table 14 shows the categories of the branch libraries. Out of these, 18 (39.1%) were departmental libraries, 23 (50.0%) were faculty libraries, and five (10.9%) were institute libraries. A close look at the Table shows that the faculty library was the only category represented in each of the six universities. Out of the 23 faculty libraries, five were from the University of Ibadan, two from Nsukka, five from Zaria, three from Ife, six from Lagos and two from Benin.

The 18 departmental libraries were from three of the universities. Thirteen of these were from the University of Ibadan, four from Zaria and one from Ife. Of the five institute libraries, Ibadan, Nsukka, and Ife had one each while the remaining two were from Zaria.
As shown in chapter one (1.5.1), these library units were conveniently grouped as branch libraries. It is, however, necessary to discern if they differ in character. This feeling is reflected at appropriate levels of this report.

In considering the extent of branch libraries in the universities, Nigerian librarians usually focus attention on departmental and faculty libraries. In many cases, departmental libraries were viewed with considerable misgiving by librarians. In his paper on aspects of branch libraries in Nigerian universities, B.O. Adediran ignored departmental libraries altogether on the grounds that "in most cases they are unorganized and are developed by departments for reference purposes and as supplementary collections to the main library collections."(4) A Faniran made scanty reference to them as "departmental reading rooms."(5) They seem to suggest that branch libraries, if any, should operate at the faculty library level.

Nigerian university teachers, on their part, have hardly shown published attention to the matter. However, the fact that these

### TABLE 14

DESIGNATION OF THE BRANCH LIBRARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Departmental Library</th>
<th>Faculty Library</th>
<th>Institute Library</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19(41.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3( 6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11(23.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5(10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6(13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2( 4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18(39.1)‡</td>
<td>23(50.0)</td>
<td>5(10.9)</td>
<td>46(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis
departmental libraries exist, would seem to give indication of their popularity in various academic departments. This observation is somewhat borne out by Dr. Ratcliffe's report which reflected the sentiment of some university teachers to such libraries at Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. (6)

As shown in chapter four (4.5.1) the investigator interviewed some heads of academic units in the course of this work. One of them, the head of a political science department in one of the universities, showed considerable interest in departmental libraries. He explained that he had decided to start one for his department. He in fact acknowledged that his university librarian was clearly against the existence of such library units. However, he had decided to get about the matter by placing some much used books in one room in his department without making it known in the university. Although there were no information materials in that room at the time of the visit, this head of department had in fact touched on how many library units in academic departments are initiated.

Further, his views on such libraries were in no way an isolated case. The responses of heads of academic units and librarians to the viewpoint that academic departments should have separate library units is shown in item one (Appendix II). The two groups viewed the matter from different angles. In all 76.7% of the 146 heads of academic units were in support of the existence of the libraries in academic departments. Those undecided were 6.8% while 16.5% were not in support.

On the contrary the majority, 57.8%, of the 90 librarians responding were not in support of the proposition. Those undecided were 6.7% while 35.5% supported the idea of library units in academic departments.

It is noteworthy that the foregoing observation is to a large extent supported by the ratings of the two groups on whether branch libraries should exist only at the faculty level. (Item 2, Appendix II). The responses are summarized in Table 15.
TABLE 15

RATINGS: ON THE PROPOSITION: ONLY FACULTY LIBRARIES SHOULD EXIST IN ADDITION TO THE MAIN LIBRARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>% of Total Heads of Academic units</th>
<th>% of Total Librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table one discerns that an aggregate of 64.5% of the heads of academic units were not in support of the viewpoint. Those undecided were 6.8% while 28.8% agreed or strongly agreed. On the other hand most of the librarians, 62.3%, were in support. Those undecided were 5.6% while 32.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The rather low level of "undecided" respondents from both the heads of academic units and librarians may be noted. As shown above, in item one, 6.8% of heads of academic units and 6.7% of librarians were undecided. In item two, 6.8% of the heads of academic units and 5.6% of librarians were undecided. The relatively low level of "undecided" respondents will seem to support the view that most of the respondents were reasonably familiar with the subject matter of the investigation.

5.2 Age

Figure 4 gives the overall picture of the age of the branch libraries. None of them was less than one year old. Nine (19.6%) branch libraries were 1-5 years old, 14 (30.4%) were 6-10 years in age and seven (15.2%) were 11-15 years old. The largest single group, 16 (34.8%) were 16 years of age and above.
FIGURE 4

AGE OF THE BRANCH LIBRARIES

Number of Branch Libraries

Age in Years
Table 16 gives the age of the branch libraries in the context of the foundation dates of each of the six universities. A close look at the table reveals that in the two oldest universities (Ibadan and Nsukka), most of the branch libraries were 11 years and above in age. At Ibadan, nine (47.4%) branch libraries were 16 years/older. Out of the remaining, four (21.1%) were 11-15 years old while two aged 1-5 years. At both Nsukka and Ife, none of the branch libraries was established in the previous 1-5 years. At Zaria three branch libraries (27.3%) were 1-5 years old, four (36.4%) were 6-10 years in age and another four (36.4%) were 16 years and above. The two branch libraries at the University of Benin were 1-5 years and 6-10 years old respectively.

As contained in Table 16 there seems to be no systematic link between the foundation dates of the universities (shown in the second column) and the number of branch libraries. True, Ibadan which was the oldest had the largest number of branch libraries and Benin, the most recent had the fewest number. In the other cases no pattern can be discerned in terms of the age of the universities. Zaria had more branch libraries than Nsukka although the later was older in age.

Table 17 shows that in general, departmental libraries were older than faculty libraries. Only one departmental library was 1-5 years old. Five were 6-10 years old and three were 11-15 years of age. The majority, nine (50.0%), of the departmental libraries were 16 years and above. With faculty libraries, the position was quite different. Eight were 1-5 years old. Another eight were 6-10 years old while four were 11-15 years of age. Only three of the faculty libraries were 16 years and above. Four of the institute libraries were 16 years and above and one 6-10 years old.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Foundation Date of University</th>
<th>Age of Branch Libraries in Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2(10.5)</td>
<td>4(21.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1(33.3)</td>
<td>1(33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3(27.3)</td>
<td>4(36.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3(60.0)</td>
<td>1(20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3(50.0)</td>
<td>1(16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1(50.0)</td>
<td>1(50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9(19.6)</td>
<td>14(30.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage (%) in Parenthesis*
### TABLE 17

**AGE BY TYPE OF BRANCH LIBRARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library</td>
<td>1(5.6)</td>
<td>5(27.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Library</td>
<td>8(34.8)</td>
<td>8(34.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(20.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis

#### 5.3 Location

As discussed in chapter two (2.3.4) there is considerable consensus among librarians that academic units located outside the main campus of a university should have branch libraries.

The majority of the branch libraries, 36(78.3%), were physically located on the main campuses of their parent universities. In other words, they were on the same campus as their respective main libraries. The rest, ten (21.7%), were located at different geographical areas outside the main campus of their respective universities.

At Ibadan all the 19 branch libraries responding were on the same campus as the main library. At Nsukka, two were on the campus of the university while one was on a separate campus. At Zaria, five were on the main university campus while seven were in outside geographical areas.

Four of the branch libraries at Ife were on the same campus as the university library. The remaining one belonged to an academic unit located outside the main campus of the University. The six branch libraries at Lagos were on the same campus as the main library of the University. At Benin, one of the branch libraries was on the main campus of the University while the other was located outside it.
5.3.1 Distance to Main Library

The distance of academic units in relation to the main library is a matter that often comes up in arguing for or against the existence of branch libraries. It is loosely accepted that any academic unit that is distant from the main library should have a branch library. How far distant has been considered from various perspectives.

The document produced by Shishko and Raffel laboured to resolve this matter. Their location model was derived from the total cost to the user in travelling from a given place (home department) to the library. The cost was found by multiplying the number of trips made by each user by the cost of each trip. The cost varied depending on whether the user was a professor, lecturer, postgraduate or undergraduate. On the basis of such calculations, universities would be able to determine how far an academic unit should be in order to qualify for a branch library. This approach may have considerable theoretical value. In practice, however, recording the number of times the various categories of users travel from different parts of a university campus to the main library is an extremely complex exercise. Further it is doubtful if distance to the university library can be isolated as the most important single consideration in deciding where to site a branch library.

Other approaches have been suggested. Harvie Branscomb observed that a departmental library would be indispensable for a department located a mile and a half (2.4 kilometres approximately) from the main library. Sam E. Ifidon felt that to be considered for a branch library a faculty should be "at least 5 kilometres (3.1 miles approx.) from the main library." If adopted this suggestion would greatly restrict the number of branch libraries in the universities. In practice the suggestion would limit branch libraries essentially to faculties and other academic units located in separate campuses of the university.

D.L. Smith and E.G. Baxter viewed the matter of distance in terms
of time spent in going to the main library. According to them, "... it may well be true that 10 minutes is too long to spend in going to the bookshelves and back in order to look up some detail between lessons." (10) Richard L. Meier explored this time element further by attaching monetary value to time spent in going to the main library. For faculty members this would be about six U.S. dollars per hour. The average value of student time would be about two dollars per hour. (11) Meier in fact reasoned that the estimate for staff members would be considerably higher if the time cost is viewed in its proper context of opportunity lost in research or teaching. "Since roughly half of the time of faculty is devoted to teaching and the other half to research, we may assume that time used for gaining access to library materials reduces the opportunity for both instruction and research." (12)

In effect nothing precise has emerged as an acceptable minimum distance an academic department, a faculty or institute should be from the main library in order to qualify for a branch library.

Table 18 gives insight into the relative distance of the branch libraries in relation to their respective main libraries. 17 (37.0%) branch libraries were less than one kilometre away from their respective main libraries. 16 (34.8%) branch libraries were 1-1.5 kilometres away from their main libraries. Five or 10.9% were 1.6-2 kilometres away. A relatively low number, 8 (17.4%), of the branch libraries were more than two kilometres away from their respective main libraries. Indeed, these eight were among the ten (21.7%) branch libraries located outside the main university campuses.

Table 19 looks at the relative distance of the branch libraries in the six universities. At Ibadan, the largest single group, nine, were less than 1 kilometre to the university library. Seven were 1-1.5 kilometres away while only three were 1.6-2 kilometres away. None of the branch libraries responding at Ibadan was more than two kilometres from the main library. At Nsukka, two of the branch libraries were less than 1 kilometre from their main library. The other one was more than two kilometres away.
TABLE 18

DISTANCE TO MAIN LIBRARY
(N=46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 kilometre*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1.5 kilometres</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 - 2 kilometres</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 kilometres</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 kilometre = 0.6214 mile

The situation at Zaria seems to be somewhat different. Five of the branch libraries were more than two kilometres from their university library. These were in fact among the seven branch libraries belonging to institutes located outside the university. These findings at Zaria give support to the observation made in chapter three (3.3) that, from its inception, the University absorbed several widely separated institutes together with their libraries.

As contained in Table 19, three branch libraries from Ife and five from Lagos were less than one kilometre from their respective university libraries. Only one at Ife was more than two kilometres away. At the University of Benin, one of the branch libraries was less than one kilometre from the main library while the other one was more than two kilometres away.

In considering the factors that produce dispersed library units in a university, several factors including distance to the main library are in vogue (see chapter two, 2.3). In order to place the issue of distance in its proper context, it is necessary to consider it in relation to other factors in the establishment of specific branch libraries. These are examined in the next section.
## TABLE 19

**DISTANCE TO MAIN LIBRARY BY UNIVERSITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Distance in kilometres</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>1-1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>1.6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses: 19

Number of Responses: 3

Number of Responses: 11

Number of Responses: 5

Number of Responses: 6

Number of Responses: 2
5.4 Factors Responsible in Origin

The question requiring reasons for the establishment of the branch libraries was in two parts. The first part dealt with spontaneous factors prompting the establishment of branch libraries: gift of books from the teaching staff or other benefaction, private foundation (e.g., Ford Foundation) and other. The second part dealt with branch libraries that emerged as a result of a deliberate planning process. Information was also sought on factors that led to the plan.

**TABLE 20**

**FACTORS RESPONSIBLE IN ORIGIN OF BRANCH LIBRARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift from Faculty</td>
<td>36(78.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundation</td>
<td>38(82.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>4(8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Main Library</td>
<td>35(76.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs of Unit</td>
<td>4(8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion of Main Library</td>
<td>33(71.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space in New Building</td>
<td>33(71.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis

**Key to Degree of Importance**

1 = Least important
2 = Somewhat important
3 = Important
4 = Very important
5 = Most important
5.4.1 Gift of Books from Faculty or other Benefactor

This element was clearly not an important factor in the existence of most of the branch libraries responding. Only two (4.3%) branch libraries emerged as a result of gifts of documents from members of teaching staff. For most of the branch libraries, 36 or 78.3%, this factor was the least important one in their establishment. Four (8.7%) considered that gifts were somewhat important. Another four indicated that such gifts were important.

5.4.2 Private Foundation

Again, private foundation was the most important reason in establishing two (4.3%) branch libraries. It was very important in one case, and somewhat important in two of the branch libraries. In most of the responding branch libraries, 38 (82.6%), this factor was the least important in accounting for their establishment.

5.4.3 Planned

Table 20 shows that most of the branch libraries were deliberately planned. 40 (86.7%) of the branch libraries emerged as a result of deliberate plan to establish them. In two cases (4.3%) planning was important while in the remaining four (8.7%), it was the least important factor. The reasons for planning the branch libraries were supplied.

4.3.1 Distance from Main Library

It is interesting that only one respondent considered distance from the main library the most important consideration in planning to establish the branch library. Three others (6.5%) indicated that distance was very important. Four (8.7%) of the respondents considered distance to be somewhat important. For most of the branch libraries, 35 (76.1%), distance to main library was the least important factor for planning.
It is, perhaps, noteworthy that distance to the main university library was not highly rated even by most of those branch libraries that were relatively far. This suggests that, in relative terms, other considerations were more important than distance in establishing those branch libraries. This observation is similar to the findings of David Genaway that quasi-departmental libraries "... were founded and maintained for reasons other than distance from an official library." (13)

5.4.3.2 Special Needs of Academic Unit

In most of the cases, 41 (89.1%), the branch libraries were deliberately planned to fulfil special needs of the academic units. Only four (8.7%) felt that special needs were not the decisive factor in planning the establishment of the branch libraries.

Various components of these special needs are discussed at different parts of this work (eg. chapter one, 1.2). Whether these special information needs are real or imagined, there is no doubt that they have been the time-honoured factors usually emphasized by academic units in demanding separate libraries or justifying their continued existence. Sometimes the branch libraries may be considerably small in terms of book stock and other resources but the urge to maintain them is always alive in most cases. This observation can be illustrated with what happened at the University of California at Berkeley. According to the historian of its library, departmental libraries in that University

... evolved over a period of years in response to the particular needs of professors and students. As early as 1875 the president had reported that book collections for agriculture and mechanical arts had been set up in the lecture rooms used for those subjects. In his first report as librarian (1876) Joseph C. Rowell indicated that in addition to the agriculture and circulating libraries there were collections in the "rooms" of five professors. When the Bacon Library was occupied in 1881, an attempt was made to consolidate all library materials in that building. However, within a few years books were being charged out to heads of departments for "departmental libraries." In time, these collections
contained books purchased with departmental funds, as well as those borrowed from the General Library.(14)

5.4.3.3 Congestion of the Main Library

Four (8.7%) respondents indicated that congestion of the main library was the most important reason for founding the branch libraries. In another three (6.5%) this factor was very important. It was somewhat important in the consideration of three (6.5%) respondents. However, most respondents, 33 (71.7%), felt that this reason was the least important one in planning the branch libraries.

5.4.3.4 Space in New Building

Seven (15.2%) respondents indicated that the branch libraries were planned following the availability of space in a new building of the respective academic units. Four (8.7%) felt that this factor was important and two (4.3%) thought it was somewhat important. In most of the cases, 33 (71.7%), this factor was the least important one.

5.5 Accommodation for Branch Libraries

According to Robert R.Walsh in his "Branch library planning" the accommodation for branch libraries can be one of three forms:

In one, the library will be housed in its own separate new building. In the second, the library will occupy some space in a new building to be shared with other occupants. Finally, part of an existing building can be vacated and renovated for library purposes.(15)

Data concerning the form of accommodation for the branch libraries are shown in Table 21. The table reveals that six (13.0%) branch libraries were housed in separate buildings. Such separate buildings were very close to the parent academic units. Only one, a departmental library, was housed in a multipurpose room. Majority of the branch libraries, 39 (84.8%),
were housed in separate rooms in the same building as their corresponding academic units.

It is perhaps not surprising that most of the branch libraries were accommodated in the same building as their respective academic units. The position of the branch library is usually a major consideration in the minds of advocates of such libraries. As shown in chapter three (3.4.1), university teachers invariably want such libraries sited at the centre of academic activities of the unit. In this way students will be able to leave their lecture rooms and enter the library during lecture-free hours. Also staff members can leave their offices or laboratories and enter the library without loss of considerable time or energy.

### TABLE 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate Quarters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Room</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.5.1 Floor Area

In planning university library buildings considerable effort is required in arriving at the surface area. University library standards sometimes contain specifications on this matter. B.U. Nwafon in his paper on "Standards for Nigerian academic library buildings" grouped existing library building standards into three. These are:

a. Standards that could apply to all library buildings irrespective of size or type, e.g., those affecting book-storage - 10 to 15 volumes per sq.ft., etc.
b. Standards that could apply to all university library buildings irrespective of their geographical locations, e.g., reader station space of 25 sq.ft. per undergraduate student reader;

c. Standards that apply to Nigerian University library buildings only.(16)

However, P. Havard-Williams explained that the surface plan of every university library must be produced in the context of the specific environment of the library. According to him:

One of the fundamental difficulties about providing standards for university library buildings is that answers throughout the world vary as to what replies are given to (i) What is the function of a university? (ii) What is the function of a university library? and therefore (iii) What purposes are served by a university library building? (17)

These searching questions mean that in providing the planning parameters for a university library building, the librarian would estimate the space needs for the book collection, reader seating, service areas and staff work space from the point of view of the specific university.

The surface area for branch libraries, on the other hand, has not been subjected to systematic examination. Kay Birula with years of experience as a branch librarian had suggested a floor space of about 576 square feet (53.5 square metres approximately) for branch libraries serving about 100 to 200 users. (18) Robert R. Walsh considered that in designing the surface area for branch libraries, two issues are involved:

Basically there are two species of decentralization. The first is an operations-oriented pattern based on kinds and forms of materials which occurs in separate libraries for map collections, rare books, documents, audio visual materials, non-Western languages, and so on. The second is user and subject-oriented pattern...(19)

According to him these and similar considerations should be reflected in the floor space of branch libraries. In practice, however, accommodation for branch libraries has in most cases
not evolved from a careful consideration of the requirements of the academic unit. According to Wilfred Ashworth such accommodation "... has not been planned for a library ... Frequently library space has to be found inside departmental buildings and it is hardly ever what the librarian would have chosen." (20)

Although as shown in 5.4.3 above, 86.7% of the branch libraries were planned, this did not imply that their space requirements were considered in the context of the specific needs of the academic units. Any such consideration normally centred on how best to utilize available accommodation in the department, faculty or institute for library purposes.

The floor plan of a faculty library shown in Figure 5 represents a considerably spacious branch library. It has a fairly large study area, open book stacks, circulation desk and a rather multi-purpose separate room which serves as the librarian's office and workroom. In other cases, the floor areas were usually smaller and without any workroom or librarian's office.

As shown in Table 22, there was considerable variability in the floor areas of the branch libraries. The floor areas of 16 (35.6%) branch libraries were 1-100 sq. metres. In 17 (37.8%) cases, the floor areas were 101-200 sq. metres. Five (11.1%) of the branch libraries were in the 201-300 sq. metres range. Each of the remaining seven had above 400 sq. metres floor space: in two of these the floor areas were above 1000 m².

The total floor space of the 45 branch libraries that supplied this information was 11,023 m². The largest branch library in terms of floor space was 1,500 m², the lowest figure was 30 m². The mean was 245 m².

Table 23 shows the aggregate floor space of the branch libraries in each of the six universities. There were variations in the total floor space from one university to the other. To a large extent these variations can be explained in terms of the
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TABLE 22

FLOOR SPACE

(N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square Metres (m²)</th>
<th>Number of Branches **</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 200</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 - 500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 - 800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901 - 1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 - 1100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401 - 1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Floor Space = 11,023 sq. metres. Mean = 245 m²
Range: High = 1500 m²; Low = 30 m²

* 1 square metre (m²) = 1.196 sq. yds.

** One respondent did not supply floor space.

number of responses and the type of branch libraries from each university. The main importance of the totals is that they give insight into the extent of study areas available outside the main library in the universities. Where a main library has space problems, there is no doubt that effective utilization of such areas in the branch libraries will considerably ease pressure at the centre.
TABLE 23

FLOOR AREA (IN m²) BY UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>484.3</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>340.8</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses:
In Table 24 the floor space of the three types of branch libraries is given. Again, to some extent, the totals depend on the number of responses from each type. However, a number of observations are noteworthy. The average floor area for faculty libraries (275.7 m²) is larger than the average for departmental libraries (140.8 m²). In fact the largest single library in terms of floor space was a faculty library with 1,500 m². The relatively high level of floor areas for faculty libraries can be explained in terms of academic programmes. As shown in section one of this chapter (5.1), faculties are usually bigger academic units than departments. The relatively large size of faculties seems to be reflected in their libraries.

However with institute libraries, a different picture begins to emerge. The average floor area for institute libraries (484.6 m²) was the largest. Also the floor area of the smallest institute library (73 m²) was larger than corresponding areas for either faculty or departmental libraries. The smallest faculty library was 35 m² while the floor area of the smallest departmental library was 30 m². This column shows that the smallest of the 45 branch libraries that supplied data was a departmental library (30 m²).
TABLE 25

READER PLACES (SEATS)
(N = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Seats</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Carrels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seats*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 (2.2)*</td>
<td>41 (89.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 20</td>
<td>7 (15.6)</td>
<td>5 (10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>12 (26.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>8 (17.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>5 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-120</td>
<td>5 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-140</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-160</td>
<td>3 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-180</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-200</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis

* Information not supplied by one respondent

Institute libraries, as explained in chapter two (2.5.3) are used extensively by advanced library users. This category of users usually requires larger space. To some extent, the space needs of these special users were reflected in the institute libraries. This largely explains why the average institute library had more space than the average faculty or departmental library.
### Table 26

Reader Places by University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To the nearest integer.
FIGURE 6

SEATING IN MAIN AND BRANCH LIBRARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>IBADAN</th>
<th>NSUKKA</th>
<th>ZARIA</th>
<th>LAGOS</th>
<th>BENIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seats</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 27

READER PLACES BY TYPE OF BRANCH LIBRARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Library</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Library</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Library</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To the nearest integer

5.6 Reader Places (Seats)

A detailed examination of the seating situation in the main university libraries was done in chapter two (2.5.6).

Table 25 gives information concerning the number of seats and carrels available to users in the branch libraries. Most reader places were in the form of long tables for four or six readers with single chairs.

The Table shows that seven (15.6%) of the branch libraries had 1 - 20 seats each. In 12(26.7%) there were 21 - 40 seats for users. Eight (17.8%) had 41 - 60 seats while five (11.1%) had 61 - 80. Another five branch libraries had 101 - 120 seats. Three (6.7%) respondents had 141 - 160 seats each. The remaining four respondents indicated the number of seats as 81 - 100, 121 - 140, 161 - 180 and 181 - 200 respectively.

The total number of seats in the branch libraries was 2889. This means an average of 62.8 seats in each branch library.

Table 25 shows that there were no seats in one branch library. This was a newly provided space for a faculty library. There were books and other documents in stacks by the wall sides.
The only desk and two chairs in the room were for the library staff. On investigation, the writer was informed that students were not allowed into the library. The teaching staff members could enter and borrow materials for use in their offices. The investigator was also informed that arrangements had been made to supply seats in the room. Then students would be allowed to enter and use the library.

5.6.1 Study Carrels

In university libraries, single study carrels are usually provided in answer to seclusion required by the more advanced library user - the research student, academic and senior administrative staff. In the six university libraries, study carrels in form of separate rooms or cubicles are available.

The situation in the branch libraries is different. Out of the 46 branch libraries only five (10.9%) had 1-20 carrels each. These were in fact, mini-carrels. However, they provide some study privacy for advanced library users for whom they were kept.

5.6.2 Seating in the Main and Branch Libraries

Table 26 indicates the extent of seats available in the branch libraries in each of the universities. To some extent, the variations in the aggregate totals can be explained in terms of the number of respondents and type of branch libraries in each university. The table shows that Ibadan had the greatest aggregate number of seats (985) in the branch libraries. Zaria had 904 seats. Benin with only two branch libraries had an aggregate of 340 seats in them. At Nsukka, Ife and Lagos, the totals were 140, 264, and 256 respectively.

The number of seats in the main libraries (Table 5, chapter two) is compared with the aggregate totals in the branch libraries in the grouped-column chart *(Figure 6).*

The figure graphically relates the overall number of seats in the branch libraries of each university with those of the corresponding main library. There is no doubt that where effectively utilized, the seats in the branch libraries would positively reduce seating problems in most of the main libraries (see 2.5.6.1).

Table 27 compares the reader places in the three types of branch libraries. The faculty libraries had an aggregate of 1,781 seats. For departmental libraries this was 878 while the institute libraries had 230. The mean number was 81 for faculty libraries, 49 for departmental libraries and 46 for institute libraries. The relatively large size of faculties (see 5.1) helps to explain why, on the average, they had more seats than either the departmental or institute libraries.
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CHAPTER SIX

NATURE OF THE BRANCH LIBRARIES: ADMINISTRATION, PERSONNEL AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

6.1 Administration

As discussed in chapter three (3.5) findings and views concerning the administrative arrangements for branch libraries are in two broad parts. Branch libraries are usually administered as part of the main university library or by the academic unit to which they belong. The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Committee on Standards gave expert consideration to the matter and stated as follows:

The responsibility for the management of all libraries both main and branch, should rest with the library administration. Library services are most effective when all the institution's library resources are considered part of one system with consistent policies for access, accounting, analysis and the like. Centralized planning and direction are necessary to achieve the best use of the financial resources an institution can allocate for library services. (1)

To determine the overall administrator of a branch library, it is necessary to discern who exercises the financial control of the library. As emphasized by Donald T. Smith "... you do not have administrative control unless you have budgetary control. Without budgetary control, you have administrative control in name only." (2) In view of this reasoning, the question which defined the chief administrator of the branch library was amplified with the phrase "approves expenditure." The responses are presented in Table 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Administrator</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Academic Unit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of Academic Unit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the Table it can be observed that the branch libraries were administered by either the university librarian or the head of the academic unit. In 24 (52.2%) of the branch libraries, the chief administrator was the university librarian. Seventeen (37.0%) were administered by heads of the academic units to which the branch libraries belong. The rest, five (10.9%) were administered by a committee of the academic unit. These five were in effect administered by heads of academic units since such committees were usually formed and controlled by him.

The idea of the committee approach to the administration of branch libraries is, perhaps, not surprising. Committees and boards are important elements at every level of university administration. Thus, some heads of academic units reflect the committee system in the administration of branch libraries. In his survey of the faculty, departmental and special libraries at the University of Cambridge, D.W. Butcher observed that such libraries were integral parts of their academic units and were in some cases administered by appropriate boards of the academic unit. (3)

It is noteworthy that the matter of shared administrative arrangement reported in the 1960's (see chapter 3.5) was not observed in the present investigation. It seems that over the years such arrangements were phased out and the respective branch libraries were administered by either the university librarian or the head of academic unit.

Table 29 gives information concerning the administrative arrangement for the branch libraries in the six universities (see next page). There were considerable differences.

The variations in the administrative structure of the branch libraries can to a large extent be explained in the context of the historical development of the libraries. As shown in chapter one (1.2), branch libraries were usually formed by academic units to enrich their academic programmes. Departmental, faculty and institute libraries were usually establis-
shed and nurtured by their corresponding academic units. The main library attention to their potential in the overall university library service is a relatively recent phenomenon.

TABLE 29

CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR BY UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Chief Administrator</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>Head of Academic Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>17(89.5)⁺</td>
<td>2(10.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>2(66.7)</td>
<td>1(33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>1(9.1)</td>
<td>6(54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>1(20.0)</td>
<td>4(80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>1(16.7)</td>
<td>4(66.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2(100)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁺ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis

This observation is largely supported by the situation at Ibadan. According to A. Faniran, "as far back as April 1967, discussions had been initiated on the takeover, by the Main Library, of the faculty libraries and departmental reading rooms that have developed on their own over the years." (4) In fact, at Ibadan the case for the centralized administration of the branch libraries in the University was made to the Development Committee. In 1970 this Committee decided that the branch libraries should come under the aegis of the University Library. (5)

Table 29 shows that the decision of the Development Committee at Ibadan has, to a large extent, produced the desired result. The majority, 17(89.5%), of the branch libraries were administered as outposts of the University Library. Only two(10.5%) were still administered by heads of academic units. The situation at Nsukka was somewhat similar. Two of the branch libraries there were administered by the University Librarian and the other one by the head of the academic unit.
The situation at Zaria (Table 29) supports the observation made in chapter three (3.5) that the University Library offers essentially advisory and consultative service to the branch libraries of that University. In effect, it had no effective administrative control of the branch libraries in the University. Ten (90.9%) of the branch libraries were administered by their respective heads of academic units, either directly or by committee. Only one was administered by the main library.

Branch libraries at the University of Lagos were largely similar to those at Zaria from the administrative point of view. During the investigator's visit, it was observed that the University Library had evolved an ad hoc arrangement whereby each branch was overseen by a professional librarian from the main library. This was essentially a liaison arrangement. The librarian as part of his official duties visits the branch library assigned to him from time to time. He generally looks after the operations and services of the branch library and sometimes holds discussion with the respective head of academic unit on matters concerning the branch library. However, the effective administration of most of the branch libraries, five (83.3%), were in the hands of the academic units. Only one was administered by the University Library.

At Ife, one of the branch libraries was administered by the University Library. The remaining four were in the hands of the corresponding heads of academic units. At Benin, the youngest of the universities, the two branch libraries were integral parts of the main library from its inception.

At Ibadan and Zaria a clear channel of communication between the branch libraries and their university libraries has emerged. This was through a coordinator of branch library services. As already explained, at Ibadan this position was designated "Co-ordinator of Departmental, Faculty and Institute Libraries." (Figure I). At Zaria there was the Departmental Libraries Unit in the main library and headed by a senior librarian (3.5). These coordinators belonged to the main library management team and were responsible to the university librarian.
A similar administrative arrangement exists between the central library and the sixteen branch libraries at the University of Queensland. According to Mary O'Mara the arrangement has produced improved communication between the central library and the branch libraries in that University. (6)

6.2 Funding

Closely related to administration is the matter of funding branch libraries. As already observed, in order to have effective administration, it is necessary for budgetary control to be in the hands of the authority vested with administrative control.

University libraries in Nigeria, like their counterparts in British and American universities, are funded by their parent universities. This contrasts with the position in some European countries where university libraries are the responsibility of appropriate government departments.

The foregoing observation gives reasonable insight into the source of funds for branch libraries. As units within universities, it seems straightforward to regard their financial needs as the responsibility of the university in which they exist. However, their very nature as special collections within the universities sometimes means that they tend to be maintained by special funds. These special sources of funds include private foundation, bequeath or donation from an individual or professional association. Even where the funds were provided by the parent university it is necessary to know whether this is integrated with the main library budget or that of the appropriate academic unit.

Previous studies have focussed attention on the various forms of financing branch libraries. Paul W.T. Poon considered donation an important element in the existence of branch libraries. According to him branch libraries "can more easily attract donations, either money or books because donors tend to donate to what they are most interested in." (17)
At the University of Capetown, the funds for the five branch libraries in the University are provided by the University as part of the funds for library services. Such funds are administered and controlled by the University Library. (8) At the University of Cambridge the situation is different and somewhat varied. According to Butcher, "with regard to the problem of finance, only a few - very few - have endowments of their own, so that by far the greater number are maintained entirely by grants from University funds, these grants being usually included in the general cost of departmental maintenance." (9) Sometimes both the main library and the appropriate academic unit jointly provide funds for branch libraries. Joan Barry observed this pattern of arrangement: "At the University of Sydney, a number of existing branch libraries started life as departmental libraries with the greater part of their collections funded by the Library, but also with some provision from departmental finances; in this phase of their existence, the staffing and supervision of these were the responsibility of the teaching departments." (10)

To discern how the branch libraries in the six universities were financed, possible sources of such funds in Nigeria were identified. These include university funding, grants from government, private foundation, staff gifts of cash and sale of duplicate or old material. Respondents were asked to indicate the amount derived from appropriate source(s) in the academic year. Only one respondent indicated that it had a grant of N5,000 * from the University Library. Others were unable to indicate the real amount derived from various sources; they supplied the percentage of total income that was derived from specific sources.

Poor record keeping was responsible for the inability to obtain the real amount derived from the various sources. Christian C. Aguolu who had sought similar information on aspects of university library funding experienced much the same problem. He observed, "The nature of the financial record keeping at the universities made it impossible to collect any reliable data concerning actual expenditures." (11) If difficulties existed in getting

* \[ \text{N} = \text{£0.9} \] approximately
real figures in respect of university libraries, the situation appeared worse in the respect of branch libraries. It was by no means easy to derive the overall financial resources for book purchase, supplies, personnel, maintenance, etc, as asked for in the questionnaire. However, from the percentages supplied, one gets a general insight into the financial arrangement for the branch libraries.

The responses show that the branch libraries were completely funded by their respective universities. In 24 (52.2%) of the branch libraries, such funds formed part of the budget of the main library which administered such libraries. In the rest, 22 (47.8%), the funds formed part of the overall budget of their respective academic units. The situation in each university was the same as the administrative arrangements for the branch libraries discussed above. (6.1)

The attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians towards this matter of channeling funds for branch libraries were quite different. A majority (61%) of the 146 heads of academic units were of the view that the branch library budget and supplies should be integrated with those of the academic units. Those undecided on the matter were 4.8% while the rest, 32.2%, were not in support. (Appendix II, Item 5) On the other hand, 62.3% of the librarians were not of the view that branch libraries should be funded through the academic units.

The views of librarians are confirmed by their responses to the statement: "Branch library budget and supplies should form part of the main library budget and supplies." (Appendix II, Item 6) The responses show that 71.1% of the librarians were in support, 5.6% undecided while 23.4% were not in support.

It is rather noteworthy that to 23.4% of the librarians, it did not sound proper to integrate the funds of branch libraries with those of main libraries. Some of the librarians had worked in branch libraries ran as part of the academic units before they became part of the main library administration. The comments of such librarians seem pertinent. They accept that
centralization of funds and supplies at the main library is necessary for systematic library and information services. At the same time they felt that it was more convenient to derive part of their funding and supplies from the academic units. This would increase their sense of belonging to the unit in which the branch library exists.

This sort of nostalgia is sometimes frowned at by the university library administration. In some cases, such feelings can lead to demands for special consideration for the branch at the expense of the university-wide library and information services. Brian Southwell feels that this is largely a human issue which the university librarian should resolve. He observed: "There is . . . on the part of many of us administrators a very real fear that the staff in their far-flung outposts (branch libraries) will go native, will throw in their lot with the group they serve rather than the group to whom they belong . . . They will speak in strange tongues, and begin to demand special consideration for their clients. . . To balance these competing demands and to help the branch librarian maintain a balance between his two interacting loyalties is . . . part of the boss-man's burden." (12)

6.3 Personnel

The extent of library and information services is often a matter of the calibre of the library personnel. In the industrialized countries, it is true that advances in technology have had remarkable impact on information handling and services. Yet the importance of personnel in interpreting and maximising the potential of information resources has never been in doubt. Likert considered the matter of personnel in general and remarked, "All activities of any enterprise are initiated and determined by persons who make that institution. Plants, offices, computers, automated equipment, and all else that a modern firm uses are unproductive except for human effort and direction." (13)

This statement helps to illuminate the usual interest in personnel matters in organizations. Harrison Bryan in his book on
university libraries had, in a lucid manner, focussed attention on the importance of personnel in the overall library and information work:

If it is true that an adequate building is not utterly essential to the functioning of a library, it is less possible to support the proposition that the effective transfer of information does not depend substantially on the quality of the library staff. Quite central to that transfer are the successive concerns of the staff to acquire, arrange and provide access to the books and other materials, to establish the links of usability with them and with other sources and to assist readers in their search. (14)

The trend is hardly different in university libraries in Nigeria judging from the extent of studies on staffing patterns and problems. An insight into the personnel situation in the university libraries is necessary in understanding the character of the staff of the branch libraries. The personnel in these libraries are in three broad categories, namely, professional, subprofessional and non-professional.

6.3.1 The Professional Staff

Initial entry into the professional library cadre is by the possession of a recognized professional qualification. Such qualifications are usually obtained following the successful completion of a prescribed course of studies and sometimes some practical experience. Sam E. Ifidon has considered the various professional qualifications in the Nigerian library science. (15) These include A.L.A., B.A., B.L.S., Diploma(Postgraduate), F.L.A., M.L.S., M.A., M.Sc., M.Phil., and Ph.D.

In effect, each professional librarian in Nigeria has one or more of these qualifications. It is also evident that there are both graduate and non-graduate professional qualifications. However, most librarians in Nigeria have graduate qualifications. In his work which examined the career and mobility of 267 Nigerian librarians, Briggs C. Nzotta gave ample space to the qualifications they had. The overall picture was as follows:
11.6% were non-graduate librarians who had either the associateship or fellowship certificates (A.L.A. or F.L.A.) of the British Library Association.

4.9% were librarians who after first of all obtaining the A.L.A. or F.L.A. certificates went on to a library school for graduate qualification, usually the M.L.S.

12.0% had bachelor's degree in library studies (B.L.S).

61.5% were graduates with postgraduate qualifications in library studies. (16)

The number and qualifications of librarians working in Nigerian universities is shown in Table 30 in the context of the overall qualifications of the professional staff in various types of libraries. Of the 126 librarians in the universities, only 4 or 3.2% had non-graduate professional qualifications. The rest were graduate librarians.

The low level of non-graduate librarians in the universities can be explained. Although librarianship is relatively new in Nigeria (2.5.1), it was realized that the educational qualification of librarians would be an important factor in raising the quality of library and information services in the universities. Thus, in the early 1950's it was possible to gain employment in the university libraries with non-graduate professional qualifications. In the 1960's this trend had phased out. The University of Ibadan, for instance, ceased to employ non-university graduates at the professional level in 1964. At the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, a similar policy was introduced in 1966. (17)

In fact, many of the non-graduate librarians had utilized the continuing education programmes in some universities to gain graduate qualifications. From Table 30 (see next page) it can be seen that 4.0% of the librarians in the universities had taken such courses and gained the M.L.S. degree. "These are men and women who on realizing the changing trend towards a graduate profession seized the opportunities offered in some library schools abroad to raise their qualifications to university degrees. In this way they prepared themselves for continued career advancement in a profession that is fast becoming
**TABLE 30**

**QUALIFICATIONS OF NIGERIAN LIBRARIANS BY TYPE OF LIBRARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Public &amp; National</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Library School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA or PLA</td>
<td>4 3.2</td>
<td>2 8.7</td>
<td>22 29.3</td>
<td>3 13.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA + MLS</td>
<td>5 4.0</td>
<td>1 4.3</td>
<td>5 6.7</td>
<td>2 9.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLS</td>
<td>14 11.1</td>
<td>2 8.7</td>
<td>13 17.3</td>
<td>2 9.1</td>
<td>1 4.8</td>
<td>32 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree + ALA or PGDL</td>
<td>61 48.4</td>
<td>11 47.8</td>
<td>13 17.3</td>
<td>8 36.4</td>
<td>4 19.0</td>
<td>97 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree + MLS</td>
<td>26 20.6</td>
<td>6 26.1</td>
<td>18 24.0</td>
<td>6 27.3</td>
<td>9 42.9</td>
<td>65 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree + PGDL or MLS</td>
<td>10 7.9</td>
<td>1 4.3</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 23.8</td>
<td>18 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>4 3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
<td>1 4.5</td>
<td>2 9.5</td>
<td>8 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126 100.0</td>
<td>23 100.0</td>
<td>75 100.0</td>
<td>22 100.0</td>
<td>21 100.0</td>
<td>267 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a totally graduate profession in Nigeria and shutting up virtually all avenues hitherto open to non-graduates for advancement." (18)

The issue of graduate qualification for librarians is in fact, not a Nigerian phenomenon. It is a world-wide trend. In the United States, librarianship has, for many years, been a fully graduate profession. (19) In an aptly captioned book, *Apprentice to graduate* . . . Gerald Bramely also reviewed how librarianship has become a graduate profession in the United Kingdom. (20)

6.3.2 The Subject Specialist Plan

Usually, however, a major consideration concerning the qualification of a graduate librarian is the nature of his subject background. The question has gained attention in response to increasing emphasis on meeting the needs of users. This is also the central issue of subject specialization in university libraries. Subject specialization has a natural link with branch libraries which exist as special subject collections. It is therefore necessary to examine the concept and practice of subject specialization in university libraries in some detail.

In chapter two (2.3.5) the nature of subject specialization was introduced in the discussion of administrative arrangements in university libraries. Charles A. Crossley has brought together the objectives of subject specialization:

1. To provide a stock of books and other library materials designed to serve the total readership of the library concerned with a given subject area.

2. To provide assistance to readers in their search for library materials, or in their use of the facilities and services, and in their search for information.

3. To provide tuition in the use of bibliographical and reference works so that a reader may find information for himself in the appropriate subject area to meet both his immediate and his long-term needs.

4. To provide liaison between teaching staff and the library service in the relevant subject area.
5. To provide information service drawing the attention of teaching and research staff to new publications relevant to their work.

6. To provide bibliographies, guides, reading lists, etc., for readers in his own subject area.

7. To provide assistance with classification and cataloguing problems and to help to formulate policies for these processes within his subject area. (21)

Crossley also provided strategies for the guidance of subject specialists and other interested persons in achieving the objectives. However, it is doubtful if any university library can fulfil these objectives for every subject field covered in the university. Nevertheless, they are very helpful for specifying the extent of the responsibilities and functions of a subject specialist.

In some universities, the issue of subject specialization is not just a theoretical proposition; it has been put into practice with varying degrees of intensity. As shown in chapter two (2.3.5), a somewhat undiluted form of subject specialization was introduced at the University of East Anglia. A variant model was designed and practised at the University of Sussex. As a member of the library staff who participated in the arrangement, Peter Durey described its nature and benefit:

The most senior members of staff after the university librarian were two sub-librarians — one in charge of acquisitions and the other in charge of cataloguing. The remainder of the graduate staff (designated as assistant librarians) all had subject responsibilities and it was the range of work which they were required to do which marked the greatest difference from a more conventionally organised library system. Each assistant librarian was responsible for book selection... in the subject or subjects which had been allocated to him...

A marked difference from the way in which material was acquired by the library as compared by many older British university libraries was the amount of selection carried out by the library staff. At Sussex assistant librarians who enjoyed the confidence of members of teaching staff selected practically all the additions to stock in that area. Others who were less sure of their ground acted more as a communication link with the teaching staff whose requests were channelled through them to the library. Normally individuals in this
category took over an increasing amount of selection as their knowledge of the bibliography of the subject improved. (22)

In addition to single subject specialists, some university libraries would require area specialists for area studies such as Oriental, African or Latin American Studies. Such area studies are usually interdisciplinary in nature. This pattern of specialization is common in West African university libraries. According to A.J.E. Dean, "At the moment, though, most of the specialists on the staff of university and college libraries are appointed to develop special collections rather than each specific section of the classified sequence, but that at least is a step in the right direction." (23)

Subject specialization is of course not feasible in very large universities. W.L. Gutsman and Peter Durey believe that it best fits universities with student population of between 3,000 and 8,000. (24) In larger university libraries, geographical, communications and related problems will mean that different administrative arrangements will need to be applied. There are modified forms of subject specialization. Thus in some universities one finds a considerable degree of subject specialization within essentially functional administrative systems. In cataloguing departments work is sometimes allocated on the basis of subject interest or language expertise of staff. Collection development is another function often performed on the basis of subject expertise or interest.

K.W. Humphreys has observed that extreme specialization would hinder the progress of a professional librarian. "... whilst the subject specialist may be giving splendid service within a very small segment of the total library organisation, he will not become acquainted with all aspects of library work and is therefore unable to be promoted to posts demanding an overall knowledge of library administration." (25) It only appears proper to ensure that arrangements are provided to enable subject specialists gain broader administrative experience in the library. A good way of realizing this is to provide appor-
opportunities for the specialists to work in various departments
of the library.

What seems to emerge is that subject specialization and its
variations provide creative opportunities for university
libraries to make the best use of available human resources in
raising the standard of library and information services. From
a wider angle, one cannot but agree with Holbrook that the whole
concept of subject specialization has brought about "... massive changes in the philosophy of librarianship itself,
involving the shift from custodial to exploitative attitudes." (26)

6.3.3 Qualifications of Subject Specialists.

The specialist nature of functions in university libraries
organized along subject lines means that special consideration
is given to the qualifications of staff who work as subject librarians. In fact the whole concept of subject specialization aims to link the professional library staff with functions requiring their subject expertise. W.L. Guttsman, a well-known exponent of the concept, stated "... it seemed possible to develop a pattern of university librarianship which on the graduate staff level would permit a combination of specific academic learning and skills with a variety of tasks." (27)

The possession of a first or a higher degree in a relevant subject is the usual requirement for providing specialist library services in a subject. A. Holbrook observed, "The subject specialist would normally have obtained at least a first degree in the subject concerned, this supplemented by a postgraduate course in librarianship." (28)

The foregoing requirement is usually specified in recruiting professional staff in Nigerian university libraries. According to B.U. Nwafor, "Since about the mid-sixties an increasing number of Nigerian academic libraries have been insisting that senior staff should possess both academic and professional qualifications." (29) The academic background usually stressed is at least a good university degree in a subject (or combination of subjects) other than library studies. In his paper
on standards of practice for West African university libraries, Jonathan O. Dipeolu has explained why professional librarians should have subject background:

It is urged that they (librarians) should at least be university graduates. . . High qualifications are demanded of librarians not merely because they desire parity of status with teaching staff but because people who are called upon to provide and serve the needs of an academic library must themselves possess academic training, in order, for instance, to take effective part in acquisition work which is possibly the most essential task of the academic librarian, who must of necessity be a subject specialist. (30)

It seems generally accepted that a subject specialist in the university should possess a university degree in the relevant subject. At the same time it is reasoned that a professional librarian without a subject background can with interest and experience fulfil the subject specialist functions. K.W. Humphreys emphasized this interpretation in his definition of a 'subject specialist':

a subject specialist is a member of a library staff appointed to develop one or more aspects of a library's technical or reference service in a particular subject field. Although he would normally already have some experience in this field and would commonly have obtained a first or research degree in the subject, it is not essential that he should have qualifications in the subject when he is appointed. (31)

Charles A. Crossley went a step further. He felt that the term 'subject specialist' is misleading and should be replaced with 'subject specialist librarian.' According to him, "There is a distinct likelihood that readers will misinterpret the term (subject specialist) to mean 'an expert in the subject concerned' rather than 'one who devotes himself to a particular branch of a profession'. Commonsense and honesty suggest that the word 'librarian' be added to the designation." The point of view is that a professional librarian with genuine interest in a subject will in time develop the required ability to deal with the information resources and services of that area. Crossley's experience as a subject specialist librarian embracing four
major branches of engineering and several offshoots illustrates that the specialist librarian need not possess a university degree in the relevant subject. (32)

However, other avenues exist for acquiring or updating the required subject knowledge. H. Schur and W. L. Saunders examined the problem in their study sponsored by the Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI) of the Department of Education and Science (DES) of Great Britain. This was a study of "the form and contents of education and training required at all levels for work in scientific and technological libraries and information departments." The report made it clear that apart from full-time, full-length courses, both the professional qualifications and subject background can be gained through the following short courses: (i) updating, refresher, retraining type of courses; (ii) courses on current trends and new developments; (iii) courses on specialist topics; (iv) gap-filling courses and (v) scientific subjects - intensive short courses to provide background in subjects such as chemistry, engineering or physics for the benefit of science information personnel who may have professional background but with little or no formal scientific knowledge. (33)

6.3.4 Branch Libraries and Subject Specialization

As special collections in the universities, branch libraries exist as subject collections as a matter of course. Their very nature make them a fertile ground for subject specialist librarians who would be responsible for all aspects of work of that library from stock development to reader services. This is true of not only departmental libraries but also of faculty and institute libraries. As A. Holbrook remarked, the subject field of a specialist librarian "... may be fairly narrow, or, more typically be broad enough to cover an umbrella of related disciplines contained in a faculty/school/departmental structure." (34)

Such a librarian in fact earns the respect of his patrons - the teaching staff and students alike. For instance, R.F.M.
Irnmelman observed that "the students in the law library (University of Cape Town) consult the assistant-in-charge with more confidence, as regards their book needs, when they find that he knows more about the subject than they do."(35)

6.3.5 Subject Background of Librarians in the Six Universities

As already seen, possession of appropriate subject background is given considerable emphasis in the recruitment of the professional staff in Nigerian university libraries. The extent to which this stated policy is reflected in the existing staffing patterns in the six university libraries covered in this work is contained in Table 31.

**TABLE 31**

| UNIVERSITY LIBRARY | Number of Librarians | Subject Background | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|
|                     |                      | Humanities | Social Sciences | Science and Technology | Other |
| Ibadan              | 33                   | 52%       | 6%           | 24%                  | 18%   |
| Nsukka              | 20                   | 30%       | 10%          | 20%                  | 40%   |
| Zaria               | 11                   | 55%       | 9%           | 9%                   | 27%   |
| Ife                 | 18                   | 67%       | 11%          | 11%                  | 11%   |
| Lagos               | 28                   | 57%       | 25%          | 11%                  | 7%    |
| Benin               | 12                   | 42%       | 50%          | 8%                   | 0%    |
| Overall             | 122                  | 50%       | 18%          | 13%                  | 19%   |


From Table 31 it can be observed that librarians with background in the area of humanities were more than those in any other area of study. Only 13% of the librarians in the six universities held degrees in the area of science and technology.
The last column in Table 31 shows the percentage of the professional staff who had professional qualifications in librarianship without subject background at a degree level. Nsukka with the 40% had the largest number of librarians in this category. It is noteworthy that at Benin, no professional librarian was lacking in subject background.

An explanation may be given to this Benin phenomenon. The University of Benin, founded in 1970, came at the period when the issue of subject background in the university libraries was receiving increasing emphasis in professional circles. Within practical limits, the library was able to reflect the prevailing trends in its recruitment policy. In this way, it has been able to ensure that all its professional staff had background in subjects other than library and information studies. However, like other university libraries, graduates in science and technology were lower in number than those in either arts or the social sciences.

The prevailing character of the subject backgrounds of the professional library staff in the universities is to a large extent a reflection of the country's high level manpower patterns. Science and engineering graduates are usually scarce. With such inducements as higher salaries and long periods of study leave, most of the graduates in science and technology are quickly absorbed by research institutes, university departments and appropriate commercial and industrial establishments. Some university libraries, however, have tried something similar. Jonathan O. Dipeolu (36) has described the practice of employing fresh graduates with critical subject backgrounds. Such entrants are usually designated librarians-in-training. They work for one or two years in the library before they are granted study leave with pay and other benefits to enter a university for a professional course in library studies. From Table 31, it seems, however, that the impact of this has been slim.

3.6 Nigerian Library Schools and Manpower Development

The extent of the subject background of librarians is a mirror to the nature of the products of Nigerian library schools.
Briggs C. Nzotta (37) in his work has shown that 65% of librarians in Nigerian universities received their professional education in local library schools. The rest, 35%, attended library schools abroad, principally in the United Kingdom and the United States.

The first seat of library education in the country was the Institute of Librarianship, University of Ibadan, established in 1960. The library school was founded with robust financial support of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. In 1970, the Institute was integrated into the Faculty of Education and renamed Department of Library Studies. The stated objectives of the library school are:

(i) to educate the leadership for the library profession;

(ii) to train supporting para-professional staff for libraries;

(iii) to conduct research into the problems of libraries and library operations in Africa;

(iv) to provide further education opportunities for experienced members of the profession;

(v) to provide a forum for discussion on problems of African librarianship. (38)

At first the library school at Ibadan admitted well-qualified non-graduates as well as university graduates into its professional programme. However, since the beginning of the 1965/66 academic year, only university graduates are admitted into the professional programmes of the Department. For the first three years of its existence, the library school prepared candidates for the United Kingdom Library Association A.L.A. examination. In 1963, it phased out the A.L.A. and replaced it with the programme leading to the award of Diploma in Librarianship of the University of Ibadan. In 1976, the post-graduate diploma programme was replaced with the one calendar year M.L.S. course. The full account of the origins and development of the Department of Library Studies is given in the papers by John Dean (39), F. Adetowun Ogunsheye (40), and Dorothy Obi. (41)
# TABLE 32
SUBJECT BACKGROUND OF THE POST-GRADUATE DIPLOMA STUDENTS, 1960/61 TO 1973/74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arts 1</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Science 2</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>General involving more than one subject</th>
<th>Total number of students per session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961/62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962/63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963/64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964/65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965/66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966/67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967/68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971/72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972/73</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973/74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see next page for notes)
The subject background of the students of the Department from 1960 to 1974 when it offered the postgraduate diploma programme is given in Table 32. From the Table it can be seen that 48.0% of the overall output of the library school within the period were graduates of arts subjects. Those who held degrees in the area of the social sciences (including education and law) were 26.4% while only 13% were science and technology graduates. The rest held general degrees.

The foregoing pattern has considerably changed since 1976 when the one year M.L.S. course was introduced. Between 1976 and 1981, the aggregate number of M.L.S. holders was 92. Of these 41(44.6%) were graduates in arts (including languages). Those who held first degree in the area of the social sciences numbered 14 or 15.2%. The rest, 37(40.2%), were graduates in science and technology. (42) This shows that there has been appreciable improvement in the number of science and technology graduates in the professional cadre. In fact recent student lists in the Department show that relatively higher number of science graduates now go for the M.L.S. course. With this development, the indications are that in the near future there will be relatively higher number of science graduates in the university libraries.

As seen above, the professional programme at the Department of Library Studies, University of Ibadan has been essentially at the post-graduate level. This placed considerable limitation on the number of librarians it is able to produce. Even then, one library school for a country as vast as Nigeria was seen

Table 32 Contd.

1. Includes English, classics, history, fine arts, humanities, religious studies, languages.

2. Includes sociology, geography, economics, psychology, political science.

to be inadequate. The need for more librarians was felt in the country, particularly in the northern parts. This need was such that F.A. Sharr, who made a government-supported study of the library needs of Northern Nigeria, made a strong case for the establishment of a library school at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. (43) Sharr's report was critical of the professional programme at Ibadan. It attributed the school's limited student enrolment to its requirement of university degree as admission qualification. He therefore suggested a B.L.S. programme for the library school of his vision at Zaria. An independent observer shared much of Sharr's views on this matter.

In both Nigeria and Ghana the deliberate choice has been made to elevate professional library education to postgraduate level with the only variant from this being provided by the undergraduate course at Ahmadu Bello. The intention is, presumably, to provide the library profession with dynamic leaders who will fashion the library services of both countries along modern progressive lines. The danger is that as the numbers of professional posts grow in both countries, there may not be enough graduate librarians to meet the needs of these libraries. The possibility is that professional posts in libraries will be filled by non-professional staff, conceivably the library technicians who have been trained by the university library schools. In spite of reservations which have already been noted, on the wisdom of introducing an undergraduate course in librarianship, the course at Ahmadu Bello would seem to have possibilities for the future in Nigeria. (44)

The Department of Library Science at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, started in 1966 with the B.L.S. programme. This has been a three year degree course. In time the Department began to offer the one year M.L.S. course which is open to both B.L.S. holders and graduates in other fields.

The Zaria B.L.S. model was at inception received with considerable scepticism in professional circles in Nigeria. This was largely because it offered a professional programme at undergraduate level*. However, the programme has now gained

* For details on this and related matters on library education in Nigeria, readers are referred to:
acceptance in the country. The evidence for this is not far to see. There are today four additional universities offering the B.L.S. programme: University of Maiduguri; Bayero University, Kano; Imo State University, Etiti; University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

The matter of the components of the B.L.S. curriculum is often given scanty or no attention. An insight into this seems relevant in the present context. Some of the graduates of the programme are in fact branch librarians and it is necessary to see the sort of background they bring to their work. Table 33 shows the content of the three year B.L.S. programme at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

From the Table one sees that, in addition to courses in library studies, the students have to study two subjects in other departments of the University. In the second year, they continue with the subsidiary courses in the subject areas of their interest. In this way their second year programme builds on what they had taken in the first year.

The coverage of these subjects is understandably quite below the first degree level. Nevertheless, the students have gained reasonable knowledge of such subjects. With interest, one can develop this knowledge further, even after qualifying as librarian, along the lines suggested by Schur and Saunders. (45) Where they are appropriately deployed in university libraries, it seems obvious that this knowledge will be put to considerable use in duties requiring subject background or interest.

Doris O. Bozimo has recently examined the curriculum of the B.L.S. programme at Zaria. She suggested that students who had, as one of the entry qualifications, G.C.E. A/L in such subjects as economics, geography, English and so on should be encouraged to continue with them while on the B.L.S. programme. She reasoned, "This will enable them to build up their much needed subject background which is indispensable to effective work particularly in university and special libraries". She also suggested that the B.L.S. course should be restructured for at least some categories of students so as to increase "their contact hours in non-library subjects". (46)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Courses in Library Studies</th>
<th>Other Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year I</td>
<td>a. Organization of knowledge</td>
<td>Any two of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Reference service</td>
<td>a. Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sociology of library Science</td>
<td>b. History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year II</td>
<td>a. Organization of knowledge</td>
<td>c. Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Bibliography</td>
<td>d. Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Administration of Libraries</td>
<td>e. French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. History of Libraries</td>
<td>f. English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Research Methodology</td>
<td>g. Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year III</td>
<td>Any six of the following:</td>
<td>Students continue with the two subsidiary subjects taken in Year I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Compilation of Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Book Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Collection Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Comparative Librarianship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Serials in Libraries and Journal Editing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Management Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Librarianship of Audio-visual Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ahmadu Bello University : Faculty of Education Department of Library Science Prospectus 1981/82. Typescript, 4.

It is clear from Table 33 that science subjects are not part of the B.L.S. curriculum. This seems rather curious in a country where there is a pronounced need of librarians with background
in science and technology. The reason has to do with the entry qualifications of the B.L.S. students. The paper by Doris O. Bozimo shows that none has so far passed the G.C.E. A/L in science subjects. This means they could not register for courses in science departments. In explaining this phenomenon Bozimo has given more insight into why librarians with science background are scarce in Nigeria:

The choice of other subjects for the degree programme (B.L.S.) has so far excluded those in the Faculty of Science where students must attain A/L papers in the relevant science subjects as a precondition for class attendance. The students' record in Library Science up till 1981 reveal a dearth of students with A/L papers in pure sciences. What few students apply to the University with adequate science background have literally been grabbed by the Science, Medical and Technological Faculties to augment the meagre personnel that the country so badly needs. Consequently, the other academic subject options have been in the humanities and social sciences. (47)

This section has been with reason tilted to issues concerning the subject background and first professional qualifications of librarians. In brief, it is necessary to mention that the library schools (Ibadan and Zaria) also offer research degrees in various aspects of library and information studies. The training of the sub-professional library staff is discussed at a later stage of this chapter.

6.3.7 Staff of the Branch Libraries

As in the main library, staff is an essential link between the information resources of a branch library and its users. This means that high quality staff is indispensable in the provision of high quality services. However, because of the variations in the type and character of branch libraries it is not easy to reach a consensus on their staffing formula. Be that as it may, it is necessary that branch libraries have professional library staff at least on part-time basis. Both the U.S. Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the Canadian University Library Standards Committee stressed the importance of appropriate staffing for branch libraries:
Competent staffing should be provided to insure the proper development and use of the library's collection. (48)

There should be access at all times to professional reference service and supervision either through a communications link, or by part-time professional staffing or full-time professional staffing, depending on the size of the library. It is desirable that professional librarians in a departmental library have education related to the subject discipline of the library. (49)

The staff of the 46 branch libraries covered in this work are in three broad categories as in the main libraries: the professional staff; subprofessional staff (library officer), and non-professional staff. However there is considerable variation in the nature of personnel in the various branch libraries.

6.3.7.1 Librarians and Library Officers

Table 34 shows the extent to which librarians and library officers were employed full-time in the branch libraries. Ten (21.7%) branch libraries had one librarian each. There were two librarians in each of two (4.3%) branch libraries. Another two branch libraries had three librarians each. The total number of librarians in the branch libraries was 20.

Considerable attention was given above to the issue of the subject background or interest in university library and information services (including branch libraries). However, the nature of the educational background of librarians in Nigerian universities (see 6.3.5) means that staff with appropriate subject background cannot be found for every branch library. From that discussion one would also perceive that professionally qualified librarians without subject background will be found in some branch libraries.

The foregoing observations are indeed borne out by the qualifications of the twenty librarians deployed to branch
## TABLE 34

### LIBRARIANS AND LIBRARY OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Staff</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>32(69.6)$^+$</td>
<td>10(21.7)</td>
<td>2(4.3)</td>
<td>2(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library officers</td>
<td>26(56.5)</td>
<td>12(26.1)</td>
<td>8(17.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^+$ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis
libraries. Eleven (55%) of these librarians had university degrees in subject areas. Education libraries (Appendix III) were the best staffed from the point of view of the subject background of librarians. Five of the librarians in education libraries held university degrees in education. One agricultural and one medical library were headed by librarians with university degrees in the basic sciences. Four of the librarians who had first degrees in the area of the humanities work in African Studies, law, medical and librarianship collections respectively. The other nine (45%) of the librarians held only professional qualifications in librarianship - B.L.S. and M.L.S. (50) As shown below, these librarians were in most of the cases heads of branch libraries.

Table 34 shows that there were altogether 26 library officers in the branch libraries. Twelve (26.1%) of the branch libraries had one library officer each. Another eight (17.4%) branch libraries had two library officers each. No library officers worked in 26 (56.5) of the branch libraries. The nature of the library officer cadre is discussed below.

6.3.7.2 Headship of Branch Libraries

The overall administrative arrangement for branch libraries was discussed above (6.1). This section turns to the matter of the staff in charge of the day-to-day matters of the branch libraries. Beatrice Sichel has referred to such heads as "managers". (51) This was to emphasize the positive involvement of such heads in planning and implementing the specialized library and information programmes of the academic units.

**TABLE 35**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Heads</th>
<th>Branches with each Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Officer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35 shows the various categories of officials who head the branch libraries. Professional librarians were in charge of 14 (30.4%) of the branch libraries. In 12 (26.1%) cases, library officers were heads of the branch libraries. University teachers were responsible in two (4.3%) of the branch libraries. The rest, 18 (39.1%), were left in the hands of other staff—clerical officers and library assistants. This overall picture is illustrated in the pie chart. (Figure 7)

The nature of the headship of branch libraries varied from one university to the other—Table 36. At Ibadan four (21.1%) of the branch libraries were managed by librarians and another seven (36.8%) by the library officers. The remaining eight (42.1%) branch libraries were placed in the hands of other staff—clerical officers and library assistants. At Nsukka, the three branch libraries were headed by librarians. The situation at Zaria was quite fluid. Four (36.4%) of the branch libraries there were managed by professional librarians and another four by library officers. Two (18.2%) were managed by university teachers and only one was left to a library assistant.

At the University of Ife, there was no librarian in any of the branch libraries. One was headed by a library officer and the remaining four by clerical officers and library assistants. At Lagos one (16.7%) branch library was headed by a librarian and the other five (83.3%) by library assistants. The two branch libraries at Benin were managed by professional librarians.

It is also pertinent to observe that there were noteworthy variations in the nature of the personnel in charge of the different types of branch libraries (Table 37). Out of the 18 departmental libraries only two (11.1%) were managed by professional librarians. Library officers were in charge of six (33.3%). One (5.6%) was managed by a university teacher and the remaining nine by clerical officers and library assistants. As revealed in the Table, the heads of faculty libraries were considerably better qualified than those of departmental libraries. Of the 23 faculty libraries in the universities, 8 (34.8%), were managed by librarians, five (21.7%) by library officers and one by a university teacher. The remaining
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### TABLE 36

**HEADS OF BRANCH LIBRARIES BY UNIVERSITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Heads of Branch Libraries</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarian No.</td>
<td>Library Officer No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>4 21.1</td>
<td>7 36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>3 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>4 36.4</td>
<td>4 36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>1 16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9(39.1%) were headed by clerical officers and library assistants.

TABLE 37

HEADSHIP BY TYPE OF BRANCH LIBRARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Of Head</th>
<th>Departmental Library (N=18)</th>
<th>Faculty Library (N=23)</th>
<th>Institute Library (N=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>2(11.1)†</td>
<td>8(34.8)</td>
<td>4(80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Officer</td>
<td>6(33.3)</td>
<td>5(21.7)</td>
<td>1(20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teacher</td>
<td>1(5.6)</td>
<td>1(4.3)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9(50.0)</td>
<td>9(39.1)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Percentage (%) in Parenthesis

Four of the institute libraries were managed by professional librarians and the other one by a library officer. The institute libraries were thus better staffed than either departmental or faculty libraries. The institutes as already explained are research-oriented. It is realized that librarians are indispensable in the whole matter of the specialized library and information services that form part of such institutes.

3.7.3 Library Officers as Heads of Branch Libraries

As shown above, a distinct category of personnel in charge of branch libraries were library officers. In Nigeria, the term 'library officer' is a widely accepted title for the sub-professional or paraprofessional library staff. Officially, they are usually designated as such by various library establishments in the country. They are usually the products of the two-year non-graduate diploma training programmes offered at various university-based library schools in the country. In the United States such subprofessionals are usually known as
library technicians although other titles such as 'library aide' or 'assistant' are sometimes employed. As in Nigeria, the training programmes of library technicians in the U.S. emphasize vocational skills and last for two years. (52)

The presence of these library officers as heads of 12 (26.1%) branch libraries requires some explanation. To do this it is necessary to have insight into the nature and role of this category of staff in libraries.

Charles W. Evans has written a very informative article in which he traced the evolution of paraprofessional library employees with particular reference to the United States. He explained that what distinguishes a professional from a sub- or para-professional is function. He dealt at length with the character of professional functions in order to show how these are different from those of the subprofessionals:

There are three basic kinds of work to be done in any library: (1) managerial work, (2) technical or performance work, and (3) supervisory work. These three types can be described simply as (1) planning the work of the library, (2) doing the work of the library and (3) overseeing the work of the library . . . A librarian's work may involve a great deal of planning responsibility. Reference work, collection development, and the organization of collections - the daily work of most librarians - all involve planning . . .

The support staff also may include paraprofessional employees, whose work is peculiar to librarianship. Hence, they use library-related skills and knowledge that librarians also have, but their work is primarily technical in nature. They may also be assigned supervisory work, but not managerial work. Thus managerial, or planning responsibility is the distinguishing characteristic that separates the librarian from the para-professional class . . .

All paraprofessionals do technical library work under the direction of librarians, to implement the managerial decisions made by those librarians and by their superiors. (53)

Both the U.K. Library Association (54) and the American Library Association (55) have also given attention to the nature of
professional and subprofessional functions in libraries. Their views on this matter are to a large extent similar to the foregoing observations made by Evans. Essentially professional functions are "those whose adequate performance involves the ability to exercise independent judgement based on the understanding of the elements of library service - books, readers, and the means by which they are brought into effective relationship - and in addition a familiarity with specific library techniques and procedures." (56) True, trained subprofessional staff can perform some of these functions. However, adequate performance of professional functions "requires professional judgement and a thorough understanding of the principles and objectives of each duty and its function in relation to the overall purpose of libraries." (57)

The subprofessional personnel in libraries thus occupy a position below the librarians but above the purely non-professional staff. This underlying principle is in fact not in doubt in designing their training programmes. According to Ogunsheye, "For the training of para-professionals the emphasis is on proficiency at operations and the two year course is adequate to teach a high level of proficiency required of the skilled technician". (58) The Department of Library Studies, University of Ibadan also explained, "The Diploma in Librarianship has been introduced to provide basic training in library techniques for personnel in all types of libraries. It is intended to train library personnel for appointment to the intermediate grades. Great emphasis is placed on practical work throughout the course." (59)

The foregoing observations show that in professional circles and by training, library officers are designed to perform intermediate duties in the libraries. Ideally, they should be supervised by the professional librarians. The presence of the library officers as heads of some branch libraries (Table 35) means that they are occupying managerial positions. This is particularly so since in branch libraries they are considerably insulated from the sort of professional
supervision that exists in the main library. Even where the branch library is under the main library supervision, their geographical separation means that the person on the spot decides on several matters without reference to the centre.

Other studies have shown that instances of library officers occupying professional positions in the libraries in Nigeria are rather widespread. Benzies Boadi in his doctoral work observed a similar phenomenon in the West African region as a whole: "The problem of quantitative insufficiency of professionally trained librarians is common to most of the developing countries. This, in most cases, has left the running of the "small libraries" in the hands of unqualified, or sub-professional, staff who lack the professional ability to organise the document resources." (60) There is the rather unusual case reported by Cavan McCarthy: "There is even a State Librarian at the Zaria (library) School; he used to be a teacher, but took the non-degree course and six months afterwards became North-Eastern State Librarian; nobody there held higher qualifications . . . " (61) In his study, J.O. Fasanya established that six (31.6%) of the 19 special libraries he surveyed were headed by personnel in the library officer cadre. (62) There is also the case of a library officer who was the substantive head of a circulation department in a university library. (63)

The reason for finding the subprofessional personnel as heads of some branch libraries and in other professional and managerial positions in libraries thus seems clear. Shortage of professionally qualified personnel is largely responsible.

6.3.7.4 University Teachers as Heads of Branch Libraries

The presence of university teachers as heads of two branch libraries requires some attention. As shown in chapter one, branch libraries were usually initiated by heads of academic units (1.2). Such libraries were developed and run as component parts of the academic units to which they belong. Sometimes the head of the academic unit is personally responsible for the management of the library. At other times, another member of the
teaching staff has the responsibility. As already seen in the older universities like Cambridge, many of the departmental libraries are directly managed by the professors. (64)

However, it is not in doubt in the minds of many heads of academic units that the library services of the department or faculty are at best when left in the hands of librarians. But they would normally like to control such appointments. The experience of Hallvard S. Bakkan as director of Bergen University Library is pertinent:

I was asked by the three professors at the Chemical Institute in Oslo for advice with regard to the Institute Library since the research assistant who had previously acted as librarian had left her post. I suggested that they apply to the Senate for permission to appoint a librarian. This person would be employed by the University Library, but be seconded to the Faculty. For personal reasons, or perhaps because this idea of cooperation was too strange to them, the professors only followed the suggestion half-way. A position as a librarian was, however, shortly afterwards established, but was made entirely independent of the University Library. (65)

It appears, however, that the presence of university teachers as heads of two branch libraries has not come about as a result of a deliberate policy. One of them, a research fellow, made it clear to the investigator that she was not a professional librarian and that she was in that position merely as part of her special responsibilities in that department. She in fact had a conviction that the library and information services of her department would be much better if placed in the hands of a librarian.

The heads of the academic units were also in favour of appointing librarians as heads of branch libraries. Questions 10 and 11 (Appendix II) asked for the views of heads of academic units and librarians on whether the branch libraries should be headed by university teachers or librarians. In fact, on this matter of headship of branch libraries, both the heads of academic units and librarians had similar points of view.
Of the 146 heads of academic units 70.9% were of the opinion that branch libraries should be managed by professional librarians, 6.8% were undecided and only 12.3% were not in support. It is perhaps not surprising that 93.4% of the librarians strongly agreed or agreed that branch libraries should be managed by professional librarians. Only 3.3% of the librarians were undecided and another 3.3% were not in support of the viewpoint.

Shortage of qualified librarians seems to be the overriding consideration that has led to the appointment of some lectures as heads of branch libraries.

6.3.7.5 Non-Professional Staff

Table 38 shows the staff members of branch libraries who did not hold qualifications in library and information studies. With the exception of student assistants, others are usually grouped together as junior staff in the libraries.

The library assistants and clerical assistants have much in common. Both are usually recruited on the basis of their West African School Certificate (WASC) or the General Certificate of Education (GCE) O-Level. Library assistants are employed for purely library-related duties such as book shelving, circulation work and so on. Clerical assistants are officially employed for office work and clerical duties. In practice, however, both the library and clerical assistants do much the same work in the libraries—registration of readers, shelving and shelf-reading and so on. Library attendants are lower in grade, but their duties are similar to those of the assistants.

As can be seen in Table 38 there were altogether 119 library assistants in the branch libraries. The highest number of 14 was employed in one branch library. This was the library of a distant research institute. There were no library assistants in three (6.5%) of the branch libraries. These were among the branch libraries headed by library officers. Since there were no other assistants in these three libraries, it means that the library officers had to combine the various duties in the
## TABLE 38

**NON-PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

*(N = 46)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Personnel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number with non-professional Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistants</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Assistants</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistants</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To the nearest integer

** Cleaners, messengers and porters.
library. The implications of this particularly for the opening hours are considered in the next chapter. Most of the other branch libraries, 16(34.8%), had one library assistant each. Twelve(26.1%) branch libraries had two library assistants each and six(13.0%) had three library assistants each. Four(8.7%) branch libraries employed four library assistants each. The remaining four(8.7%) branch libraries had five, six, eight and twelve assistants respectively.

The total number of clerical assistants was 23. In fact 30 (65.2%) branch libraries had no separate clerical assistants. The highest number in any one branch library was four.

A total number of 34 other junior staff were also employed in 14 of the branch libraries. These staff were such as porters, messengers and cleaners. A high number of eight janitors work in one library. Five(10.9%) branch libraries had one janitor each. Another five(10.9%) had two janitors each. There were four janitors in each of two (4.3%) branch libraries and three in one(2.2%) branch library. In effect the majority, 32(69.6%), of the branch libraries had no janitors of their own. The practice observed was that these branch libraries drew the services of this category of staff from the appropriate academic unit's pool of janitors.

6.3.7.6 Student Assistants

Sometimes university students are recruited on temporary basis and for specific duties in university libraries. Beatrice Sichel has focussed attention on the utilization of student assistants in branch libraries. She reasoned that during the period of economic belt-tightening such libraries would find it difficult to recruit regular staff. Yet it is necessary to maintain effective services. A good alternative is to hire student workers on a short-term basis to assist the permanent staff. However, such student workers require adequate training.

From her personal experience as the head of the Physical Sciences
Library, Western Michigan University, Sichel grouped the duties of student workers into two:

A. House Keeping Functions

1. Shelving books and periodicals
2. Shelf reading
3. Inventory control
4. Stack management
5. Book loss prevention

B. Public Service Functions

1. Receptionist
2. Book circulation
3. Reserve circulation
4. Specialized materials circulation
5. Patron registration
6. Miscellaneous Services, e.g., photocopying service, use of microform readers, interlibrary loan requests, etc.

Table 38 shows that student assistants were not a common feature in the branch libraries. In all there were 29 student assistants employed in eight (17.4%) of the branch libraries. A high number of ten student assistants work in each of two (4.3%) branch libraries. Three branch libraries (6.5%) had two student assistants each. Another three (6.5%) engaged one student assistant each.

The nature of the work done by the student assistants was the same in the eight branch libraries. They were engaged on voluntary basis and unpaid to keep the libraries open when staff were away. For instance, with the help of two student assistants, it was possible for one branch library to remain open from 3.30 to 10.00 pm.

6.4 Information Resources

The nature of information resources in university libraries with particular reference to the six covered in this work was discussed in chapter two (2.5.4). In that context it was explained that some university libraries are important because of their strength in specific special areas or materials.
TABLE 39  

COVERAGE OF SINGLE-SUBJECT DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Subject Area</th>
<th>Other Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Studies</td>
<td>Education, Management, Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Computer science, Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Geophysics, Petroleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Sociology, Medicine, Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>Rural sociology, Farm management, Cooperatives, Agricultural Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Wood science, Silviculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic and Islamic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Administration, Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Building, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Studies</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Branch libraries are by nature special collections. Usually the mere mention of their names gives sufficient insight to the nature of information materials in them. Thus the information resources of a library in the department of archaeology would centre on archaeology, those of a library in the physics, department on physics and so on. This phenomenon is amplified by the remark of A.N.L. Munby that, "departmental libraries advertise their scope and nature by their titles."(67) How far is this true of the branch libraries in the six universities?
In Tables 39 to 41 the contents of the information resources of the branch libraries are shown.

**TABLE 40**

**COVERAGE OF FACULTY LIBRARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Library</th>
<th>Subjects covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Animal science, Agricultural biology, Agricultural extension, Agricultural economics, Forestry, Fishery, Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Economics, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Business adminstration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Food technology, civil engineering, Petroleum technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education, major arts, science and social science subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>History, Sociology, Political science, and economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Library studies, Education, Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Economics, Finance, Marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Mass communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Surveying, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 provides insight into the contents of the information resources in the departmental libraries. The "core subject area" of the collection is invariably the name of the department to which the departmental library belongs. From the Table it is clear that most of the departmental libraries hold materials on other subject areas. Only three of them confined their collections to the core subject areas of their parent academic departments.
At the other extreme, the Administrative Studies Library had information materials in six other areas, namely, politics, local government, public finance, economic policy and development, logical and quantitative analysis.

**TABLE 41**

**COVERAGE OF INSTITUTE LIBRARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute Library</th>
<th>Subjects Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Economics, Agriculture, Politics, Sociology, Education, Regional planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture and related subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research</td>
<td>Agriculture, Economics, Statistics, History, Geography.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest of the departmental libraries in Table 39 reflected varying degrees of information materials in other subject areas. In addition to materials in library and information studies, the Library Studies Library held information resources in education, management and sociology. The Mathematics Library reflected computer science and statistics in its collection. The English Departmental Library held materials in classics. The Agricultural Economics Library had information resources in rural sociology, farm management, cooperatives and agricultural finance.

With the faculty libraries, the information materials were essentially a matter of the subject areas that form the faculty. (Table 40). There is a remarkable reduction of acquisition of information materials in fringe subject areas. The reason for this phenomenon is to be found in the nature of the academic
programmes of most faculties.

Faculties, as already seen (5.1), are formed on the basis of relationship of academic disciplines. To a large extent, subsidiary and elective courses in many departments are chosen from other departments of the same faculty. This tendency means that a faculty library often concentrates its resources on the subject areas of the faculty.

In fact the scope of the faculty libraries as shown in Table 40 gives considerable insight into the nature of the academic disciplines that make up the faculty. Some respondents, however, remarked that the information materials in their faculty libraries were on the subjects of the faculty. Others gave details. The Faculty Library for Agriculture had materials on animal science, agricultural biology, agricultural extension, agricultural economics, forestry, fishery, and biochemistry. The Social Sciences Faculty Library included economics, geography, political science, psychology, sociology and business administration in its resources. In one Education Faculty Library, there were information materials on library studies, education and the social sciences.

The Institutes as shown in chapter two (2.5.3) are inter-disciplinary in nature. This basic character of the institutes is reflected in the information holdings of the institute libraries. In the African Studies Library, there were materials on pre-history, linguistics, African history, music, anthropology and African religions. The Economic Development Institute Library had resources on economics, agriculture, politics, sociology, education and regional planning. One Agricultural Research Institute Library had materials on agriculture, economics, statistics, history and geography. The other Agricultural Institute Library indicated that its resources were on agriculture and related disciplines. The Institute of Education Library did not specify the subject scope of its information resources.

6.4.1 Levels of Duplication

The foregoing examination of the contents of the information materials in the branch libraries brings out two levels of
duplication of collection in the universities. Usually branch libraries represent considerable duplication of the information materials held in the main library. Thus many of the materials in library and information studies held in the Library Studies Library and in one faculty library would also be found in the corresponding main libraries. The same is true of the materials in wood science, prehistory, food technology and other subject areas shown in Tables 39 to 41.

This sort of duplication is well-known and is a legitimate way of making materials in heavy demand available. Donald J. Urquhart sees this as a positive way of improving physical access to documents. According to him "... in some academic libraries, the largest cause of failures (to supply users with their information requirements) was the inadequate duplication of items in heavy demand," (68) If there were no branch libraries such materials would still be duplicated in the main library.

The other level of duplication that is not usually recognized is that many branch libraries duplicate materials held in other branch libraries of the same university. A look at Tables 39 to 41 shows that materials on sociology were held in the Library Studies Library, Nursing Library, Religious Studies Library, Economic Development Library, and of course the Social Sciences Library. Statistics was reflected in the holdings of a Mathematics Library in a university with a separate department of statistics. This level of duplication is particularly a feature of departmental libraries. A major cause of this phenomenon is the tendency of a departmental library to reflect both the core and subsidiary academic interests of the parent unit in its collection.

An honours student in library and information studies may take subsidiary courses in education and vice versa. A mathematics major can take his electives from the department of statistics and vice versa. This dispersion of academic interests in universities often brings considerable pressure on departmental libraries. They sometimes reflect both the major and subsidiary programmes in their information resources. There is also the
problem posed by the tendency to include the general research collection used by graduate students. The end result is that common information materials exist in several branch libraries. Usually in one of them such materials will belong to the core collection while in others they do not.

A simple way of mitigating this form of duplication is to ensure that branch libraries concentrate on materials relating to the core curriculum of their respective academic units. According to the ACRL Committee on Standards and Accreditation, branch library information materials "should be restricted, as far as possible, to the subjects the branch serves. . ."(69) This means that materials in the fringe or subsidiary areas of the academic unit should be used or obtained from the main library or other branch library.

6.4.2 Acquisition Policy

To determine the broad acquisition policies of the branch libraries, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which acquisition was related to the curriculum. The responses are shown in Table 42. From the Table one sees that in 24(52.2%) of the branch libraries conscious effort was always made to relate library acquisition to curriculum. In 20(43.5%) branch libraries, such effort was usually made. Only in two cases was the effort sometimes made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Relationship</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Much depends on how the word curriculum is interpreted for purposes of collection development. If the target is to provide materials relevant to the core academic programme, duplication will, in fact, be considerably contained. However, if, as it seems in most single-subject departmental libraries, the intention is to reflect every scope of the curriculum (including the elective, subsidiary and general research materials) then duplication of resources will continue to be widespread. The case of materials in Sociology described above illustrates this phenomenon.

6.4.3 Types and Size of Information Materials

Information materials in libraries are usually in two broad categories - print and nonprint media. In university libraries, the conventional information materials are in print formats: books, periodicals and so on. However, with the influence of the new technology and changing patterns of education and information, materials in non-traditional formats now form components of most university library and information resources. These are variously referred to as new media, nonbook materials, media resources, nonprint materials or multimedia. Tables 43 and 44 show the extent of information materials in the branch libraries.

As in the main libraries, books and periodicals were the main types of information materials in the branch libraries. Books were the only component of the materials that one finds in all the branch libraries, as shown in Table 43. The total number of books in the 46 branch libraries was 255,385. The highest number in one branch was 25,057 and lowest, 374. The average was 5,552.

Periodical titles were the next important type of information materials held in 40(87%) of the branch libraries - Table 43. The total number of periodical titles was 3,928 with a high of 500. Six(13%) of the libraries had no periodical titles. The mean was 98 (Table 44).

The other formats of information materials were not widely reflected in the branch libraries.
### TABLE 43

**TYPES OF INFORMATION MATERIALS**

(N = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material</th>
<th>Branches with Each Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonbook Materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms (films, cards, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonorecords, slides</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses and Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: Charts, files, pamphlets</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handouts, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 44

**SIZE OF INFORMATION MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Branches with Each Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>255,385</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>25,057-374</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>500-2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Publications</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>400-2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonbook Materials:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms (films, cards)</td>
<td>3,221</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>120-3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonorecords and Slides</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>710-4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses and Projects</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1,322-12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To the nearest integer  
** Pamphlets, charts, files, handouts.
Table 43 shows that 16(34.8%) of the libraries have shown interest in the acquisition of government documents. The total number of government documents was 11,080. The highest number in a branch library was 400. There were no government documents in 30(65.2%) branch libraries.

Materials in nonprint media were in two sections - to differentiate microforms from other audiovisual materials such as phonorecords and slides. A total of 3,221 microforms (microflims, fiche and microcards) were held in 11(23.9%) branch libraries. Phonorecords were held in 7(15.2%) branch libraries. The overall number was 1,572 items.

These dissertations and final year undergraduate projects were another category of information materials in some branch libraries. The acquisition of these depends on the academic programmes and policies of the parent unit. In some cases, it is a requirement that copies of successful theses, dissertations and projects must be deposited in appropriate branch library. There was a total 3,667 such materials in 11(23.9%) branch libraries. Theses and dissertations were also usually held in the respective main libraries. However, the final year undergraduate projects were in most cases held only in the branch libraries. This situation increases their importance. They are in fact the only documentary materials available in some specific matters such as local history, customs and oral tradition.

The other information materials held in some branch libraries were varied in character. In one there were 715 charts and posters. One held 62 files on various topics relating to the programmes of the parent academic unit. In two of the branch libraries there were 1,426 and 19,654 pamphlets respectively. One other held 882 papers and handouts.

These materials have in most cases not received the attention they deserve. Usually, they contain original information relating to the subject area of the branch library. The files, papers, charts and some pamphlets contain materials variously referred to as seminar papers, research papers, working papers
or discussion papers. Although some of these papers are later published in learned journals, very many end up in the form they were originally presented.

An estimate for such papers in the United States shows that "about one-third of the papers appear in the periodicals or books within three years of being available as working papers, and most are never published elsewhere." (70) This situation has greatly enhanced the importance of such papers. In fact, in the United States, there is the Economics Working Papers Bibliography - EWP (71), issued semi annually and containing some 2,500 entries each year. Economics and management are the core subjects but the bibliography also covers other social science fields such as sociology, psychology, politics, urban studies and international studies.

Where properly acquired, processed and made accessible, these papers and documents will constitute a major contribution of branch libraries in the overall university library and information services.

6.4.4 Reference Materials

Reference materials were not a major aspect of the information resources of the branch libraries. Twelve(26%) had no reference materials. In the others, such materials were very few, usually general and subject encyclopaedias and dictionaries. Bibliographical materials such as indexes and abstracts, bibliographies and printed library catalogues were virtually absent from the libraries.

6.4.5 Books and Periodicals by University

As shown above (6.4.3), books and periodicals were the two main types of information materials in the branch libraries. A further treatment of these two components of the information resources seems necessary. This is to give insight into the relative strength of books and periodicals in the branch libraries of each university.
Table 45 shows the aggregate totals of books and periodicals in the branch libraries in the universities. There were considerable variations. The age, number and types of branch libraries in a university help to explain the differences.

The aggregate total of 91,994 books at Ibadan was the largest in one university. Zaria had the next largest number of books (83,346). Benin with 7,500 volumes had the lowest aggregate number of books. Benin, of course, had only two branch libraries and was the youngest of the universities. The aggregate numbers of books at Nsukka, Ife and Lagos were 12,175, 48,862 and 11,508 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY (Type of Material)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan: Books</td>
<td>91,994</td>
<td>4,842</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka: Books</td>
<td>12,175</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria: Books</td>
<td>83,346</td>
<td>7,577</td>
<td>25,057</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife: Books</td>
<td>48,862</td>
<td>9,772</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos: Books</td>
<td>11,508</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin: Books</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To the nearest integer.

A somewhat different picture is discernible from the mean figures. Ife with 9,772 had the largest average number of books to a branch library. Zaria again came second with an average of 7,577 books. The lowest average of 1,918 books was observed for Lagos branch libraries. The mean numbers for the branch libraries at Ibadan, Nsukka and Benin
were 4,842, 4,058 and 3,750 volumes respectively.

The average shows that the largest branch library in terms of book stock had 25,057 volumes and this was at A.B.U., Zaria. Ibadan had the smallest with 374 books.

The overall totals of periodical titles in the branch libraries also varied from one university to the other. Zaria with 1,151 titles clearly had the largest number of periodicals in the branches. This time Ibadan came second with an aggregate total of 760 periodicals. Nsukka with 200 titles had the lowest number. The overall number of periodical titles in the branch libraries at Ife, Lagos and Benin was 670, 647 and 500 titles respectively.

The column for the range shows that the largest number of 500 periodical titles was held in two branch libraries, one at Lagos and the other at Benin. The low numbers at Ibadan, Nsukka, Lagos and Benin confirm that there were some branch libraries with no periodical titles.

6.4.6 Book Stock and Periodicals in the Main and Branch Libraries

In Table 46 the book stock and periodical titles in the main libraries as well as the aggregate totals in the corresponding branch libraries are compared. This helps to see, to a considerable extent, the importance of the information resources in the branch libraries in relation to those in the corresponding main library. At Zaria, the aggregate number of books in the branches was 30.31% of the main library book stock. The overall book stock of the branches at Ibadan was 26.06% of the main library holding. At Ife this was 22.62%. The percentages for Benin, Lagos and Nsukka were considerably lower. In all, the book stock of the branch libraries constituted 16.95% of the book stock of the main libraries.

The periodical holdings of the branch libraries exhibit similar characteristics. At Zaria the periodical holdings of the branch libraries were 31.33% of those in the main library.
### TABLE 46

**BOOKS AND PERIODICALS IN THE MAIN AND BRANCH LIBRARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Ibadan</th>
<th>Nsukka</th>
<th>Zaria</th>
<th>Ife</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Benin</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Stock in Main Library</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>313,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,507,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Stock in Branches</td>
<td>91,994</td>
<td>12,175</td>
<td>83,346</td>
<td>48,862</td>
<td>11,508</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>255,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Stock of Branches as % of Main</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals in Main Library</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>23,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals in Branches</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals in Branches as % of Main</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aggregate periodical holdings of the branch libraries at Benin were 25% of those in the Central Library. At Ife and Lagos, these were 14.59% and 14.37% respectively. Overall, the periodical holdings in the branch libraries were 16.6% of the periodical titles in the six main libraries.

6.4.7 Unique Materials

The issue of whether or not branch libraries should possess unique information materials is pertinent. As subject collections at separate locations, it is reasoned that unique materials should not form part of their collections. Such materials should be held in the main library where they should be accessible to all library users. The Parry Report gave expert consideration to the matter and recommended, "In general no library outside the central library should contain items which are unique in the university, unless it is large enough to justify the appointment of library staff adequate to offer services of the standard of the central library, including extended hours of opening." (72)

To determine the extent of unique information materials in the branch libraries, respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of the total collection that was unique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Materials as % of Collection</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47 shows that unique information materials were a regular feature in the branch libraries. Only 5 (11%) showed that they had no unique materials. In 10 (22%) they formed 1 - 20% of the collections. In 11 (24%) of the branch libraries, unique materials formed 41 - 60% of the collections. Seventeen (37%) branch libraries had 61 - 80% materials that were unique. The remaining two branch libraries held 81 - 100% unique materials.

The cause and nature of these unique materials were not indicated. However, it is possible to deduce the reasons for the presence of a fairly large amount of unique materials in the branch libraries. As already explained these libraries started on their own without central control or coordination. Materials were acquired essentially from the point of view of the academic interests of the unit. The broader issue of viewing branch library resources in the context of university-wide library and information services is a recent development.

In the circumstance unique materials were freely acquired by the branch libraries. Conceivably the intention may have been to acquire relevant information materials which the main library was unable to provide. These materials would include books, periodical titles and nonbook materials. Unique materials in the branch libraries can also be traced to the special papers they possess. As already seen, these include seminar papers, project reports and so on.

The presence of a considerable amount of unique materials in the branch libraries increases the importance of the collections. Such materials may be of value to other library users of the university. It is therefore necessary for the collections to be accessible not only to the members of the relevant academic unit but to other library users. This matter of access to branch library resources is examined in the next chapter.

6.4.8 Sources of Acquisition

Various avenues are open to university libraries to acquire relevant information materials. Usually, however, most of the
materials are acquired by purchase. Other methods such as gifts, bequeath, exchange, co-operative acquisitions, and legal deposit sometimes provide information materials with varying degrees of intensity and success. In general, however, these are regarded as sidelines of normal library acquisitions.

In university libraries in Nigeria, nearly all of the information resources are acquired by purchase. Of these materials more than 90% are purchased from the United Kingdom and the United States. M.W. Anyakoha (73), E.O. Ejiko (74), and W. Olufunmilayo Oyelese (75) have discussed the matter of acquisitions at length. In particular they highlighted the problems involved in the process - mainly on account of the remoteness of Nigeria from the centre of world publishing and the country's tough economic measures which inhibit the freeflow of funds and materials.

The other methods of acquisition are of little or no importance. As seen in chapter two (2.5.5) sometimes very special documents are received as gifts in the libraries. But such gifts are very irregular. At the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Anyakoha has observed as follows: "It is only a few occasions that this library receives worthwhile gifts. The Nigerian public has not matured to be philanthropic. The donors give only what they have no space for ..." (76)

Exchange of information materials has also not played a meaningful role in the development of university resources. But it often receives attention. T.O. Odeinde has suggested the sort of materials to be acquired by exchange. These include government documents, theses and dissertations, reprints and machine readable data. (77) In her paper "Building library collection through exchange - the Ibadan University experience", Bimpe Aboyade has shown how exchange of materials can be formed to obliterate many of the foreign exchange problems arising from purchase. She showed how the vigorous exchange arrangements evolved by John Harris at the Ibadan University Library produced some 630 exchange partners from different parts of the world. (78) This once successful venture is now a thing of the past. The situation at Nsukka gives indication of the prevailing
obstacles: "Since not much publishing is going on within the University, the librarian has little or nothing to offer in exchange. Certain faculty journals which were used for exchange often appeared most irregularly or just died off unsung and unknelled, leaving the library at midstream with her exchange partners."(79)

The branch libraries were asked to indicate the amount of materials they acquire through purchase, gifts from faculty members and others, exchange, and donations from government or industry. The responses are shown in Table 48. It is at once clear that, similar to the situation in the main libraries, purchase is the dominant method of acquiring materials in the branch libraries.

The Table shows that in the majority of cases, 33(71.7%), purchase accounts for 81-100% of the information materials acquired. Eleven (23.9%) of the branch libraries acquire 61-80% of their materials by purchase. In two (4.3%), materials by purchase account for 41-60% of the overall acquisitions.

**TABLE 48**

**ACQUISITION SOURCES IN THE BRANCH LIBRARIES**

\(N = 46\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition Method</th>
<th>Percentages of Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01-20 21-40 41-60 61-80 81-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>---   ---      2(4.3) 11(23.9) 33(71.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>37(80.4) 9(19.6) --- --- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Donations from:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and others</td>
<td>13(28.3) 32(69.6) 1(2.2) --- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>37(80.4) 9(19.6) --- --- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>45(97.8) 1(2.2) --- --- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44(95.7) 2(4.3) --- --- ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis
Again, like in the main libraries, gifts have not been of much importance in the collection development of the branch libraries. The Table shows that many of the branch libraries received no gifts at all. However, in 32 (69.6%) branch libraries, gifts from faculty members and others account for about 1-20% of the information materials. In this regard, it may be noted that some members of the teaching staff often leave the periodicals they receive as members of learned societies with their branch libraries. The Table also shows that the branch libraries do not receive much from government or industry.

Only nine (19.6%) indicated that exchange of information materials was responsible for 1-20% of their acquisitions. The majority, 37 (80.4%), engaged in no exchange transactions.

Exchange is potentially a feasible method of enriching the information materials in branch libraries. As special collections, they can often identify themselves with libraries of similar interest in other places for purposes of exchange of materials. Some of the academic units publish materials in their specialized fields. For instance, at the Department of Library Studies, University of Ibadan there are: (1) the occasional papers, (2) The Nigerian Journal of Library and Information Studies, and (3) the Prospectus. With judicious use of these materials in exchange transactions, it can be possible for the Departmental Library to acquire substantial materials in library and information studies from other places. Publications similar to the ones mentioned above exist in many other academic units and can be utilized for exchange purposes. There is of course the general problem of irregular issue of periodicals in Nigeria as already observed. But a number of the publications manage to survive.

Other sources of acquisitions account for up to 20% of the information materials in two (4.3%) branch libraries. These were specified as materials received as members of appropriate learned and professional bodies.
6.4.9 Selection of Materials

The vast majority of the information resources of the branch libraries, as seen above, are acquired through purchase. This implies selection. Selection of materials is no doubt one of the major functions of a university library. The success of this exercise puts the university library on the path to effective library and information services.

Positive involvement of both the members of the teaching staff and librarians is essential for effective selection of information materials. According to Professor P. Havard-Williams, "A library cannot be better than its collections. It is the books which, with the assistance of the teaching staff, are selected each year that make a library and ultimately give it the reputation it deserves." (80) Periam J. Danton emphasized the same point in different words. He stated that selection of library materials is "the most fundamental, the most challenging, and the most indispensable function of the library. It is the sine qua non. It determines the quality of the collection." (81)

University libraries are invariably aware of the fundamental importance of effective selection of materials. As discussed above (6.3.2) this is perhaps the most important function of the subject specialist librarian. Even in university libraries organized along functional lines, the subject expertise or interest of the entire professional staff is often utilized in book selection. The usual design of acquisition policies also underscores the importance which university libraries attach to selection of information materials.

For the same reason as above, university teachers are invariably involved in book selection exercise. Since they are best able to judge the relevance of specific documents to their teaching and research programmes, their specialist views carry remarkable weight in deciding whether or not to acquire a particular item. In his paper, "The faculty and the development of library collections" Maurice F. Tauber has given considerable attention to the involvement of the teaching staff in book selection.
He reasoned along the following lines:

One of the assumptions upon which librarians of academic institutions work is that book collections should be developed with the active participation of the faculty members.

Faculty members, at the time they are recruited by the University, should be selected with some regard for their ability to strengthen the library collections. (82)

In Nigerian universities, members of the teaching staff are often indicted for their lack of interest or low involvement in the selection of university library materials. E.O. Ejiko described the apathy of faculty members in book selection. "The faculty members especially in the older universities are not interested in selecting books and other materials to be added to stock." (83) In her letter captioned "Inactive lectures" published in the Library Association Record, Adebimpe Ike observed:

From practical experience in a university library (which is not organized on a subject basis with subject librarians linking with academic departments) it is the librarians who select over 70% of all titles acquired in the library. And this pattern is not unique to the University of Lagos. Many Nigerian university libraries are functionally structured so that all the librarians are expected to select more than 70% of materials needed for the teaching and research programmes of the university. This is because the lecturers who know the requirements of the courses they teach remain inactive in aiding the librarians in the selection of the materials they need. (84)

If Nigerian university teachers are inactive in selecting materials for the main libraries, there is abundant evidence that they participate positively in selecting materials for branch libraries. Table 49 reveals the patterns for selection of the branch library information materials. In a majority of the branch libraries the librarian and the teaching staff were jointly responsible for selecting the information materials. In six branch libraries, members of the teaching staff were entirely responsible for the selection of materials. These six branch libraries, in fact, had no professional librarians. The branch librarian alone selects materials in only one (2.2%)
branch library. In the remaining two (4.3%) branch libraries, materials were selected by the selection committee in the main library. In these cases, however, initial selection was done by the branch librarian although this was subject to vetting by the selection committee in the main library.

As subject specialists some branch librarians have, in course of their work in specific academic units, developed indepth knowledge and interest in the unit's curriculum. In this situation, the members of the teaching staff have immense confidence of the branch librarian in the library's collection development. Maurice F. Tauber observed something more than this at the University of Columbia, U.S.A. :

In some instances, deans and directors of units of the University indicated that they had no real worries about the development of their collections, since they had full confidence in their librarians. Not only were they willing to allow the librarians to buy or otherwise acquire for present needs, but they took seriously any recommendations of the librarians for building resource materials in areas that might be considered peripheral at the time. In a number of instances, the librarians have been able to prepare the way for the installation of new courses, the expansion of limited curriculums, and the furtherance of research on advanced levels. (85)
The active participation of university teachers in selecting materials for branch libraries is perhaps not surprising. As explained in chapter five (5.1) they have considerable attachment to these libraries and as such show positive involvement in their collection development. Often they walk into the library with their specific course or other bibliographic requirements. Maurice F. Tauber has also observed "notable cases in which individual faculty members have taken the responsibility of building collections in their special fields" (86)
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CHAPTER SEVEN

NATURE OF THE BRANCH LIBRARIES: AVAILABILITY OF COLLECTIONS AND SERVICES

7.1 Access to Information Materials

Access is basically the foremost consideration at the root of the demands for, and existence of, branch libraries in the universities. If university students, teachers and researchers have ready and convenient access to bibliographic information as well as the needed documents the quest for separate branch libraries can be contained. In fact, decentralization is traditionally seen as a means of ameliorating this problem of access. Since there is presumably no convenient access to the information materials needed by the users, specialized subject libraries are demanded and established in close proximity to such users. In this way the required materials will be physically accessible. From this angle, decentralization is viewed as an answer to the problem of access.

At the same time branch libraries mean that there is considerable physical separation of information materials in the university. Such materials in a branch library can be useful to a reader in another location of the university. University library's concern with this situation is often reflected in the effort to co-ordinate these separate library units. In doing this, the target is usually to ensure that the information materials in every part of the university are physically accessible to the overall library users of the institution.

These somewhat divergent approaches to the same problem is a traditional feature of universities with decentralized library services. The world-wide concern with the problem of access to information materials can thus be seen as a wider interest in what has featured in the universities for long. According to K.W. Humphreys, "One of the fairly recently accepted programmes of IFLA, the UAP (Universal Access to Publications) impinges on what has been for decades a burning question in academic libraries - the centralization or decentralization of library
resources - which is fundamentally a matter of access." (1)

Universal access to publications is an ideal. Its realization is largely dependent on the success of two IFLA programmes of Universal Bibliographic Control (U.B.C.) and Universal Availability of Publications (U.A.P.). In fact the two programmes are linked together. Donald J. Urquhart has observed this link: "Our aim is to serve our users. They require access to the information in the records. To provide this there are two requirements. First it must be possible to discover which records may be of interest and, secondly, it must be possible to obtain access to these records." (2) The U.A.P. programme was spurred by the U.B.C. programme.

7.1.2 University Libraries and the U.A.P.

As indicated above, the issue of physical access to information materials is not new to university libraries. Traditionally, university libraries acquire materials, organize them and promote their use through reader services and co-ordination of dispersed service points.

However, the new dimension is that the U.A.P. programme (as well as U.B.C.) has provided a world-wide forum for improving access to the information resources in a university, locality or nation. Where branch libraries exist, such information materials include those in the main library as well as the materials in every location of the university. Any activity or improvement in this means enhanced availability. From a wider angle, such improvement or activity is a worthy contribution to the overall success of the U.A.P. programme. In parts of this chapter, some of the ways in which availability of overall information resources in the universities is encouraged or inhibited are examined.

7.1.3 Organization of Information Resources

Once information materials are acquired in libraries, the stage is reached to organize them for use. In doing this the ability
to reflect the various reader approaches is important. Monica A. Greaves explained the underlying principle in a simple language:

The purpose of the organization of library materials is to bring their contents to the notice of the readers. The reader is very important. If one wants to be a cataloguer, one has to know a lot about readers. It is a good idea for an intending cataloguer to begin his career as a reference librarian or a reader's adviser, so that he may meet the readers, get to know their needs and understand the use that can be made of the classification scheme and the catalogue.

The main problem in organizing the information resources in Nigerian libraries is that the general classification schemes in use were developed outside Africa. These schemes include the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), Universal Decimal Classification (UDC), Library of Congress (LC), and the Bliss Bibliographic Classification (BBC). Because of their foreign origin, they have not reflected the political, linguistic and other features of the continent. S.A. Orimoloye emphasized this fundamental point, "But it must be noted that present-day general classification schemes were conceived and designed by Americans and Europeans. Therefore, and understandably, American and European countries are satisfactorily and adequately covered in the classification structures whereas most other countries are relatively poorly covered." (4)

The LC scheme is in use in the six university libraries: Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, Ife, Lagos and Benin. However, some of them started with different schemes and changed to the LC later. The Ibadan University Library, started with the BBC; in 1974 it changed to the LC. Also the Ahmadu Bello University Library, Zaria, started with Bliss. In 1967, it changed to the LC. Benin University Library started with the UDC mainly because the parent University was conceived as a technological institution. In time, however, the University broadened its scope and included the faculties of arts, education and the social sciences as well. Consequently, the Library switched over to the LC scheme. Nsukka, Ife and Lagos started with LC from inception.
Considerable variation exists in the nature of the organization of information materials in the branch libraries covered. At Ibadan, A. Faniran has observed, "There was no uniformity in the cataloguing systems adopted. Some of the (branch) libraries used the Library of Congress classification, a few used either Bliss or Dewey, while others used 'home' made schemes." (5) At Zaria, the situation was somewhat similar as explained by the Departmental Libraries Unit of the main library, "Principally, there are two things involved in the procedures. The books (from branches) are either brought to K.I.L. (main library) when we use Library of Congress classification scheme or we go to the department to work when materials are to be catalogued and classified using Dewey Decimal scheme." (6) The situation was the same at Ife and Lagos. However, at Nsukka and Benin the branch libraries were organized, using the LC scheme as in their respective main libraries.

The overall situation was as follows: In 27(58.7%) of the branch libraries, the books were classed using the LC, as in the corresponding main libraries. Eleven others applied a different scheme: the DDC in eight(17.4%) and the UDC in three(6.5%) of the branch libraries. Two(4.3%) branch libraries evolved home made schemes. One of them indicated that the library would soon switch over to the LC scheme in use in the main library. In seven(15.2%) branches, no classification schemes were in use. These collections were not organized in any systematic order. They also had no form of catalogue.

The form of catalogue in most of the branch libraries was relatively simple. Author/title or dictionary catalogues were maintained. The notable exceptions were the two with home made schemes. One had a shelf list. The other maintained three forms of catalogue: author/title, classified and subject.

In the main libraries, periodicals were arranged by titles under broad subjects. As shown in chapter six(6.4.3) periodicals were held in 40 of the branch libraries. These indicated that the periodicals were arranged by title.
7.1.3.1 The Union Catalogue

Perhaps the most effective way of linking the information materials in two or more libraries is the union catalogue. According to Silvère Willemin, "A union catalogue is an inventory common to several libraries and containing all or some of their publications listed in one or more orders of arrangement." (7)

In spatial terms, Willemin distinguished between four types of union catalogues, namely, local union catalogue, regional union catalogue, national union catalogue and continental/world union catalogue. (8) The information materials in a university can be included in one or all the above levels of the union catalogues. However, the union catalogue reflecting the information resources of a single university with dispersed library units does not exactly fit into any of these four groups. Such can best be described as institutional union catalogue. However, the techniques for producing and organizing such institutional union catalogues are essentially the same as those for local, regional and national union catalogues. In addition to the work of Silvère Willemin, the principles and techniques for the union catalogue of books are also covered by L. Brummel. (9)

Joan Whiffin recently covered a similar ground with regard to the union catalogue of serials in a special issue of The Serials Librarian. Whiffin's account is particularly helpful because it is done in the spirit of the Universal Availability of Publications (U.A.P.). According to her this link between the union catalogue and U.A.P. is evident in "The usefulness of union catalogues and lists of serials as registers of existing serial resources, as the means of achieving physical access to those resources through the location information provided, and as showing the state of preservation of serial literature." (10)

The issue of union catalogues in universities with branch libraries received expert consideration of the Committee of
Standards and Accreditation of the Association of College and Research Libraries. It showed the scope of institutional union catalogues and the need to make them accessible at every service point in the university. According to the guidelines, "All holdings of a library system, including those of branch libraries, should be listed in union catalogues and other access points to the collections and be open to the library's general community. Branch users should have access to the files of the branch's holdings, union lists and other similar records produced by the library system in the branch." (11)

1.3.1.1 Institutional Union Catalogues of Books

In his paper B.O. Adediran observed that in 1973 only the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, maintained an institutional union catalogue of books. The situation at Nsukka was described as follows:

The University of Nigeria consists of Anamdi Azikiwe Library and the Economic Development Institute Library. .. together with small collections in Agriculture and Education Faculties on the Nsukka Campus. All the collections are serviced from the Anamdi Azikiwe Library which is the main library where the union catalogue is housed. (12)

Since the foregoing report was made, there has been considerable improvement in forming institutional union catalogues in the universities. Ibadan started a union catalogue of books in the branch libraries in 1974. Zaria formed its institutional union catalogue in 1975. At Benin, the information materials in the branches were integrated in the main library catalogue from the start. At Lagos, some of the branch library materials were reflected in the main library catalogue. Table 50 shows the situation.

The institutional union catalogues of books in the universities vary in one important respect. At Ibadan, the union catalogue housed in the main library contains entries for books held in the branch libraries only. One unit entry of each book in the branch libraries is filed in alphabetical sequence in the union
catalogue. In addition to the usual bibliographic data, each entry contains a location code indicating in which library to find the item. For instance "AGRIC" is boldly stamped on all entries for books housed in the Faculty of Agriculture Library, "NURS" for those in the Department of Nursing Library and so on. These codes are fully explained on the notice placed on top of the union catalogue cabinet.

**TABLE 50**

**BRANCH LIBRARY MATERIALS REFLECTED IN INSTITUTIONAL UNION CATALOGUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Union Catalogue of Books</th>
<th>Union List of Serials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Branches</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan (N=19)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka (N=3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria (N=11)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife (N=5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos (N=6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin (N=2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One snag though exists in this arrangement. This union catalogue reflecting the books in the branches is separate though adjacent to the main library catalogue. This means that readers must remember to search the union catalogue for items they are unable to find in the main library catalogue. These matters are usually explained during orientation programme and instruction on the use of library resources. However, it seems that only very thorough or needy users will remember to go to the branch union catalogue for items not found in the rather very bulky author/title catalogue, subject catalogue and shelf list at Ibadan. As a further help, it seems necessary to place notices on top of the main library catalogue cabinets reminding readers to search in the branch library union catalogue for items not available in the main library.
The sort problem described above is virtually non-existent at Nsukka, Zaria, Lagos, and Benin. In these libraries, the books in the branches are fully integrated in the main library catalogues. This means that a user will find items held in the branch libraries in the same sequence as those in the main libraries. Location codes are appropriately stamped or typed on entries reflecting materials in the branches. The end result is that the attention of the reader is almost automatically drawn to items in the branch libraries while searching the catalogue in the main library. The Kashim Ibrahim Library (K.I.L.), Ahmadu Bello University has explained how it ensures that this important link between the main and branch library collections is maintained:

There are three types of (unit) cards:

a. One set is the K.I.L. author cards which were removed from the catalogue cabinets.

b. At the back (top left hand corner) of the K.I.L. cards is written the name of the departmental libraries. For instance, if the books are from the Chemistry Library, abbreviation (chem) is written at the back of the K.I.L. cards so that readers can go to that department to use the books.

c. The other set of cards (for materials not held in K.I.L.) bear the name of the department at the top right hand corner. Here "chem" is written on the top right hand corner to indicate that the book is possessed by the Chemistry Department but not in stock at K.I.L. (13)

One common defect with the institutional union catalogues of books as they presently exist requires attention. The entries are housed in traditional library cabinets in the appropriate main libraries. In effect, it is not possible to stay in a branch library and bibliographically examine what is held in the main library and possibly other branch libraries in a pertinent subject area. To do this, in the Nigerian situation, there must be physical contact from a branch library to the main library. This matter is looked at fully in chapter eight from the wider angle of evolving university library systems out of the existing arrangements.
1.4.1.2 Institutional Union List of Serials

From Table 50 it can be seen that the periodical holdings of the branch libraries were reflected in the main libraries at varying degrees. At Ibadan, the periodical holdings of 16 (84.2%) branch libraries were listed in the institutional list of serials. At Nsukka the periodical holdings of two branch libraries were listed in the main library. Zaria included the holdings of 11 branch libraries in the institutional union list of serials in the main library. Lagos reflected the holdings of just one (16.7%) of its branch libraries. At Benin only one branch library held periodicals and these were included in the list in the main library. As with books, the periodical holdings of the branch libraries at Ife were not reflected in the main library.

Union lists of serials can conveniently be housed in the main and branch libraries. Even when they exist in the form of traditional card catalogues, they are usually not as bulky as those for books. As seen in chapter two (2.5.4) the number of current periodical titles in the main libraries varied from a high of 4,592 to a low of 2,000 titles. This means that it is relatively simple to have such entries in several branches.

Ibadan University Library has given a lead in producing the list of the University's periodical holdings in book form. This 558-page computer produced serials catalogue was issued in March 1976. It made use of Arabic numerals to show the location of each title in the catalogue: 1 - Main Library; 2 - Medical Library; 3 - Faculty of Agriculture Library; 4 - Chemistry Library, and so on. However this catalogue is now largely dated. Both the main library and the University Computing Centre are currently co-operating to produce a revised edition.

One great advantage of having the union list of serials in a book form is that multiple copies can easily and economically be produced for use at appropriate service points in the University. However, only five (26.3%) of the 19 branch libraries covered at Ibadan had the printed union catalogue of serials. Another one indicated that it had one copy some years
ago but that the copy was lost. In the other branch libraries of the University no trace of this document was observed.

In effect, 41(89.1%) of the branch libraries covered in this work do not have immediate bibliographic access to periodical titles in the main or other branch libraries of the same university. As indicated above, this matter is given a further attention in the next chapter.

7.1.4 Users

Traditionally branch libraries have restrictive and parochial access policies. To a large extent this has arisen as a result of intense proprietorial feeling which the members of the academic staff and students have towards their branch libraries. Indeed, in some cases, it is an accepted norm that such libraries are not open to users from other locations of the university. Morris A. Gelfand as Unesco consultant on university libraries for developing countries gave an insight into the phenomenon:

"The fact that they formed their own collections probably contributed to the sense of possessiveness that many faculties and academic departments now have toward their libraries... The sense of possession, coupled with a high degree of autonomy has frequently led, however, to restrictions being placed upon access to and use of faculty libraries by university members not associated with the particular faculty. It seems also to have been influential in deterring the development of university-wide library systems. (15)"

Wilfred Ashworth has also examined the issue. He reasoned as follows:

"Although most of the use will arise within a particular department, there is need, which is increasing as interdisciplinary studies grow, for others to have access to the material. This is a nuisance to those students who have to go to departments at a distance, especially when it means that they cannot study texts from different disciplines alongside each other. It can also draw resentment from the major users of the departmental material who see this usage as invasion of "their" library. (16)"
It seems clear that the primary users of any branch library will remain the students and faculty members of the unit to which the library is affiliated. At the same time the need for every library user of the university to have ready and full access to information materials at every location of the university has never been in doubt. The Committee on Standards and Accreditation of the Association of College and Research Libraries aptly reflected the mood of librarians on this matter. "Branch collections should be open to the total academic community at hours convenient to the users." (17)

In some universities, practical steps have been taken to ensure that branch collections are open to every library user in the university. At Ibadan, for instance, this was the overriding motive in the efforts to coordinate the resources of the branches. In a circular the University Library informed all academic units that every branch library is part of the University library system and that access to them would be on the same basis as access to the main library resources. In effect, "any member of the University with valid library ticket can make use of the resources of the main library as well as those of branch/faculty libraries." (18) In principle this sort of arrangement or understanding exists in the other universities. These are in conformity with the usually accepted view that branch resources should be "available to all readers in any subject or faculty." (19)

However, in practice, the situation is not as simple as some official documents and theoretical viewpoints would make it. As shown in Table 51, there were considerable variations in the use of the branch collections.

**Table 51**

**ACCESS TO BRANCH LIBRARIES**

(N = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized Users</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff of unit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff and Students of unit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All library users of university</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty (65.2%) of the branch libraries were open to the academic staff and students of their corresponding units. Four (8.7%) were open to the teaching/research staff of the units. Two of these, in fact, belong to research institutes: one of them added that its resources were open to all teaching/research staff of the university (but not to students). In one faculty library there were no seats as shown in chapter five (5.6) and so students were not allowed into the library. Only 12 (26.1%) of the branch libraries were open to all library users of their respective universities. Figure 8 graphically illustrates the overall situation.

This pattern was not confined to any one university. As shown in Table 52, the practice of restricting branch library use was rather widespread. Most of the branch libraries at Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, Ife and Lagos were not open to all library users in the universities. At Benin, however, the two branch libraries were open to all library users of the University.

### TABLE 52

ACCESS TO BRANCH LIBRARIES BY UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Authorized Users</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Staff of Unit</td>
<td>Academic Staff and Students of Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>16 (84.2)</td>
<td>3 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsukka</td>
<td>1 (33.3) +</td>
<td>1 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife</td>
<td>3 (60.0)</td>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Percentage (%) in Parenthesis

These restrictive access practices were confirmed by personal observation in some of the branch libraries. In fact, in a few single-subject departmental libraries, some categories of
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students of the departments had no access to the collections. In one chemistry library, the writer was informed that first year students were not allowed into the library. This restrictive practice was explained in terms of departmental tradition.

Another departmental library in science was even more restrictive. Only final year students of the department had access to the library. This prohibitive arrangement is contained in the "Departmental Library: Regulations." conspicuously placed at the entrance to the library: "The Library is open to final year Botany students only and NOT to their friends from outside the Department." (20)

The attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians towards this matter of access to branch libraries seem pertinent.

**TABLE 53**

**RATINGS ON THE PROPOSITION: ONLY MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT SHOULD USE THE BRANCH LIBRARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>% of Total Heads of Academic Units</th>
<th>% of Total Librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 53 one discerns that 32.2% of the 146 heads of academic units strongly agreed or agreed that "only members of the academic unit should use the branch library." (Item 12, Appendix II) Those undecided were 5.5% while 62.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The responses of librarians to this matter are somewhat similar: 32.2% strongly agreed or disagreed, 4.4% were undecided while 63.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The observation is to a large extent supported by the ratings of the two groups to the statement, "Branch library resources should
be open to all library users of the university." (Item 13, Appendix II) More than 60% of the heads of academic units and librarians were in support of the view. Those not in support were in each group below 30%.(Table 54)

TABLE 54

RATINGS ON THE PROPOSITION: BRANCH LIBRARY RESOURCES SHOULD BE OPEN TO ALL LIBRARY USERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is thus clear that the majority of the heads of academic units and librarians were of the view that branch libraries should be open to all library users of the university. However, it is noteworthy that up to 32.2% of the heads of academic units and another 32.2% of the librarians (Table 53) felt that the use of branch libraries should be restricted to members of the academic unit. Where people who share this view are in the position to regulate the use of branch libraries, it is possible that their expressed attitudes would influence their decision.

There is also the traditional element of viewing persons from other locations of the university as invaders in the branch libraries. Paul W.T. Poon has restated this parochial posture developed in many academic units over the years: "They might think that the departmental library is their own and disallow or discourage other people from using it." (21)

These factors help the account for the observation that access to 65.2% of the branch libraries was restricted to members of the corresponding academic units. (Table 51)
In most cases, however, some form of arrangement exists for other library users to have limited access to the branch libraries with restrictive access regulations. Such arrangements are not usually documented but they sometimes take the form of granting a needy user special permission for specific in library use. In some cases, the branch librarian might demand special introductory letter from the user's head of department. D.W. Butcher has observed a somewhat similar situation at the University of Cambridge: "The conditions of access to the (departmental) libraries vary considerably; but it is well worth bearing in mind that, even if admission to some of the libraries may be somewhat restricted, access can usually be obtained by special permission." (22)

7.1.4.1 Categories and Numbers of Users

Tables 55 and 56 show the nature of the users. Similar to the situation in the main libraries, members of the academic staff and students are the major users of the branch libraries. As seen above, the difference is that the users of branch libraries are essentially members of the academic unit in which the branch library exists.

The categories and numbers of users contained in Tables 55 and 56 are often a matter of the academic programmes and size of the parent unit of the branch library. Table 55 shows that members of the teaching/research staff were recorded in every case. Postgraduate students were shown as users in 33(71.7%) branch libraries. These libraries belong to academic units with postgraduate programmes. Undergraduate students use 42(91.3%) of the branch libraries.

There was an overall total of 473 other users. These users were not members of the appropriate universities but were given special permission to use the libraries.
### TABLE 55

**STATUS OF BRANCH LIBRARY USERS**

(\(n = 46\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Users</th>
<th>Branches Open to Each Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Users from outside the University

### TABLE 56

**NUMBER OF USERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Users</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean(^*)</th>
<th>Range High</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>No. of branches open to each category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Student</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>19,717</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* to the nearest integer

#### 7.1.5 Circulation of Materials

In the university libraries, most of the information materials are on open access and can be borrowed by registered users. Loan periods are more or less the same in the six university libraries. The periods vary depending on the status of the user. Undergraduates can borrow books for two weeks and postgraduates for four weeks. The members of the teaching/research staff are usually granted extended periods of loan, sometimes up to one academic year. This traditional approach to loan periods is still practised in many countries. R.F. Eatwell observed, "The orthodox method of dealing with loan periods is
FIGURE 9

CIRCULATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR BRANCH MATERIALS

- Circulating and non-circulating
- In library use
- Circulation for Staff

58.7%
39.1%
1.3%
to have long (or indefinite) periods for academic staff and perhaps research students, and shorter periods for undergraduates, ranging from 14 days to a term." (23)

This approach raises a number of questions. The idea of lending some books for up to a session means that for a whole academic year such books will not be seen on the shelves. As Michael Buckland observed, for any given unit of information material, "--- the length of the loan period and immediate availability are inversely related. The longer the loan period, the lower the immediate availability; the shorter the loan period, the higher the immediate availability; (24)

Some techniques exist for ameliorating the problem. Normally books on loan are subject to recall on demand. However, there are readers, few though they may be, who sometimes feel that what they are unable to find on the shelves are not possessed by the library. This approach is not altogether unwholesome as open access is, in part, designed to encourage browsing. At the same time effective user education helps to reduce user failures resulting from this approach if users form the habit of checking at the catalogue as well.

Another form of help is the practice adopted in some universities, to limit all users to specific loan periods, sometimes up to ten weeks for the academic staff. For instance, the University of Surrey Library limits staff to twenty books for ten weeks, postgraduates ten books for four weeks and undergraduates seven books for two weeks. (25) In this way there is reasonable likelihood that every book will be on the shelf for sometime in the session. Reserve book service is also a widely used device to ensure that much needed information items are available for use in the library.

Figure 9 shows the circulation arrangements in the branch libraries. Mixed circulation arrangements exist in 27(58.7%) of the branches. In these libraries, some items circulate while
others were for in the library use. Such materials that circulate can be on loan to registered users of the branch libraries. In 18 (39.1%) branch libraries, materials could only be borrowed by the staff members. The information materials in one branch library were for in use only.

7.1.5.1 Loan Periods

The loan periods for the branch library information materials that can be borrowed are shown in Table 57. The loan period was less than one week in one (2.2%) branch library, one week in six (13.3%) branch libraries and two weeks in 28 (62.2%) branches. In another six (13.3%) branch libraries, information materials can be borrowed for three weeks. Four (8.9%) branch libraries allowed materials on loan for four weeks.

**TABLE 57**

**LOAN PERIODS FOR STUDENTS**

(N = 45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loan Period</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is pertinent to observe that the loan periods described above apply to students. For members of the teaching/research staff, very flexible loan facilities exist in the branches. Usually, the staff could borrow materials for indefinite periods. Sometimes materials would remain with some staff members for several academic years, presumably on the grounds that such items are kept for teaching/research purposes.

Obviously, this practice reduces the physical availability of such information materials, as already explained. There is also the other viewpoint that such practices amount to improper use of university property. A. Faniran observed this tendency
and reasoned that university teachers frown at centralized arrangements for the libraries since such would check their rather uncontrolled use of materials.

The administrative centralization has however not been without its attendant problems. The most glaring is the opposition from some members of the academic staff. This is to be expected for several reasons — a lecturer could have in his possession as many as twenty titles from departmental collections for a period of three years or more without any record that he has borrowed them. In effect, some lecturers used library books as if they were private property. Their uncompromising attitude would therefore be understood in that centralization would definitely deny them or their former freedom of action and private ownership of University books. (26)

7.1.6 Opening Hours

The use of any university library depends largely on its opening hours. Hours of access is therefore a major element in determining the extent of physical availability of resources in the library.

The university libraries in Nigeria are usually open from 8.00 am to 10.30 pm, Monday to Friday during term. There are variations in the weekend opening hours but most of them open from 8.00 am to 1.00 pm on Saturday and 5.00 to 10.00 pm on Sunday. Infact, no major criticism can be made on their opening hours.

The situation is remarkably different with the branch libraries. Respondents were asked to give an assessment of their opening hours in relation to those of their corresponding main libraries. Only six (13.0%) branch libraries indicated that they open for equal number of hours as their respective main libraries, 22 (47.8%) were open for nearly equal number of hours. Sixteen (34.8%) branch libraries were open for about a half of the number of hours while two (4.3%) were open for less than a half of the time.

Table 58 gives an insight into the number of hours the branch libraries remained open. During the weekdays (Monday to Friday) most of them were open from 7.30 am to 3.30 pm which is the
normal working period in Nigeria. In fact 17(37.00) of the branch libraries closed at 3.30 pm: in effect, these libraries opened for eight hours daily, Monday to Friday. Thereafter, considerable variations in the hours of access can be observed. Four (8.7%) branch libraries at Zaria were open until 11.00 pm. These four were thus open for 15 hours daily, Monday to Friday. The other branch libraries closed at various hours between 3.30 pm and 11.00 pm.

**TABLE 58**

**DAILY OPENING TIME IN HOURS (MONDAY TO FRIDAY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During weekends, the story was quite different as shown in Table 59. On Saturdays 27(58.7%) of the branch libraries were closed. Two (4.3%) were open for four hours. At the other extreme, one remained open for 14 hours, from 8.00 to 10.00 pm on Saturday. The rest were open for varying number of hours. (Table 59)

On Sundays, 43(93.5%) branch libraries were closed. Only three (6.5%) were open for seven, eight and twelve hours respectively.

Overall, the branch library opening hours are clearly not enough. However, it is necessary to view the matter in the context of the personnel and other resources of the branches. These are evaluated with possible solutions in chapter eight.
TABLE 59

WEEKEND OPENING TIME IN HOURS

(N = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>Saturday No. of Branches</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sunday No. of Branches</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Services

Essentially service is the overall goal of the major activities in university libraries. In chapter two (2.5.3) these were discussed at considerable length from the point of view of university libraries in the Nigerian and African environment. As shown in chapter three (3.7) most of the functions and services of branch libraries are essentially the same kind of the services provided in the main library.

The difference, however, is that the services of a branch library are for a specific group within the university. As D. W. Butcher observed, each branch library "meets a special need --- Each one has grown to cater for a group of specialists." (2.7)

Thus while the functions and services may be quite similar in "kind"to those of the main university library, they can be considerably different in quality and level. Much of the activities connected with selection, acquisition and organization of information resources in the branch libraries have been covered at the appropriate levels of this work.
In Table 60, the extent to which the branch libraries provide specific services to users is shown. Most of the libraries, 27(58.7%) offered reference services. However, the slim nature of reference materials in these libraries (6.4.4) and the fact that there were no professional librarians in most of the branches (6.3.7.2) would mean that such reference services were limited in scope. The wider angle of interpreting the information materials of the library or sometimes of several libraries usually provided in the university libraries can hardly be available at the branches. Current accession lists were provided by 23 branch libraries. Twelve offered special bibliographies. Ten branches provided current contents. The other services—indexing, photocopying, abstracting and literature searches were provided in relatively few branch libraries.

**TABLE 60**

**SOME SERVICES OF BRANCH LIBRARIES**

(*N* = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Branches Providing Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current acquisitions lists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special bibliography</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current contents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature searches</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.1 **Peculiar Services**

Respondents were also asked to indicate any unusual services they provide, for example, those not available in any other library in the university. Most of the respondents indicated that they had no such services. However, six of the respondents indicated the nature of such services offered. One institute library indicated that it provides an ethnographic
film service. A library studies library supports the "teaching effort of lecturers with practical back up, eg., cataloguing, classification, reference work." A faculty library in education showed it was making a comprehensive collection of theses in education for reference. Another education faculty library had available "school textbooks collection for teachers in training." One agricultural library indicated its peculiar services as follows: "Occasional ordering of books for students; exhibition of books in cooperation with booksellers/publishers for students' purchase on the spot." A faculty of law library observed as follows: "Availability of rulings and judgments from various courts for research purposes."

7.3 **Chief Advantages**

As required in the questionnaire, the respondents indicated what they considered to be the chief advantage of each collection. However, seven respondents felt that in their situation one factor could not be singled out as the most important. These seven chose more than one reason:

The overall response are shown in Table 61. Nineteen branch libraries indicated that greater availability of material was their chief advantage. More personalized service was the chief advantage in 18 cases. Sixteen chose convenience of location. The opportunity to use unique materials was paramount in 15 branch libraries. Greater number of hours accessible and casual atmosphere were each mentioned by two respondents.

**TABLE 61**

**CHIEF ADVANTAGES OF BRANCH LIBRARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Advantage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater availability of materials</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More personalized service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of location</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique materials</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual atmosphere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater number of hours accessible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It seems interesting to relate the chief advantages of the branch libraries as shown in Table 61 with some of the findings in this work. Greater availability of materials was chosen as the chief advantage of the largest number of branch libraries. In chapter six (6.4.3) the nature and size of these collections were highlighted and discussed. Being usually small in size the branch library staff and primary users invariably have very good knowledge of the collection. Although the organization of these information materials were not as thorough as those in the main libraries (7.1.4), their relative smallness and intense use make it easy to retrieve or account for any material. Readers appear to give more importance on convenience of access than they do on schemes of classification or even mere comprehensiveness of collection. Robert Taylor has shown that "a system which provides easier access, especially physical convenience, will be more effective than a system which is concerned only with quality of the scheme of subject organization." (28)

Also the very elaborate work of Richard M. Dougherty and Laura L. Blomquist which looked at the issue of access to university library resources revealed as follows:

It would appear from the findings that many researchers place greater importance on the convenience of access to library collections than they do on comprehensiveness of holdings.

Then, two, the smaller and more personal environment of a branch library is more familiar, less threatening, more inviting and more convenient. (29)

The issue of more personalized service indicated as the chief advantage by 18 branch libraries is in fact borne out by the foregoing observation. In many cases the branch library staff know the primary users by name and often discuss their information needs in and sometimes outside the library. Convenience of location chosen by 16 respondents has also not come as a surprise in view of the findings in chapter five (5.5). Most, 40 (87.0%) of the branch libraries were located in the same building as their parent academic units. In this way, the primary users find them very convenient particularly from the point of view of lecture rooms, offices and laboratories.
As seen in chapter six (6.4.7) unique information materials were a regular feature of the branch collections. This helps to show why the use of such unique materials was most highly rated in 15 of the branch libraries. Only two respondents showed that the chief advantage was greater number of hours accessible. This, and the observation in 7.1.7 that most of the branch libraries open for relatively low number of hours show that this matter is a live problem in most of the branch libraries. As already indicated, this issue will be given a further consideration in chapter eight.

7.4 Publications

Respondents were asked to indicate and give full bibliographic citation of any published material(s) relating to their specific branch libraries. Most of the respondents had no such publications. Only one provided a valid response. The relevant periodical article is cited below:


This publication has been reflected in chapter three of this work.

7.5 Difference in Attitudes of Heads of Academic Units and Librarians.

At the appropriate parts of this report, the expressed attitudes of the heads of academic units and librarians towards branch libraries in the universities were reflected. The nature of the questionnaire used for this purpose (Appendix IV) makes it possible to draw statistical inference from the responses. To achieve this, the responses of the 146 heads of academic units and 90 librarians were scored using the criteria described in chapter four (4.3.1.1). The t-test was applied to determine the level of the difference of the responses of the two groups. Table 62 presents the means, standard deviations and obtained t-statistics for the responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Group+</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D++</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Group+</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D++</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-7.79*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-5.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-5.12*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-7.26*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-8.43*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-5.15*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>-2.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-5.91*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-3.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.67*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-3.77*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 62 Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Group ++</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D+++</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-3.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-2.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>71.65</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>-6.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>80.49</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
+ For the description of Items 1-22 see Appendix IV
++ Group i = Heads of Academic Units (Number: 146)
ii = Librarians(Number: 90)
+++ S.D. = Standard Deviation
* Cases where the t-tests are significant at the 0.05 level.
Degree of Freedom (DF) = 234
In reading the mean scores, it should be borne in mind that higher scores indicate favourable disposition towards the specific matter concerning branch libraries. Conversely, relatively low mean scores represent less favourable attitude. Table 62 shows that in 16 of the 22 variables on the scale, librarians had higher mean scores than heads of academic units. The mean scores for heads of academic units were higher in four of the variables: these were items 8, 9, 14 and 20. A close examination of the mean scores for the two groups reveals though that the difference was relatively less in scores of the two groups in items 17 to 22 which sought their views on whether branch libraries should provide such services as current awareness, specialized bibliographies and photocopying. The relative agreement on these matters suggests that there is considerable consensus on the nature of branch library services.

An attempt can be made to explain the relative higher mean scores by librarians in most of the variables. As librarians they were probably conversant with the prevailing views on various issues concerning branch libraries in the universities as reflected in the literature of library and information studies. In answering the questions they were probably inclined to ensuring conformity with these prevailing views rather than answering the questions from the point of view of their peculiar experiences as required in the questionnaire. On the contrary, the heads of academic units were presumably lacking in these rather pre-conceived viewpoints and responded to the questions from the point of view of their respective circumstances.

The foregoing reasoning is to a large extent supported by the obtained standard deviations. The spread of the scores (as indicated by the standard deviations) was greater for the heads of academic units in 17 of the 22 variables. This shows that the heads of academic units gave more varying responses than librarians who seemed to concentrate their responses on relatively narrow range.
The obtained t-values show that the difference between the expressed attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians were statistically significant in 15 (68.2%) of the variables. These were denoted with asterisks in Table 62. In the remaining seven (31.8%) variables the difference was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Overall, the composite t-value of -6.92 was statistically significant at the .05 level.

7.6 Comments

Respondents were asked to express their views on matters concerning branch libraries (Questionnaire II). A total of 33 (71.7%) of the respondents made comments. These are presented below.

Several respondents would want the branch libraries to have greater autonomy in dealing with their matters. Incidentally most of these views were expressed from the branch libraries that were centrally administered:

- Branch librarians should be given more freedom to run the affairs of the branch libraries, especially in acquisition of materials.

- Greater freedom and autonomy should be granted to the branch librarian in the overall management of the branch library.

- Branch libraries should be semi-autonomous with separate vote. Their success depends on headship.

- Greater autonomy as far as funds and administration of the branch library is concerned.

- Greater autonomy and better involvement of faculty in policy matters.

- More autonomy.

Related to autonomy is the issue of finance raised by several respondents. They seem to stress the need for branch librarians to have ready access to branch library funds:

- If money were allocated specifically for library needs and was easily available, it would make the work of the library easier. In particular, it is essential for the acquisition of Nigerian materials to have ready cash, so that you can buy whenever you need to.
- Separate vote required to enable the branch library function effectively.
- Branch libraries should be given separate votes to cater to their needs.
- Faculty and (other) branch libraries require separate vote to be able to function properly.
- Funds should be made available for the purchase of books instead of buying books through the main library.
- There should be more funds for staffing and equipment.

The need for improved human and material resources was mentioned by many respondents:

- Improved facilities needed in the library. There is also need for regular supply of periodicals, and better cooperation with the department.
- Improved facilities and regular supply of newspapers.
- More seats should be provided for students.
- Prompt attention to the library's requests especially on staffing and materials.
- There should be (a) photocopying machine (b) a very viable reference collection for research.
- Better staffing and improved working relationship between the branch and main library.
- More professional (subject specialists) and less technical staff.
- Microforms and phonorecords as well as facilities for using them required.
- More staff should be employed to improve services.
- More staff: professional and clerical.
- Services will improve if more staff are employed.
- More seats required.

A few respondents would want their present accommodation extended:

- Extension of the library desirable.
- More physical space.
The rest of the respondents suggested other ways of improving the overall services of the branch libraries in the universities:

- Current awareness service is very necessary as many readers know very little about the collection.

- Branch libraries should endeavour to give "specialized" services for the benefit of their readers.

- Generally, improve status of librarians. This is relevant. Research should be done on improvement of the status of librarians in Nigeria.

- There is need for porters to check students as they leave the library.

- No matter how small a departmental library is, it needs to open throughout the day to meet user demands.

- Effort should be made to loan out books to students if at least for a night.

- Necessary to include branch libraries in any computerization arrangements of the main library.
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CHAPTER EIGHT

SUMMARY AND SYSTEMS EVALUATION

8.1 Introduction

This last chapter is in three broad parts. The first part consists of the salient points of the previous seven chapters. The second part moves a step forward in search of fruitful ways and means of evolving university-wide library systems out of the present arrangements and future possibilities. Recommendations for further research growing out of the present work form the third and final part of the chapter.

8.2 Recapitulation

Chapter one contains a statement of the problem, definitions, scope and limitations, and arrangement of the work. References to the need to evolve overall university library systems and the rather scanty treatment of branch libraries in Nigerian universities underscores the decision to focus this work on branch libraries. At the same time, this investigation impinges on the premise that branch libraries in a university are, or should be integrated components of the institution's library and information services. In view of this, the study investigates the nature of branch libraries in the universities at Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, Ife, Lagos and Benin City from the broader perspective of library and information services. The study also aims at establishing the expressed attitudes of heads of academic units and librarians towards branch libraries. The findings would provide a basis for formulating a framework for university-wide library systems.

Chapter two examines the issue of departments in university libraries. The same chapter highlights some aspects of university libraries in order to give some insight into the environments in which the branch libraries exist.

Chapter three reviews the literature of branch libraries in universities. Indeed, the chapter represents a comparative examination of patterns of branch libraries in the universities.
from different parts of the world and at various periods.

The details of the procedures and method employed to gather information concerning branch libraries in the six universities are contained in chapter four. Two questionnaires were designed and used. One required essentially factual information. The other was a Likert-type questionnaire formed to measure the expressed dispositions of heads of academic units and librarians towards branch libraries. Usable responses were received from 46(71.9%) of the branch libraries, 146(71.2%) heads of academic units and 90(71.4%) librarians from the six universities.

In chapter five some elements in the beginnings and extent of the branch libraries are presented and discussed. The age of the branch libraries is shown in the context of the foundation dates of the universities. A majority of the branch libraries are physically on the same campus as their corresponding main libraries. However, 21.7% are located at different geographical areas outside the main campus of their respective universities.

The most important single factor responsible for the establishment of the branch libraries was the need to provide for the special information needs of the parent academic units. Such other considerations as gifts, distance to the main library, and congestion in the main library were considerably less important. The majority, 84.8%, of the branch libraries are in separate rooms in the same building as their corresponding academic units. However, 13.0% are in separate quarters in the vicinity of the academic units to which they are affiliated.

The accommodation and seating in the branch libraries were examined. In most cases these have not evolved as a result of careful planning such as is usually the case with the main libraries. Often the real planning begins with considering how best to use any available accommodation as a branch library. However, the accommodation in the branch libraries is substantial. At Ibadan, the aggregate floor area of the branch libraries is 2,393 square metres with 985 reader places. The branch
libraries at Nsukka have an overall floor area of 483 m² with 140 seats. The aggregate floor area of branch libraries at Zaria is 4,843 m² with 904 seats. Ife branch libraries have an overall total of 1,704 m² with 264 seats. The overall floor area of the branch libraries at Lagos is 394 m² with 256 seats and at Benin is 1,206 m² with 340 reader places. There is no doubt that if properly harmonized for effective use, these facilities would considerably ameliorate the accommodation and seating constraints of the relevant main libraries.

Chapter six looks at the administration, financial arrangements, personnel and information resources of the branch libraries. The responsibility for administration of 52.2% of the branch libraries is vested in the appropriate main library. The others, 47.9% are administered by the corresponding heads of academic units. The universities provide the funds for the branch libraries but such funds are incorporated in the budgets of the appropriate main libraries or academic units that administer the libraries.

The personnel of the main and branch libraries reflected the prevailing character of library staff in the country. The insufficient number of appropriately qualified librarians has the result that, in many cases, non-librarians occupy professional positions. Thus, 30.4% of the branch libraries are managed by librarians, 26.1% by library officers, 4.3% by university teachers and the rest, 39.1%, by library and clerical assistants.

The information resources of the branch libraries are similar in kind with those of the main libraries. Books and periodicals prevail. The other types of information materials include government publications, nonprint materials, theses and projects, pamphlets, charts, files and handouts. These materials include a considerable amount of unique items. There is also considerable duplication of resources, particularly in the single-subject departmental libraries. As in the main libraries, most of these materials are acquired by purchase.
In chapter seven the essential features of access to information materials are examined. The major libraries in Nigeria have achieved considerable uniformity by adopting the Library of Congress classification scheme, and by applying the international cataloguing rules and standard bibliographic description. However, this advantage has not been extended to all the branch libraries: the LC is in use in 58.7% of the branches, the DDC and UDC in 23.9%. Home made schemes have been developed in 4.3% of the branches while 15.2% are not professionally organized.

Physical access to the branch collections is to a large extent hampered by restrictive measures. In most, 65.2%, only members of the appropriate academic units have access to the collections. Indeed, in 8.7% of the branches, access is confined to the members of the academic staff. However, 26.1% of the branch libraries are open to all library users of the corresponding universities. These largely restrictive measures pervade the circulation arrangements and loan periods of the information materials in the branches. There are also considerable restrictions in the hours of access.

The services of the branch libraries resemble those offered by the main libraries in type but differ in the sense that they are directed to specific groups. In addition to the normal functions of selection, acquisition, organization and circulation of information materials, the branch libraries provide the following services, in descending order of magnitude: reference, current accession lists, special bibliographies, current contents, indexing, photocopying, abstracting and literature search. The peculiar services offered include an ethnographic film service, a comprehensive collection of theses in education, the supporting of teaching effort with practical back-up, provision of school textbooks for teachers in training and occasional ordering of books for students.

The largest single group of the respondents felt that the chief advantage of the branch collections is greater availability of resources. This observation is shown to lend ample support to
the view that many readers place greater importance on conveni-
ence and ease of access to information materials than they do
on mere comprehensiveness of collections or schemes of
classification.

The tabulation and comparison of the expressed attitudes of
the heads of academic units and librarians towards branch
libraries produced an overall t-value of -6.92, which is statis-
tically significant at the .05 level. The chapter also includes
the respondents' comments which reflect their perceptions of
ways and means of improving the services of branch libraries.

8.3 Systems Evaluation

In chapter one it was observed that Nigeria's foremost university
librarians had expressed the need for branch libraries in the
universities to form integral components of university library
systems or networks. Such a viewpoint underscores an early
realization that harmonizing the entire library and information
resources of the universities would lead to improved services.
However, the character of the branch libraries as shown in this
work reveals that the expressed concern of leading librarians
has remained largely unattained. We need to explore ways and
means of evolving integrated university library systems.

Edythe Moore has explained the nature of a library system:

Webster defines a system as a set or arrangement of
things related or connected as to form a unity or
organic whole, a set of facts, principles, rules,
etc classified or arranged in an orderly form as to
show a logical plan linking the various parts...
System implies the total picture from the library's
objectives, its users' needs and requirements ... And it has to do with how well these subsystems are
interrelated and synchronized or meshed. It has
to do with the total picture but at the same time
it is concerned with the most minute portion of a
subsystem ... because each component must be designed
to fit properly with the other components rather than
to function by itself. We are always concerned with
systems, regardless of whether we have a manual or
mechanized library operation. (1)
Two important elements are implicit: (1) a system has component parts (sometimes tagged subsystems), (2) the component parts are effectively linked up so that they exist as an organic whole. Branch libraries in a university can thus exist as integral components of the university library system. It is, however, necessary to bear in mind the mission of branch libraries (see chapters one and five) as well as the objectives of university libraries (chapter two). This realization that every component of a system has a somewhat peculiar nature gives elegance to the overall picture.

Sometimes the distinction between a system and its component parts (subsystems) is blurred. What one person regards as a system can be a subsystem to another person. For instance, the component parts of the acquisitions department can be regarded as its subsystems; in another context, the whole of the acquisitions department becomes a subsystem of the total library system. To avoid this confusion, it is necessary to give precise elements that make up a particular system.

Perhaps, it is already evident that in the context of this work the component parts of a university-wide library system are regarded as the main library and all the branch libraries of that university. In such a system four important elements can be discerned: (1) users, (2) information resources, (3) main and branch libraries, and (4) the linking of (1), (2) and (3) into a coherent whole both of materials and of services.

8.3.1 Extent of Branch Libraries

The component parts of the university-wide library system are the main library on the one hand and varying numbers of single-subject departmental libraries, faculty libraries and institute libraries on the other. In the system, the main library occupies a pre-eminent position. As Arthur T. Hamlin put it:

The central library ideally is all things to all scholars. It not only provides volumes on all subjects, numbered in six to seven figures, but a wealth of rare books and
At the same time, the very nature of dispersed library units in the six universities makes it necessary to streamline their extent. As already explained, the branch libraries have grown in a lopsided manner. In the universities some research institutes have branch libraries while others have none. Several academic faculties have faculty libraries while there are none in many. Also several academic departments particularly at Ibadan and Zaria have single-subject departmental libraries while most in the six universities have none.

In many cases the university libraries have in recent times shown interest in the potential of the branch libraries in the overall library and information services in the universities. As already seen, the action of the university libraries has so far taken the form of coordinating the resources of the libraries and seeking to centralize the administration of existing branch libraries. However, no explicit statement on the overall extent of branch libraries or their establishment was discerned.

On their part, there is the tendency of several librarians to ignore or show scanty attention to single-subject departmental libraries when examining the libraries of the universities. As observed in chapter five (5.1) this sort of attitude is usually on the grounds that such libraries are somewhat small, sometimes ill-organized and run as private properties of relevant academic departments. Benzies Boadi who explored the nature of library networks in the English-speaking countries of West Africa observed that librarians in the region often looked down on small libraries in government departments, colleges on much the same grounds. He remarked, "These libraries (the government, special, technical, school and college libraries, etc): may be small but their importance to the social and economic development of their countries should be overlooked. Their document resources should be as well organised as those of
the well-established libraries." (3) Harold L. Tveiterås observed a somewhat similar situation in some German universities, "Here are institute libraries of every magnitude (some of them contain nearly 100,000 volumes) which are virtually without a library-trained staff." (4)

The single-subject departmental libraries are libraries. The fact that they exist, flourish and continue to be held in high esteem by their primary users means that they fulfil a definite demand. Some collections are important not because of their size but because of their quality and uniqueness. Robert Shackleton, as Bodley's librarian, made an important observation:

The high quality of Oxford as a library centre results not only from the Bodleian but also from the wide range of other libraries which complement its resources. These libraries present a great variety, from the richness of a college like Merton, antedating both the Bodleian and the invention of printing, to a small but precious collection like that of the department of Art. (5)

A systematic approach to all the information resources in a university is an essential element of a university library system.

In terms both of organization and resources, a statement on the extent of branch libraries in each of the universities needs to be evolved. From the patterns of branch libraries in the universities, faculty libraries hold considerable promise in the library and information services of the universities. As shown in chapter five, they are the one kind of subsidiary library that exists in all six universities. Decentralization of library services to the faculty level is also a positive way of containing much of the pressure for single-subject departmental libraries.

Developments in the administrative systems in the universities seem to give added fillip to the faculty library idea. Many of the universities are now decentralizing their administrative machinery to the faculty level. The arrangements at the university of Ibadan give an insight into this kind of development. The document, "Decentralization scheme for the University" states as follows:
The powers and functions of Senate in respect of the following matters should be delegated to the Faculty Board which shall administer such matters in accordance with regulations made by Senate. (6)

These matters include appointment and promotion of academic staff below the rank of Reader, organization and control of courses of study and examinations, the selection of students, granting of fellowships and similar awards. Earlier, these powers were concentrated at the centre. The document also specified that the Bursary and Maintenance Departments should be decentralized and placed at the faculty level. It noted that the Library has achieved this to a large extent. In most of the other universities, similar arrangements for decentralization of the administrative machinery to the faculty level exist.

The environment offered provides an opportunity for evolving a machinery that would make the existence of branch libraries at the faculty level a settled policy in the universities.

Faculty libraries offer opportunities for better use of space than single-subject departmental libraries. Robert R. Walsh (7) has demonstrated that a larger branch library provides better accommodation than several separate departmental libraries. For instance, ten small departmental libraries will have ten staff areas, ten circulation desks, etc. Conversely, one faculty library ten times as large will need one circulation desk, one workroom, etc., thus resulting in more usable floor space in the same amount of gross area. Robert H. Blackburn felt strongly that decentralization of libraries at the faculty or school level is inevitable as a university grows. He reasoned:

... a single large central library becomes too unwieldy and inflexible and distant to provide what is needed, and a large number of small departmental libraries do not add up to anything useful. (8)

The university authorities in Nigeria are placing considerable emphasis on planning as a separately identifiable function. This is reflected in the establishment of planning offices and
development committees to harmonize the immediate and long-range plans of the institutions. Where the library implications are reflected at every stage of discussion and decisions on the use of space and building as a whole, many of the accommodation problems and associated crises of libraries can be averted. In his paper on "Master planning for university libraries," Robert H. Muller considered the whole issue of including libraries as an integral part of campus planning. For universities that would decentralize their library services, he reasoned that the realistic approach is to evolve "planned decentralization" in contrast to "expedient decentralization";

Planned decentralization means the establishment of large libraries serving the subject disciplines or schools located within a given area. Such multi-disciplinary libraries have also been referred to as "cluster libraries." It would obviously be better if a campus would group its instructional buildings by subjects that are broadly related (physical sciences, biomedical sciences, social sciences, humanities)... (9)

This would fit into the faculty structure in Nigerian universities. In most cases the academic departments that make up a faculty are housed in the faculty building. In a few cases, however, the departments are in a cluster of buildings in the same vicinity. Thus, it is relatively easy to provide for faculty libraries in the plans for faculty structures. In this way the practice of converting any available accommodation into a branch library (See chapter five, 5.5) will be contained and better space provision will be achieved for the libraries.

Many of the issues highlighted and discussed in support of larger branch libraries in chapter three (3.4.1) are relevant in stressing the need for restricting branch libraries to the faculty level.

As seen in chapter five (5.1), there are departmental libraries at Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, and Ife. It seems likely that any move to merge such libraries into larger units (faculty libraries) will receive stiff resistance from the academic departments to which they are affiliated. It therefore seems conven-
ient to reorganize them as parts of the university library system. However, new single-subject departmental libraries will hardly emerge where faculty libraries are systematically developed.

Institute libraries are relatively few in number and they belong to units that are not part of any faculty administration. Institutes such as the Economic Development Institute, University of Nigeria; Institute of African Studies, University of Ibadan; and Institute for Agricultural Research, Ahmadu Bello University have their own academic boards on more or less the same basis as a faculty board. Institute libraries might therefore exist on the same level as faculty libraries. They are indeed the best staffed of the branch libraries.

These levels of a university library system are graphically presented in Figure 10. Three levels are shown in this hierarchical model.

Level 1 represents the main library which is also known as the central library. In part, this is because it is traditionally located at the centre of the university's academic life. More importantly, the adjective "central" depicts the coordinating role of the main library in a university with dispersed library and information services. The main library serves or should serve as the switching centre of the system, providing effective coordination and link with the other levels of library and information services in the system.

Level 2 in Figure 10 represents the faculty and institute libraries. As already seen, confining the development of library and information services to this level offers considerable opportunities for improving and coordinating the overall library services of the universities.

Level 3 in the Figure (representing single-subject departmental libraries) is a feature of university library systems principally at the University of Ibadan and Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
There is then a framework for evolving a branch library policy for each university. Such a policy should be initiated by the appropriate university library or library committee. For it to command the respect of the overall academic community, it should be considered by relevant university bodies and committees - academic departments, faculty boards, planning and development committees and the senate. In fact, the main library requires close collaboration of these component bodies of the academic community in order to evolve an integrated library system. Typical policy statements on this matter are contained in the works of Guy R. Lyle (10) and Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber. (11) With a clear perception of the extent of branch libraries in each university, it becomes considerably easier to plan the nature of the relationship between the component parts of the university library system.

8.3.2 Administrative Arrangements

The administrative patterns for university libraries were highlighted and discussed in chapters two(2.2) and six(6.3.2). Although the conventional functional structure is adopted in most university libraries in Nigeria, there are indications that
in future greater emphasis would be placed on subject arrange-
ment. Adedeji Adelabu has looked at the matter and observed:

A crucial problem of our university libraries in Africa
today is their hierarchical and bureaucratic structures
which savour too much of red tape. It seems possible to
develop a pattern of university librarianship which, on
the graduate staff, would permit a combination of speci-
fic academic learning and skills with a variety of tasks.
To do this, one must in turn have subject specialists
each working in a field (or related fields) of knowledge
but covering in respect of it (or them) book selection,
classification, bibliographical and reference work . . .
Thus, in place of horizontal division of functions, you
achieve a vertical integration. (12)

Indeed, the consideration is a live topic in university library
circles in Nigeria. O.O. Ogundipe sees the organization of
university libraries along subject lines as particularly appro-
priate in Nigeria because of the library background of most
students and some staff:

Not having been much exposed to first rate libraries,
especially in their secondary school days, if at all,
they are unaware and ignorant of information that can
be got from the library not just in term of general
quick reference questions but in-depth use of library
materials. (13)

At the national level, "the National Universities Committee on
Academic Planning which included some librarians has rightly
recommended its adoption by Nigerian university libraries."(14)

The University of Benin Library has given a lead in this matter.
Its administrative structure has been re-ordered along subject
lines:

The subject divisions at the University of Benin follow
the main subject groups somewhat along the lines of the
faculties and meanwhile are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Science and Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Law (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subject specialist arrangement has considerable attraction in universities with branch libraries. Such branch libraries will logically be parts of the relevant subject fields in the main library. For instance, a social sciences faculty library will be more or less an extension of the social sciences division of the main library. James Thompson has observed that the current emphasis on larger branch libraries is taking place simultaneously with "the current tendency in university libraries to prefer to have a series of major subject divisions rather than one massive general collection." (16)

Since most of the university libraries are presently administered along the traditional functional patterns (2.2), effective coordination of the branch resources along the lines covered below is necessary in order to establish the much desired interaction between the main and branch libraries.

8.3.3 **Personnel**

As observed in chapter six the staffing of the branch libraries is inadequate in quantity and quality. Because of the importance of staff in the provision of effective library and information services (see 6.3.7) it is very necessary for each university to evolve an arrangement that would ensure a reasonable number of staff in the branch libraries.

8.3.3.1 **Professional Staff**

In chapter six it was explained that each branch library should have access to professional staff. Where the faculty library arrangement is accepted, it looks feasible to ensure that each faculty library has a full-time librarian. As already shown, there were relatively more librarians in faculty libraries than in the single-subject departmental libraries. In fact at Nsukka and Benin, the existing faculty libraries had librarians on full-time bases. Ibadan and Zaria had librarians in most of the faculty libraries.

What is needed is for each university library to ensure that an
appropriately qualified librarian is deployed to every faculty or institute library. In fact the case for a librarian for every branch library at this level can easily receive sympathetic consideration of the university administration in view of the current arrangements to decentralize university administration and services to the faculty level.

However, in view of the manpower situation in the country (see Chapter six), there is a real possibility that there will be difficulty in finding the required number of librarians with appropriate subject background or interest. In such a situation, some of the faculty libraries can at least have librarians on part-time bases. As already seen, a somewhat similar arrangement was observed at Lagos. (6.1) K.W. Humphreys has in fact recommended something similar, "... it may be necessary as at the University of Uppsala to establish a team (at Uppsala more than 20) of librarians from the central library to be responsible for all aspects of the work of the libraries in departments. The staff can make sure that all books are accessible, that readers are assisted and that technical processes are undertaken professionally." (17) In this, the subject background or interest of such librarians will be an important guide. It is also necessary to be precise about the hours in the day or week when the librarian concerned will work in the branch library and the nature of his functions.

3.3.2 Other staff

As shown in chapter six, the number of staff in the branch libraries were in most cases very inadequate. For improved services, particularly improved hours of access, it is necessary to ensure that reasonable number of library officers and library assistants are employed in each branch library. In this regard, it should be borne in mind that branch libraries should run two shifts in a day in order to achieve improved hours of access.

Library Officers: Each faculty or institute library should have
two library officers, one for the morning shift and the other for the evening. As the number of librarians are not adequate, it is necessary to ensure that there is at least a library officer in each single-subject departmental library. However, professional service should be available along the lines suggested in 8.3.3.1 above.

Library Assistants: The need for more assistants particularly for improved opening hours was stressed in chapter six. With due regard to the size of the libraries and their users, each faculty library should have four assistants, two for the morning shift, and two for the evening. A departmental library should have two assistants.

Student Assistants: In chapter six, it was shown that student assistants can be utilized to resolve part of the personnel problems of the libraries. Students usually take considerable interest in the affairs of their branch libraries. Where appropriately recruited and trained, they can perform many of the duties of library assistants. In particular, student assistants can be very helpful in achieving increased opening hours for branch collections.

8.3.4 Access to the Resources

From the nature of library and information resources in this work, access is perhaps the matter that should receive the greatest attention. Because it is the most important consideration, it is necessary to restate the major reasons for improved access to the branch libraries.

The information resources of the main libraries were shown to be inadequate in most of the cases. This inadequacy is accentuated by the difficulties in implementing resource sharing arrangements in Nigeria. It was also observed that reader places in the main libraries fall short of the acceptable numbers. Further, the students' hostels are in most of the cases overcrowded. Rooms meant for single students are occupied by two or more. This invariably disrupts private study facilities in the hostels. Even then, the hostels are in most cases not sizeable enough. At Ibadan, Zaria and Lagos in particular, a proportion
of students must make private arrangements for accommodation, often in substandard houses outside the university premises.

The branch library resources can positively improve the library and information facilities in the universities. The space and seating of the branch libraries if fully utilized can ameliorate many of the existing seating problems in the relevant main libraries. Positively, they can provide ample reader places in the universities. In fact, in some cases what a reader requires is seating, sometimes to work on his notes with his personal books. The Parry Report's expert remark on this matter is very relevant, "It should be borne in mind when deciding on seating provision that many students use the library simply as a place in which they can write their essays or work with their own books. This is a legitimate use of library accommodation especially when a student lives not in a hall of residence but in lodgings or in a home which lacks quiet facilities for study." (18)

The nature of the information materials in the branches (Chapter six) underscores the need to give constant attention to ways and means of making them really available to every interested user in the universities. The information materials in the branch libraries can be useful to different library users in the universities (see Tables 39, 40, and 41). In any case, the interdisciplinary nature of modern fields of study means that each collection contains documents that can be of interest to users in different academic fields. James Thompson gave a lucid insight into this phenomenon:

Very few subjects are of interest only to one set of people; indeed most subjects overlap departmentally, and many overlap between faculties. Consequently, it is wrong that one department should have sole use of materials which are of interest to other sections of the university community. (19)

The importance of the information materials in the branch libraries is considerably heightened by the findings in chapter six (6.4.7) that they contain a high level of unique materials. Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber observed, "To maintain an important collection with unique materials for a limited
number of hours may be a real disservice to over half of the potential users."(20) In view of the findings in this work, it is not just the opening hours that require attention. It is necessary to ensure that university library users are aware of the existence of the collections.

The need for improved access to the information resources in the universities is also evident from the general state of library development in the country. In chapter one reference was made to the relatively low level of library development in the country meant that greater emphasis is placed on development of library and information services in the universities. Oyeniyi Osundina gave additional insight into the need for improving access to the library and information resources in the universities:

The problem of the Nigerian student is not the question of wanting or not wanting to use the college library. The question is whether or not his university can provide for his (information) needs in the first place, and secondly whether or not he has access to what is provided. Because he has no funds to buy text books, or because the books are not even on sale in book stores, accessibility becomes, to him, a paramount factor in the achievement of his educational objectives. (21)

8.3.5 Coordinating the Library Systems

A major element in improving access to the resources in the university library system is coordination. As already seen, the main libraries are concerned, at varying degrees of intensity, with coordinating the library resources in the universities. So far reasonable success has been achieved in centralizing the administration of the resources. However, mere centralization of administration cannot guarantee access to the collections. Effective coordination of the resources is the answer. Arthur M. McAnally observed that a common weakness in universities with dispersed library services is inadequate coordination:

Perhaps the greatest weakness of the departmental system has been lack of co-ordination among the
different units. Some systems have been called "centralized", but, actually, co-ordination and control have been so inadequate that there has not been much difference between the so-called "centralized" departmental library system and the decentralized system in which each library is more or less independent. (22)

K.W. Humphreys believes that "... a coordinated library system based on a minimum number of branch libraries is the only hope for the future of university libraries." (23) In order to achieve improved access to the library resources sustained attention must be paid to detailed identification and effective implementation of measures that would make the resources really accessible. In the light of the findings in this work, such measures should cover the following grounds:

8.3.5.1 Users

In chapter seven it was observed that in theory the branch libraries were open to all library users in the various universities. In practice, however, it was shown that access to 73.9% of the branch libraries were restricted to members of their respective academic units. The collections should not only be accessible on paper; they should be seen to be open to users. To achieve this, there is need to abrogate all traditions, regulations and other measures that obstruct access to the collections. This can be achieved by main library action aimed at showing that university-wide access to the collections improves and in no way limits, the quality and quantity of information available to every user.

Naturally, the primary users of each branch library will remain the staff and students of the appropriate academic unit. However, the nature of the resources in the branches, as already seen, can make them useful to other library users in the universities. A valid university library card is enough to admit users from other academic units. For instance, at the University of Cape Town, a reader can register in the main library or at any of the five branches and the reader's card "may be used at any library within the university library system." (24)
8.3.5.2 Knowledge of the Resources

Another important matter in the use of the branch libraries is the knowledge of the existence of such collections. It is doubtful if there is any user in the Universities at Ibadan, Asuksa, Zaria, Ife and Lagos who is fully aware of all the branch collections in his university, or, at least those that can be of use to him. Without this knowledge, he would probably be unable to reach the relevant collections that can enrich his academic programme. This makes it necessary for every user to have ready access to relevant information concerning all the collections in the university. Information given about each branch library should include the name of the library, its location, hours of opening, name of librarian or other person responsible for it and telephone number, if any. Such information can be included in the library guides usually given to readers in the main library. Also it is necessary to place this sort of information at a conspicuous place in every branch library.

8.3.5.3 Opening Hours

The opening hours of the branch collections were clearly inadequate as observed in chapter seven. In order to be properly utilized, it is necessary for the branch libraries to open for equal number of hours as the main libraries, from 8.00 am to 10.30 pm. By improving the staffing situation along the lines suggested above, it will be possible for the branch libraries to achieve longer hours of access.

8.3.5.4 Standardizing Cataloguing Practices

In chapter seven it was revealed that while the main libraries in the universities have adopted the Library of Congress scheme, the branch libraries were not uniformly organized. As already seen, the nature of the origins and general lack of professional staffing in the branch libraries were largely responsible for the situation. However, with improved staffing and coordination, the branch collections should be organized according to a uniform system. As shown in chapter seven, the main libraries
at Ibadan, Zaria and Benin City had changed to the LC. If they can do this, it seems relatively simple to standardize cataloguing and classification practices in the branch libraries. In this way the bibliographic records in each university library system will be uniform and interchangeable. The use of the collections will also be enhanced as readers will be familiar with the organization of information materials in every library in the system.

8.3.5.5 The Union Catalogue

The institutional union catalogues as they presently exist are defective in one important respect. As shown in chapter seven no branch library in the universities has bibliographic records of relevant information materials in other libraries. At the moment, it cannot be easy to have the union catalogues in every branch library in view of costs and infrastructural problems. However, something can be done. The arrangement at the Technological University, Berlin, can be adapted in the universities. According to Paul Adegbein, "Each special library (in the university) must have available, in addition to its own catalogue, records of works of interest in other parts of the University, and as a first step towards achieving this goal a xeroxed copy of the relevant section of the classified catalogue of the University Library is provided." (25) In this way, it will be possible for branch library users and staff to have bibliographic access to other relevant information materials in the university.

8.3.5.6 Contacts and Records

Regular contact is an important element in a university library system. The contacts can take several forms - regular visits of the appropriate main library staff to the branches to coordinate services, staff circulars, meetings of branch librarians with the university librarian, van service, bulletins covering current matters concerning the collections and staff.

It is also necessary for appropriate records of the main library to reflect the situation of the university library system. The
regular bulletins and annual reports of the university libraries should reflect developments from every part of the library system. So far, this has not been the case. Most of such bulletins and annual reports are usually on branch library matters. However, the layout of the annual reports of Ahmadu Bello University Library, Zaria can be adapted and improved. The 1981/82 Annual Report of the "University Library" covered the main library, Kashim Ibrahim Library, as well as developments in seven of the branch libraries in the university - Agricultural Library, Division of Agricultural Colleges Libraries, Medical Library, School of Basic Studies Library, President Kennedy Library, Institute of Education Libraries, and Veterinary Medicine Library. This sort of report should be extended to include all components of the university library system. The basis of the account can be faculty and institute libraries. The faculty library report should reflect developments in any single-subject departmental libraries within the faculty. In this way the reports and bulletins will give a complete picture of the university library system.

8.3.6. University Library Systems and the Computer

The computer has provided immense opportunities for improving library and information services. In the words of Dougherty and Blomquist, with the application of the computer to much of library and information work, "Users no longer need to rely solely on printed sources of information. They can now retrieve bibliographical information from computer terminals located in the sanctuary of their departments and even their offices."(26)

There is no doubt that the computer application will quicken the full integration and availability of information resources in any university library system. As K.W. Humphreys observed, the application of relevant facets of the new technology to library functions will result in a fully intergrated university library system:

The advent of computerization has enabled the librarian to provide a unification of records of the books, periodicals and other material in his library. With computer produced microfiche he can place a set
of catalogue entries for the resources available anywhere on the campus and, if he can afford it, a terminal to access the total library data base which could in a fully automated system give information not only on books in stock but also on orders, books on loan, works at binders, etc. When a reader has such facilities, the physical distribution of the library is of less consequence to him.(27)

Elements of the above facets of computer-based university library systems have been realized in university communities in the developed countries. Indeed the forecasting study of Georges Anderla observed that in the near future, the application of the new technology will radically transform the nature of library and information services.

The consensus of several hundred scientists and experts is that the future of the knowledge industry and all its components, without exception, is closely related to the automation of information. The unanimous view is that during the decade 1980-90 automated information will entirely replace the more or less adequate manual processes at present... (28)

The situation in Nigeria seems to indicate that the achievement of fully computerized university library systems cannot be realized within the target period of 1980-1990. The application of the computer to the university library services has been the object of many studies. The paper on "Computers and computer use at Nigerian universities" gave an expert account of current status of computer facilities in the universities. Dorothy S. Obi(29) and Nat M. Adeyemi (30) looked at the whole issue of the application of the technologies to the information handling environment in developing countries with specific reference to Nigeria. Victor C. Igwilo (31) and Benson E. Edoka (32) surveyed plans and prospects for computer application in the university libraries with specific reference to the circulation control systems; O.C. Ande Moottch (33) and Raphael U. Ononogbo (34) covered the rather low level of computer application to library and information services in Nigeria.

From the foregoing accounts one easily discerns that meaningful computerization of library and information services in the
universities can hardly be realized in the near future. The various aspects of the telecommunications, financial, infrastructural and personnel problems that hamper the whole matter of computerization of the library services are emphasized in the works.

In the circumstance, there is no doubt that manually operated university library systems will prevail for sometime. However, by streamlining university-wide library and information services along the lines offered in this work, a sound foundation would be laid for the transformation of the present-day manual university library systems into computerized university library systems of the future.
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8.3.7 Conceptual Framework of A University-wide Library System

Based on the observations in this work, a conceptual model of a fully integrated university-wide library system is offered — Figure 11. To make the presentation simple, the model depicts a university library system made up of the main library and three branch libraries. The essential element is that the information resources of the main and branch libraries are fully integrated in the overall interest of the library user.

8.4 Recommendations for Further Research

Three important matters raised in this work require separate and more detailed investigation.

The importance of physical access to documents was stressed. How does the library user get the document he requires in the universities? It is necessary to study the existing and potential document delivery patterns in the context of infrastructural characteristics of the universities and their libraries. This will hopefully produce new and better ways of improved access to information materials through improved document delivery arrangements.

Four broad categories of users of the main and branch libraries were identified in this work. They include undergraduate students, postgraduate students, teaching/research staff and some outside people. It will be necessary to give further attention to the primary and other libraries they use and for what purpose.

The need for appropriate linkages to exist among the component parts of a university library system was stressed. As this is an important element in improving the overall library and information services, it requires a separate and more detailed attention.
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APPENDIX I

Types of Branch Libraries

This Appendix explains the main types of branch libraries that can form part of a university library system.

**Class Library.** A small collection of students' text-books and a few reference books housed usually in a lecturer's room for the benefit of his students.

**Collegiate Library.** This is developed to furnish the information materials needed by the students and faculty members of a particular college or school, usually a professional school.

**Divisional Library.** A library attached to a division or a group of related departments of a university or college.

**Institute Library.** A collection established in support of the academic programmes of a research institute or centre.

**Laboratory Collection.** A small group of information materials kept in a laboratory, a lecturer's office or a departmental office as a direct help in teaching or conducting research on a particular subject.

**Sectional Library.** A portion of the university library's collection relating to a particular field of study and housed in a department or faculty.

**Single-subject Departmental Library.** A collection of information materials pertaining to the work of a single academic department and housed separately from the general book collection of the university.

**Sub-library.** A large collection of information materials provided for a faculty or a combination of subjects.
**APPENDIX II**

**Questionnaire 1**

Responses of Heads of Academic Units and Librarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group **</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic departments should have separate branch libraries.</td>
<td>i. 81</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only faculty libraries should exist in addition to the main library.</td>
<td>i. 28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Branch library should be administered by the academic unit it serves.</td>
<td>i. 28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Branch library should be administered by the main library.</td>
<td>i. 16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Branch library budget and supplies should be integrated with the academic unit's budget and supplies.</td>
<td>i. 45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Branch library budget and supplies should form part of main library budget and supplies.</td>
<td>i. 20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Branch library should not possess unique materials (i.e. books, journals, slides, etc., not found in the main library).</td>
<td>i. 5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Branch library should include materials for research in its collection.</td>
<td>i. 78</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Branch library should open for equal number of hours as the main library.</td>
<td>i. 33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Group **</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREED</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Branch library should be managed by professional library staff.</td>
<td>1. 54</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Branch library should be managed by a university teacher.</td>
<td>1. 4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Only members (faculty and students) of the academic unit should use the branch library.</td>
<td>1. 15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Branch library resources should be open to all library users of the university.</td>
<td>1. 29</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Materials selection for branch libraries should be done by librarians alone.</td>
<td>1. 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 69</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Branch library materials should be processed in the main library.</td>
<td>1. 19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ordering, cataloguing, etc.)</td>
<td>2. 20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Branch library materials should be processed in the main library.</td>
<td>1. 30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Branch library should inform university teachers when new materials arrive.</td>
<td>1. 76</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Branch library should produce specialized bibliographies in appropriate subject area(s).</td>
<td>1. 65</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Branch library should assist readers in locating library materials in the university.</td>
<td>1. 47</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Branch library should provide photocopying service.</td>
<td>1. 71</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Group **</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Branch library collection should only be used for reference, that is, i.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39 14 49 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its materials should always be available but must be used in the library.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 7 47 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Branch library collection should be placed on loan to university teachers and students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53 25 34 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48 7 15 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* See Appendix IV for instructions for completing this questionnaire.

** Group i = Heads of Academic units (Number = 146)
Group ii = Librarians (Number = 90)
APPENDIX III

List of Branch Libraries Surveyed

University of Ibadan

Department of Agricultural Economics Library*
Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies Library*
Department of Chemistry Library*
Department of Classics Library*
Department of English Library*
Department of Forestry Library*
Department of Geology Library*
Department of History Library*
Department of Language Arts Library*
Department of Library Studies Resource Centre*
Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages Library*
Department of Mathematics Library*
Department of Nursing Library*
Department of Philosophy Library
Department of Physics Library*
Department of Religious Studies Library*
Department of Theatre Arts Library
Department of Zoology Library

Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry Library*
Faculty of Education Library*
Faculty of the Social Sciences Library*
Faculty of Technology Library*
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Library*

Institute of African Studies Library*

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Department of Geology Library
Department of Political Science Library

Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine Library*
Faculty of Education Library*

Economic Development Institute Library*
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

Centre for Economic and Social Research Library
Centre for Islamic Legal Studies Library*

Department of Administrative Studies Library*
Department of Architecture Library*
Department of Chemistry Library
Department of Economics and Social Research Library
Department of Fine Arts Library
Department of History Library
Department of Human Anatomy Library
Department of Local Government Studies Library*
Department of Mathematics Library
Department of Mechanical Engineering Library

College of Agriculture Library*

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Library*
Faculty of Biological Sciences Library*
Faculty of Education Library*
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Library*
Faculty of Law Library*

Institute of Agricultural Research Library*
Institute of Education Library*

University of Ife, Ile-Ife

Department of health Sciences Library*

Faculty of Administration Library
Faculty of Agriculture Library*
Faculty of Education Library*
Faculty of Law Library*

Institute of Agricultural Research and Training Library*
University of Lagos

Faculty of Business Administration Library*
Faculty of Education Library*
Faculty of Engineering Library*
Faculty of Law Library*
Faculty of Science Library*
Faculty of Social Sciences Library*

Institute of Advanced Legal Studies Library

University of Benin, Benin City

College of Medical Sciences Library*
Ekewen Road Branch Library*

* Returned Questionnaire.
APPENDIX IV

(Questionnaire 1)

Department of Library Studies,
University of Ibadan,
Ibadan.

6th February, 1981

QUESTIONNAIRE ON ATTITUDE TOWARDS BRANCH LIBRARIES

Dear Sir/Madam,

You are requested to indicate below how you personally feel about branch libraries in Nigerian Universities. For the present purpose, the phrase "branch library" is employed to mean any unit of the university-wide library system physically removed from the main university library - this definition embraces departmental libraries, faculty libraries and institute libraries.

Please read each statement below carefully and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by ticking (v) one of the numbers. Ticking number one (1) means you Strongly Agree; number (2) means you Agree; number (3) means you are Undecided; number (4) means you Disagree; and number (5) means you Strongly Disagree.

Please note that your response will be treated in strict confidence and will be utilized for research purpose. It is also hoped that the result will be helpful in appraising branch libraries in our universities.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours truly,

Benson E. Edoka.
1. Academic departments should have separate branch libraries.

2. Only faculty libraries should exist in addition to the main library.

3. Branch library should be administered by the academic unit it serves.

4. Branch library should be administered by the main library.

5. Branch library budget and supplies should form part of main library budget and supplies.

6. Branch library budget and supplies should be integrated with the academic unit's budget and supplies.

7. Branch library should not possess unique materials (i.e., books, journals, slides, etc., not found in the main library).

8. Branch library should include materials for research in its collection.

9. Branch library should open for equal number of hours as the main library.

10. Branch library should be managed by professional library staff.

11. Branch library should be managed by a university teacher.

12. Only members (faculty and students) of the academic unit should use the branch library.

13. Branch library resources should be open to all library users of the university.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Material selection for branch libraries should be done by librarians alone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Branch library materials should be processed in the main library (ordering, cataloguing, etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Branch library materials should be processed in the branch library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Branch library should inform university teachers when new materials arrive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Branch library should produce specialised bibliographies in appropriate subject area(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Branch library should assist readers in locating the library materials in the university libraries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Branch library should provide photo-coping service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Branch library collection should only be used for reference, that is, its materials should always be available but must be used in the library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Branch library collection should be placed on loan to university teachers and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Colleague,

QUESTIONNAIRE ON BRANCH LIBRARIES

Enclosed, please find a questionnaire on branch libraries in Nigerian universities. For the present purpose the phrase "branch library" is employed to mean any unit of the university-wide library system physically removed from the main university library - this definition embraces departmental libraries, faculty libraries and institute libraries.

Please complete the questionnaire by supplying the required information about your "branch" library.

Please note that the information you supply will be treated in strict confidence and will be utilized for research purposes. It is also hoped that the result will be useful in determining commonalities about these libraries.

Sincerely yours,

Benson E. Edoka.
(QII) QUESTIONNAIRE ON BRANCH LIBRARIES IN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES

I. Name of Department / Institute / Faculty: ______________________

II. Date of origin (of the Department . . .) ______________________

III. Name of Library: __________________________________________

IV. Subject area(s) included in the collection: ________________

1. Indicate type of present academic unit of the library

_________________________ Department
_________________________ Institute
_________________________ Faculty

2. Is the branch library located on the same campus as the main university library:

_________________________ Yes
_________________________ No

3. Distance from this collection to the main university library:

_________________________ Km. If unknown, indicate approximate distance:

_________________________ Very near __________ Near
_________________________ Far __________ Very far

4. Date of origin ________________ If unknown, indicate its approximate age:

_________________________ Less than a year
_________________________ 1-5 years old
_________________________ 6-10 years
_________________________ 11-15 years
_________________________ 16- years old or older.

5. Indicate the nature of space in which this library is housed.

_________________________ Separate quarters
_________________________ a multipurpose area
_________________________ Separate room in the department / faculty
_________________________ other (specify) ______________________
6. Total number of floor area of the space: ______________________ sq. metres.

7. Indicate in relative order of importance (1 = least important) the factors that led to the establishment of your branch library. Check only those applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gift of books from faculty or other benefactor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private foundation (e.g. British Council, Ford Foundation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately &quot;Planned&quot; as the result of a felt need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "Planned" indicate reason(s), again in order of importance 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance from the main university library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs of the department/faculty not provided by the main library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main library has become too congested for readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new building made more space available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Indicate total number of authorised users of the library:

- Faculty Members: __________
- Research Students: __________
- Undergraduates: __________
- Other (Specify): __________

9. Give total number of reader places (seats) available in the library:

- Seats: __________
- Carrels: __________
10. Indicate nature of access to the collection (check one):

__________________ Open to all library users of the University.

__________________ Open only to teaching staff and students of the academic unit.

__________________ Open only to teaching staff of the academic unit.

__________________ Open only to students of the academic unit.

11. Indicate policy regarding circulation of materials:

__________________ Combination of circulating and non-circulating.

__________________ Only faculty may check out books.

__________________ Only students may check out books.

__________________ Non-circulating (i.e. "in library" use only).

__________________ Other (Specify) ____________________

12. Loan periods, if any, for books that circulate:

__________________ less than one week ______ one week

__________________ two weeks ___________ three weeks

__________________ other (Specify).

13. Indicate source(s) of funds for current fiscal year operating expenditure for this library (book purchase, supplies, personnel, maintenance, etc.)

Departmental/Faculty supply and expense budget _________

Main library supply and expense budget _________

Grant from Federal, State or other public body _________

Endowment _________

Private foundation _________

Staff gifts of cash _________

Sale of duplicate or old materials _________

__________________ Other (Specify) _________

Total : ___________________
14. Are acquisitions purchased with a conscious effort to relate them to the curriculum.

________________________ Always ___________ Usually
________________________ Sometimes ___________ Rarely
________________________ Never.

15. Indicate the chief administrator of the library (approves expenditure).

________________________ University Librarian
________________________ Departmental/Faculty Head.
________________________ A Committee of Department
________________________ A Committee of University library.
________________________ Other (Specify).

16. Materials for purchase are selected by:

________________________ branch librarian and teaching staff.
________________________ branch librarian alone.
________________________ a Committee of teaching staff only.
________________________ a Committee of Main library staff only.
________________________ other (Specify) 

17. Indicate the official in charge of the day-to-day running of the library:

________________________ Librarian __________ Library officer
________________________ University teacher __________ Other (Specify)

18. Types and number of personnel currently working in the library. If any staff is employed half-time, please indicate the number of hours for such staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time (Hrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraprofessional (library officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretarial or Clerical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Does the branch library open for equal number of hours as the main library?

- Equal number of hours.
- Nearly equal number of hours.
- About a half number of hours.
- Less than a half number of hours.

20. Indicate the hours when the collection is typically open for use:

Mon. From ________ to ________
Tue. From ________ to ________
Wed. From ________ to ________
Thurs. From ________ to ________
Fri. From ________ to ________
Sat. From ________ to ________
Sun. From ________ to ________

21. Holdings by type of material. Give numbers of each category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals (titles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms (micro-fiche, film, cards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual materials: phonorecords, slides, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Number of reference books in the library. ________

23. What percentage of the total material in this collection would you say is unique (not in the main university library)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Where are the branch library materials processed (ordering, cataloguing, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordering</th>
<th>Cataloguing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the main/branch library.</td>
<td>in the main/branch library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Indicate the degree of organization of the collection. Check all items that apply:

- by the same classification scheme as the main library.
- by a different classification scheme.
- by broad topic only.
- by author only.
- by a special taxonomy.
- no systematic arrangement.

Name of classification scheme

Form of catalogue

Arrangement of Serials:

- by the same system as the main library
- by title.
- by subject
- other (specify).

26(i) Are branch materials reflected in the institutional union catalogue? Yes/No.

(ii) Indicate the availability of union lists in the University main library and the branch library. Check as applicable:

Union list of books in the University libraries:

Main Library _____________ Branch Library _____________

Union list of serials in the University libraries:

Main Library _____________ Branch Library _____________

27. Sources and percentage of acquisitions for the library. Check those that apply.

- gift from faculty and others %
- purchase
- government
- industry
- exchange
- other (specify)

Total 100%
28. Which of the following services do you provide in your library? Check those that apply.

Reference __________ Yes _________ No.
Indexing __________ Yes _________ No.
Abstracting __________ Yes _________ No.
Current contents __________ Yes _________ No.
List of current accessions __________ Yes _________ No.
Special (subject)bibliography __________ Yes _________ No.
Other (Specify) __________ Yes _________

29. How would you rate the value of this library to your department/faculty?

___________ Unessential __________ Helpful but not essential.
___________ Essential to departmental/faculty research.
___________ Essential to teaching function.

30. Which is the chief advantage of having this collection:

___________ Convenience of location
___________ Greater availability of materials
___________ Unique materials
___________ Greater number of hours accessible.
___________ Casual atmosphere
___________ More personalized services
___________ Other (Specify) __________

31. Indicate any special or unusual services provided by this branch library (services not available in the University library system, for example) __________

32. Are there any article(s) or written description(s) of your collection published in any professional journal?

___________ Yes _________ NO If Yes, please cite reference __________

33. Comments or suggestions for improving branch library service __________

34. Respondent:
Signature: __________ Date: __________
Official Position: __________