



UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN
JOURNAL OF
LIBRARY AND INFORMATION
SCIENCE
UI-JLIS

Volume 4 No. 2, July, 2021

Website: journal.library.ui.edu.ng

E-mail: ibdkdljournal@gmail.com

**UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN
JOURNAL OF LIBRARY AND
INFORMATION SCIENCE
UI-JLIS**

Volume 4 No. 2, July 2021

Website: journal.library.ui.edu.ng

E-mail: ibdkdljournal@gmail.com

**University of Ibadan Journal of Library and Information Science
UI-JLIS**

Volume 4 No. 2, July 2021

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, without the prior knowledge or permission in writing from the author. However, duly acknowledged quotations can be used for research purposes.

Published By
Kenneth Dike Library,
University of Ibadan.

ISSN: 2630-7146

Printed by
Samab Calvary Printers,
61, Anfani Layout, Off Ring Road, Ibadan
08033588056, 08075927642

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Helen O. Komolafe-Opadeji

Editor

Dr. Emmanuel Babatunde Ajala

Editorial Team

Professor Harry Akussah	-	Ghana
Professor S. O. Popoola	-	Nigeria
Dr. Billy Kalema	-	South Africa
Dr. Gregory T. Papanikos	-	Greece

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

1. **Abdulumumin Isah**
*Department of Library and Information Science,
University of Ilorin, Nigeria*
2. **Abdulsalam Abiodun Salman**
*Department of Library and Information Science,
University of Ilorin, Nigeria*
3. **Rashidat Titilayo Fayomi**
*Department of Library and Information Science,
University of Ilorin, Nigeria*
4. **Abdullahi A. Bakare**
*Lecturer, Department of Library and Information Science,
Faculty of Information and Communication Technology,
Kwara State University, Malete, Ilorin, Kwara State.*
5. **Ganiyu Oluwaseyi Quadri, PhD**
*Senior Librarian, Kenneth Dike Library,
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State.*
6. **Mohammed Lawal Akanbi**
*Senior Lecturer, Department of Library and Information Science,
Faculty of Communication and Information Science,
University of Ilorin, Kwara State.*
7. **Omobolanle Seri Fasola**
*Department of Library and Information Science,
Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria.*
8. **Thomas A. Ogunmodede (Ph.D)**
*Olusegun Oke Library, Ladoke Akintola
University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.*
9. **Amina Suleiman Hamza (CLN)**
*Department of Library and Information Science
Yusuf Maitama Sule University, Kano.*

10. **Bappah Magaji Abubakar (PhD)**
*Department of Library and Information Sciences,
Bayero University, Kano*
11. **Kazeem Adeshina**
The Polytechnic, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria
12. **Grace Temilolu Ikenna CLN**
*Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan,
Ibadan, Nigeria*
13. **A. S. Sambo, MIM**
Federal University of Petroleum Resources
14. **A. Isah, PhD**
University of Ilorin, Ilorin
15. **Oriogu, Chuks Daniel**
*Library Department, Achievers University Owo,
Ondo State*
16. **Ogbuiyi-Oriogu, Darlina Chima**
*Library Department, Achievers University Owo,
Ondo State*
17. **Ayodele John Alonge**
*Department of Library Archival and Information Studies,
University of Ibadan*
18. **Adebayo Murtala Adegboire**
*Department of Library Archival and Information Studies,
University of Ibadan*

CONTENTS

1. Use of Digital Devices on Conflict and Conflict Resolution: Perceptions of Undergraduate Students in Selected Academic Institutions in Kwara State Nigeria.....	1
2. A Comparative Assessment of Disruptive Behaviours among Users in Selected University Libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria.....	20
3. Use of Social Media and Study Behaviour of Library and Information Science Students in South-West, Nigeria.....	39
4. Information Seeking Behaviour of Diabetic Patients in Public Hospitals in Kano Matropolis.....	55
5. A Descriptive Analysis of School and Home Factors affecting the Use of Library among Senior Secondary School Students of the Polytechnic Ibadan Staff School.....	71
6. A Synopsis of the Concept of Records Life Cycle in the Records Management Environment.....	96
7. Information Resource Sharing Strategies in the era of Insecurity among Postgraduate Library and Information Science Students in South - East Universities in Nigeria.....	105 *
8. The Place of Organizational Culture on Conflict Management in University Libraries	120
9. Knowledge of Safe Sexual Behaviour and HIV among in-School Adolescent in Selected Secondary Schools, Southwest, Nigeria.....	140

A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOURS AMONG USERS IN SELECTED UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

By

Abdullahi A. Bakare

*Lecturer, Department of Library and Information Science,
Faculty of Information and Communication Technology,
Kwara State University, Malete, Ilorin, Kwara State.
E-mail: tobyan1@yahoo.com*

Ganiyu Oluwaseyi Quadri, PhD

*Senior Librarian, Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan, Ibadan,
Oyo State. E-mail: qudriseyi@gmail.com*

Mohammed Lawal Akanbi

*Senior Lecturer, Department of Library and Information Science,
Faculty of Communication and Information Science,
University of Ilorin, Kwara State.
E-mail: mohammedlawala@gmail.com*

Abstract

This study investigated comparative assessment of disruptive behaviours among users in selected university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria. This study engaged the use of a survey research method and the target population for the study consists of 150 staff from various divisions in three selected university libraries in Kwara State. Purposive sampling technique was adopted for this study. This means only staff with experiences on the various accounts of disruptive behaviours that users exhibit in their libraries were considered most suitable to participate in the study. A structured questionnaire was used to generate information. Face validity was done by professional in the field and reliability test was conducted using Alpha Cronbach Coefficient, the result yielded $r=.074$ before final administration of the instrument on the respondents. A total of 62 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to selected staff, out of which 57(92%) were completed and retrieved representing a high return rate. The data generated were analyzed with SPSS, using tables, simple percentages, and

frequency counts. The findings revealed that the most practiced disruptive behaviours exhibited by users in the libraries were incessant noise making, theft and mutilation of library materials as well as struggle, fight, and misuse of library space. The perceived factors influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours among others revealed a lot of security breaches as a result of non-installation of CCTV around and in the library for effective surveillances and negligence on the part of both the security personnel and library staff in observing constant supervision. The study concluded that disruptive behaviours have been identified to have negative impact on the orderly use of the selected university libraries as learning environments. One of the recommendations is that, instead of relying only on manual method of monitoring, the use of electronic surveillance camera also known as closed-circuit television (CCTV) system for close surveillance within and outside the library premises should be considered to effectively monitor as a way of being proactive in curbing disruptive behaviours among the users.

Keyword: *Disruptive, Disruptive behaviours, Library users, University libraries, Kwara State*

Introduction

The main objectives of university libraries cannot be separated from the mission and vision of the universities, which are teaching, learning, and research (Cobblah and Walt, 2016). Being a key component of a university system, the university libraries have a direct influence on academic efforts by providing a wide range of information resources and services to the faculty, staff, and students. Library information resources used in supporting teaching, learning, and research activities may be in both print and electronic formats such as textbooks, journals, indexes, abstracts, newspapers and magazines, reports, CD-ROM databases, Internet/E-mail, videotapes/cassettes, diskettes, magnetic disk, computers, and microforms (Popoola and Haliso, 2009).

Today, universities are waking up to the realisation that the work of many users such as faculty, researchers and students depends on the library because it is the place where students especially can learn to move beyond lectures and investigate for themselves. For the faculty, changes in teaching methods require the university library to supplement textbooks and enrich the curriculum. Despite all the benefits

and advantages university library can offer, there exists threat to intellectual property occasioned by disruptive behaviours by users. To this end, disruptive behaviours exhibited by users within the library have posed a major challenge to the library culture worldwide (Jato, 2005; Bajpai, 2013). Yamson and Cobblah (2016) have established that libraries across the world are faced with the issues of security of their collection. The issue of collection security in libraries in developing countries is further worsened by low funding for libraries. There is therefore a compelling need for librarians to put in place measures that would effectively curb incidence of disruptive behaviours in order to protect their collections or else their libraries will soon be empty.

A behaviour is considered disruptive if it violates the code of conduct, rules, and regulations of the university library put in place to maintain orderliness. In more specific terms, behaviour becomes disruptive or threatening if it, results in inflicting physical harm to the collections, facilities or equipment or, disrupts the flow of smooth operations of the libraries. This behaviour acts in practical consequence to infringe on the privileges of other innocent users and future researchers to freely benefit from the use of university library facilities and services to support their academic activities.

Disruptive behaviour, therefore is any conduct or condition that disturbs the orderly use of the library or learning environment characterized by harassment, weakened staffs' ability to promote and disseminate effective information services, and users' ability to access the effective privileges the library has to offer. Specific behaviours that are considered disruptive in this study are acts of theft and vandalism of library materials and personal belongings of staff and users, mutilation and damage to books, violent attacks on staff and users as well as other anti-social behaviours perpetrated on library premises.

Just like any other university libraries in Nigeria, it appeared that adequate security measures were not put in place in the selected university libraries in Nigeria as this was confirmed by Quadri (2017), hence the pattern of behaviours that are considered disruptive seemed to be persistent. If appropriate interventions as required are not urgently put in place to check the uncomfortable trends, it could lead to users and staff frustration and disappearance of information materials in the selected university libraries. This study made an effort to understand the various forms of disruptive behaviors that have been observed to be a common phenomenon among users of the selected university libraries. In the process, more appropriate security measures for confronting,

controlling, and containing acts of disruptive behaviours were identified to mitigate the negative impact on the users' academic efforts in the selected university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria.

Statement of the problem

Just as librarians have obligation to maintain an orderly environment for academic learning to support educational conduct to take place, users also have an obligation to put library facilities into use in a manner that does not interrupt peace, violate or infringe upon the rights and privileges of other users. However, disruptive behaviours by users for several years have been a source of concern to university libraries management who are also partly accountable for learning and research outcomes in universities. Overtime, disruptive or inappropriate behaviours that have been observed to be a common and recurring phenomenon seem to have multiple effects in the studied university libraries. One, it detracts genuine users from the university library as a learning environment. Second, it compromises the amount of instructional resources that could be made available to the other compliant users. Third, it takes away a large amount of valuable time needed to attend to the rest of the users.

If drastic measures are not taken, lesser disruptive behaviours such as sleeping, unacceptable level of noise, use of phones, and wrong use of electronic devices and other electric appliances could evolve into verbal or physical threats to either the staff or other users. Most importantly, excessive display of disruptive behaviours by delinquent users could interfere with the functioning and flow of the smooth operation of the university libraries. As a consequence, the disruption can jeopardize the efforts of the library in meeting the needs and expectations of the university in contributing to teaching, learning, and cut-hedging research for community development. This is the gap this study is designed to fill. Therefore, this study is aimed at investigating the disruptive behaviours among library users in selected university libraries in Kwara State by finding out the most common practices of these behaviours, identifying the factors that influence users into exhibiting these disruptive behaviours, and providing possible solutions on how these behaviours can be curbed.

Research questions

The questions that were answered in the course of this study are as follows:

1. What are the most common practices of disruptive behaviours among users in the selected university libraries in Kwara State?
2. What are the perceived factors influencing users into exhibiting such identified disruptive behaviours in the selected university libraries in Kwara State?
3. What are the challenges of the library in curbing users' disruptive behaviours in the selected university libraries in Kwara State?

Review of related literature

Herbert (1998) defines disruptive behaviour as an act of interference with another person with the intention to prevent them from continuing some ongoing activity or cause them displeasure. Charles (1996) describes a disruptive behaviour as an act that is somewhat deliberate, intentional, and considered inappropriate for the setting or situation in which it occurs. According to Oruc (2011), any behaviour that threatens the flow of activities in the library can be defined as disruptive behavior. Disruptive behaviour also known as problem behavior can take many forms such as disruptive talking, sleeping, noisy movements, laughter, shifting of chairs, and whispering among users, vandalism, damages, over-borrowing and purposeful displacement of materials on the shelves. According to Harmer (2001) cited in Oruc (2011, p.185), these misbehaviours in some contexts can develop into more complex situations such as insolence, insulting or bullying other users, damaging property and refusing to accept sanctions or punishment. In accord with this, Awujoola and Olapade (2015) describes a disruptive user as one who violates the rules and regulations of a library and thus, becomes a threat to its intellectual properties through theft, mutilation, and other forms of abuse. Today, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has introduced another dimension to the nature of disruptive behaviours exhibited by users.

Eruvwe, Akpojotor, and Okonoko (2015) argued that in this era of ICT, it is difficult to stop users from entering the library with their phones, laptops, tablets, and iPads. Some of these devices, according to the authors are multifunctional and are often used in a manner that disturbs the peace of other serious users in the library. These are what the authors described as behaviors associated with modern technology. Several studies have been conducted on disruptive behaviours by users in university libraries. One such study was by Dyszlewski, Moore, and

Tung (2015) who sought to determine what types of disruptive behaviour were encountered by law library staff of some studied university schools of law. The top three types of behaviour encountered were verbal aggression, excessive or unmanageable requests, and physical aggression. Each of them was reported by majority of the respondents. Theft was also reported by almost half of the respondents. Also, respondents volunteered other examples of problematic patron conducts such as unauthorized use of food, drink, or tobacco; erratic behavior consistent with symptoms of mental illness; misuse of library computers; viewing online pornography; trespassing or loitering; sleeping; stalking or harassment of library staff or other patrons; and general rudeness. Eruvwe, Akpojotor, and Okonoko (2015) in a related study found out that among users, the reasons for disruptive behaviours were attributed to a series of assignment that requires specific books that are limited in copies and not readily available online, selfish interest, lack of photocopy facilities, lack of orientation, lack of discipline, ignorance, and inability to easily locate materials when needed. The authors concluded that most academic libraries in developing nations including Nigeria lack adequate security measures which encouraged users to perform such disruptive acts. This was supported by Quadri (2017) who reported in a study on security management practices in Kenneth Dike Library and found that CCTV cameras and electronic gate will go a long way in tackling disruptive behaviours as well as safeguarding library information resources.

Specifically, on factors that cause acts of disruptive behaviours associated with theft and vandalism, Aba, Kwaghga and Doms (2014), Quadri (2017), Katushabe (2018) and Ubogu (2019) in their studies revealed that user's selfishness, laziness, lack of vigilance on the part of security guards, economic depression or poverty, lack of user orientation were responsible for committing acts that are considered disruptive. Awujoola and Olapade (2015) and Katushabe (2018) investigated the various forms of disruptive behaviours in university libraries in Nigeria. The forms found to be common were throwing books out through windows, tearing off pages of books, stealing registered library users' borrowers' tickets to borrow books, and conniving with some library staff such that a user can be issued with more tickets than allowed by the library.

Ubogu (2019) in a study examined causes of disruptive acts among users of the Delta State University Library, Abraka. Findings showed that delinquent acts among users are caused by refusing library users to

borrow books, students' frustration or unfamiliarity with library services, harsh economic situation, lack of photocopying services, lack of orientation, pressure for academic success and adequate security measures. Whatever the form and reasons for disruptive behavior, the role of librarians as the custodians of the collections is to provide a conducive learning environment by maintaining control and preserving orderly conduct (Oruc, 2011). However, many of the library staff lacked adequate training to fulfill these roles. For instance, many of the respondents in a study by Dyszlewski, Moore and Tung (2015) indicated that their training arose primarily through informal discussions among colleagues. Several others relied on consultations, lectures, or workshops arranged by consultants or outside library organizations. A few respondents revealed that their training was largely self-directed, while others indicated that their training was unsatisfactory in some ways. Quadri (2017) suggested that in curbing disruptive behaviours and safeguarding library information resources, some library personnel should be trained as a security personnel to stop the act. Ewing (1994), Omoniyi (2001) and (Gerlenter, 2005) found out in their study that many of the security personnel posted to the library are often not literate enough to identify library materials and prevent them from being stolen. They are always gullible as library users often play on their intelligence. It has also been established that many university libraries were not leveraging on the use of ICT for monitoring users with a view to curbing disruptive behaviours. Ikuomola, Okunola and Fabunmi, (2014), and Yamson and Cobblah (2016) in their studies disclosed that none of the three libraries studied had Close Circuit Television (CCTV) for monitoring students and their activities, while irregular electricity supply was also identified as a common problem.

In another related study, Ekere, Akor and Akor (2019) found out that one of the library studied, Umar Yaradua University library has improved in the use of ICT to secure its resources while Al Qalam university library was still left behind as it was still using the manual system of searching the users at the entrance of the library as a means of securing the library materials. Gadekar, Dhakne and Chavan (2013) opines that library are considered venerable, quiet, peaceful and safe places for study, learning and research. In addition, libraries are soul of the educational institutes and play vital role by providing resources and services according to curriculum of the faculty and students. However, if unchecked, disruptive behaviors can jeopardize the flow of their supporting roles in their educational institutions.

Research methodology

This study engaged the use of a survey research method. The target population for the study consists of staff from various divisions in selected university libraries in Kwara State. For this study, three University libraries were picked from all the University libraries in Kwara State. They are: University of Ilorin library, a Federal University; Kwara State University library, a State-owned University; and Al-Hikmah University library being a private university library. The total population of staff at the University of Ilorin library was 118, Kwara State University library 20, and Al-Hikmah library 12, giving a total of 150. Purposive sampling technique was adopted for this study. This means only staff with experiences on the various accounts of disruptive behaviours users exhibit in the libraries were considered most suitable to participate in the study. They are the staff in readers' services, serials, reference units, and electronic libraries responsible for the caring, security, and custody of library materials and facilities. Based on the finding made, the total number of staff in these units was 62. Thirty two from University of Ilorin library, Twentyfrom KwaraState University library, and Ten from Al-Hikmah University library. A structured questionnaire was used to generate information. Before the instrument was administered, it went through face validation and reliability test. Using the Cronbach alpha method, the result of the reliability test yielded $r=.074$. The data generated were analyzed with SPSS, using tables, simple percentages, and frequency count. All of the values were calculated such that they enhance a better understanding of the proportions in terms of particular responses.

Results

Response rate

A total of 62 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the selected staff. Out of these, 57 copies were completed and retrieved, representing 92 percent, a high return rate. The breakdown of the response rate is shown in Table 1:

Table 1: Response rate of respondents in the selected university libraries in Kwara State

University	Questionnaire administered	Number of returned questionnaire	Percentage (%)
University of Ilorin (UNILORIN)	32	27	43.5
Kwara State University (KWASU)	20	20	32.2
Al-hikmah University	10	10	16.1
Total	62	57	92

Demographic characteristics of the respondents

The demographic characteristics of the respondents concerning their gender, age, marital status, institution, current unit/section of the library, position, educational qualification, and years of experience are treated in Table 2.

Table 2: Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Demographic information	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	27	47.4
	Female	30	52.6
	Total	57	100
Age	15-20 years	10	17.5
	21-30 years	29	50.9
	31 and above	18	31.6
	Total	57	100
Marital status	Single	12	21.1
	Married	45	78.9
	Divorced	-	-
	Total	57	100
Institution	UNILORIN	27	47.4
	KWASU	20	35.1
	AL-HIKMAH	10	17.5
	Total	57	100

Demographic information	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Current section/unit	Readers' services	20	35.1
	Serials	12	21.1
	Reference	15	26.3
	E-library	10	17.5
	Total	57	100
Position	Professional	28	49.1
	Para-professional	20	35.1
	Supportive	9	15.8
	Total	57	100
Educational qualification	NCE	10	17.5
	OND	9	15.9

The demographic characteristics of the respondents in terms of gender revealed that the majority of respondents, that is 30 (52.6%) were females, while 27(47.4%) were male. The table also reveals that majority of the respondents that is, 29(50.9%) were between the ages of 21-30 years, 18(31.6%) were between the age of 31 and above, while the lowest being 10(17.5%) were between the ages of 15-20 years. In terms of their marital status, the table shows that 45(78.9%) representing the majority were married, twelve (12) of the respondents representing (21.1%) were single, while none of the respondents was divorced. On the aspect of the institution of the respondents, it can be seen from the table that 27(47.4%) were from the University of Ilorin, 20(35.1%) were from Kwara State University, and 10(17.5%) were from Al-hikmah University. This suggests that majority of the respondents were from the University of Ilorin and the least majority were from Al-Hikmah University. Also, analysis of data regarding the current section/unit of the respondents shows that the highly populated section/unit was the circulation with 20 respondents, representing 35.1 percent. The least populated section/unit was the E-library with 10 respondents, representing 17.5 percent. The analysis on the position held by the respondents revealed that 28(49.1%) were professionals, 20(35.1%) were Para-professional and 9(15.8%) were supportive staff in their respective libraries. This indicates that majority of the respondents were made up of professionals. Based on the qualification of the respondents, 21(36.9%) of the total respondents had a Bachelor's degree in Library and Information Science

(BLIS), while two 2(3.5%) being the least of the total population had a Doctorate Degree (Ph.D). This indicates that majority had Bachelor degree in Library and Information Science (BLIS). Finally, based on the duration of working experience, majority that is, 36 respondents representing 63.2% of the total respondents have worked between one to four (1-4) years, and just one respondent representing 1.8% have between 15-19 years of work experience.

4.4 Analysis of research questions

Research Question 1:

What are the most common practices of disruptive behaviours among users in your library?

Table 3: Common practices of disruptive behaviours among users in selected academic libraries in Kwara State

Common practices of disruptive behaviours among users	Selected university libraries under study							
	UNILORIN		KWASU		ALHIKMAH		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	F	%
Theft and mutilation of library materials	23 (40.4%)	4 (7.0%)	13 (22.8%)	7 (12.3%)	8 (14.0%)	2 (3.5%)	57	100
Vandalism of library materials	19 (33.3%)	8 (14.0%)	8 (14.0%)	12 (21.1%)	7 (12.3%)	3 (5.3%)	57	100
Struggle, fight and misuse of library space	22 (38.6%)	5 (8.8%)	14 (24.6%)	6 (10.5%)	8 (14.0%)	2 (3.5%)	57	100
Incessant noise making and sleeping in the library	21 (36.8%)	6 (10.5%)	16 (28.1%)	4 (7.0%)	9 (15.8%)	1 (1.8%)	57	100
Eating and drinking in the library	17 (29.8%)	10 (17.5%)	7 (12.3%)	13 (22.8%)	7 (12.3%)	3 (5.3%)	57	100

The result of the analysis in table 3 revealed that majority of the respondents from all the selected university libraries, 21(36.8%) from

UNILORIN, 16(28.1%) from KWASU, and 9(15.8%) from AL-HIKMAH, agreed that incessant noise-making and sleeping in the library was the most common practice of disruptive behaviours among users. This is followed by theft and mutilation of library materials and struggle, fight, and misuse of library space. The breakdown of the distribution of agreements by respondents about theft and mutilation of library materials shows 23(40.4%) for UNILORIN, 13(22.8%) for KWASU, and 8(14.0%) for AL-HIKMAH University, while on struggle, fight, and misuse of library space, it shows 22(38.6%) for UNILORIN, 14(24.6%) for KWASU and 8(14.0%) for AL-HIKMAH University. However, while majority of the respondents agreed that vandalism of library materials and eating and drinking in the library were practiced by users in UNILORIN 19(33.3%) and AL-HIKMAH 7(12.3%), about the equivalent number of respondents from KWASU 12(21.1%) disagreed that they were practiced.

Research question 2: What are the perceived factors influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours in the library?

Table 4: Perceived factors influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours in the selected university libraries

Perceived factors influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours	Selected university libraries under study							
	UNILORIN		KWASU		ALHIKMAH		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	F	%
Inadequate security systems and measures	20 (35.1%)	7 (12.3%)	16 (28.0%)	4 (7.1%)	8 (14.0%)	2 (3.5%)	57	100
Negligence of library staffs in observing constant supervision of users in the library	19 (33.3%)	8 (14.0%)	13 (22.8%)	7 (12.3%)	6 (10.5%)	4 (7.1%)	57	100
High cost of photocopying materials in the library	16 (28.0%)	11 (19.3%)	13 (22.8%)	7 (12.3%)	6 (10.5%)	4 (7.1%)	57	100
Unavailability of photocopying services	20 (35.1%)	7 (12.3%)	9 (15.8%)	11 (19.3%)	2 (3.5%)	8 (14.0%)	57	100
Lack of CCTV around and in the library for effective surveillances	22 (38.5%)	5 (8.8%)	16 (28.0%)	4 (7.1%)	7 (12.3%)	3 (5.3%)	57	100
Lack of concern for other users needs(selfishness)	18 (31.5%)	9 (15.8%)	11 (19.3%)	9 (15.8%)	9 (15.8%)	1 (1.8%)	57	100
Financial constraint (poverty)	7 (12.3%)	20 (35.1%)	8 (14.0%)	12 (21.0%)	3 (5.3%)	7 (12.3%)	57	100

Table 4 shows the results on perceived factors that influence users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours by staff in the selected university libraries in Kwara State. Majority (78.8%) of the respondents in the three selected university libraries overwhelmingly agreed that lack of CCTV around the library for effective surveillances and inadequate security system and measures accounting for 77.1 percent were the major factors influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours. Majority of the respondents, about 67 percent, in all the selected university libraries also admitted that negligence on the part of the staff in observing constant supervision and selfishness on the part of users were major causes of exhibiting disruptive behaviours by users. This is followed by 61 percent of all the respondents across the three selected university libraries who agreed that high cost of photocopying materials was a factor influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours. On the contrary, majority of the respondents in all the selected university libraries 68.4 percent disagreed that financial constraint was a factor in influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours. However, majority of respondents 11(19.3%) from KWASU library and 8(14.0%) from AL-HIKMA expressed a contrary opinion that unavailability of photocopying services was a major factor influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours as against the majority from UNILORIN library 20(35.1%) who agreed to the same item.

Research question 3: What are the challenges of the library in curbing users' disruptive behaviours?

Table 5: Challenges faced by the selected university libraries in curbing users' disruptive behaviours

Challenges by staff in curbing disruptive behaviours by users	Selected university libraries under study							
	UNILORIN		KWASU		ALHIKMAH		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	F	%
Inadequate library materials to go round the users	22 (38.5%)	5 (8.8%)	16 (28.0%)	4 (7.1%)	7 (12.3%)	3 (5.3%)	57	100
Lack of basic facilities (electricity, photocopying machines)	19 (33.3%)	8 (14.0%)	4 (7.1%)	16 (28.0%)	6 (10.5%)	4 (7.1%)	57	100

Challenges by staff in curbing disruptive behaviours by users	Selected university libraries under study							
	UNILORIN		KWASU		ALHIKMAH		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	F	%
Ill-trained library security to carry out effective security measures	24 (42.1%)	3 (5.3%)	16 (28.0%)	4 (7.1%)	8 (14.0%)	2 (3.5%)	57	100
Inadequate training for library staff in applying effective security measures in the library	22 (38.5%)	5 (8.8%)	13 (22.8%)	7 (12.3%)	6 (10.5%)	4 (7.1%)	57	100
High cost of installation of CCTV for close surveillance of the library users and facilities	20 (35.1%)	7 (12.3%)	14 (24.5%)	6 (10.5%)	3 (5.3%)	7 (12.3%)	57	100
Insufficient funds	18 (31.6%)	9 (15.8%)	16 (28.0%)	4 (7.1%)	7 (12.3%)	3 (5.3%)	57	100

Table 5 shows the challenges to the staff of the selected university libraries in curbing disruptive behaviours. The results in the table reveals that ill-training of library security to carry out effective security measures topped the list as a major challenge to all the selected university libraries in curbing incidence of disruptive behaviours by some users. This is because 84.1 percent of all the respondents across the three university libraries overwhelmingly agreed to it. This is followed by inadequate library materials to circulate among all users at the same time. This was agreed to by 78.8 percent of all the respondents and was closely followed by both insufficient funds and ill-training of staff by about 72 percent of the total response across the three selected university libraries. Although, majority of the respondents 19(33.3%) in UNILORIN and 6(10.5%) in AL-HIKMAH indicated that lack of basic facilities such as electricity and photocopying machines was a major challenge, about the same number of respondents 16(28%) from KWASU disagreed. Similarly, majority of the respondents from UNILORIN 20(35.1%) and 14(24.5%) from KWASU agreed that high cost of CCTV installation for close monitoring of library users and facilities was a

major challenge, while most respondents from AL-HIKMAH 7(12.3%) indicated otherwise.

Discussion of findings

The study sought to find out the common practices of disruptive behaviours among users. The most practiced disruptive behaviours exhibited by users in the libraries were incessant noisemaking, theft, and mutilation of library materials as well as struggle, fight, and misuse of library space. This is in line with the finding of Dyszlewski, Moore, and Tung (2015) who in their study sought to determine what types of disruptive behavior were encountered by law library staff of some studied university schools of law. The top three types of behavior encountered were verbal aggression, excessive or unmanageable requests, and physical aggression, which were each reported by at least sixty percent of the respondents. Theft was also reported by almost half of the respondents. Also, respondents volunteered other examples of problematic patron conduct such as unauthorized use of food, drink, or tobacco; erratic behavior consistent with symptoms of mental illness; misuse of library computers; viewing online pornography; trespassing or loitering; sleeping; stalking or harassment of library staff or other patrons; and general rudeness. However, vandalism of library materials was found not to be practiced in KWASU library.

Findings of the study on the perceived factors influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours revealed a lot of security breaches as a result of non-installation of CCTV around the library for effective surveillance and negligence on the part of both the security personnel and library staff in observing constant supervision. Others were selfishness on the part of users and high cost of photocopying, materials except for UNILORIN library where it was unfounded. This finding agrees with those of Ikuomola, Okunola and Fabunmi, (2014) and Yamson and Cobblah (2016) who found out that none of the three libraries studied had Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) for monitoring students and their activities. Specifically, Aba, Kwaghga, and Doods (2014), Katushabe (2018), and Ubogu (2019) in their study revealed that selfishness, laziness, lack of vigilance on the part of security guards, economic depression or poverty, and lack of user orientation were responsible for exhibiting disruptive behaviours by users.

On the contrary, it was found that financial constraint was not found as a factor influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours among users in all the selected university libraries. Similarly, while findings revealed that unavailability of photocopying services was a

major factor influencing users into exhibiting disruptive behaviours among users in KWASU and AL-HIKMAH libraries, it was found not to be a factor in UNILORIN library. According to Eruvwe, Akpojotor, and Okonoko (2015), lack of photocopy facilities, lack of orientation, lack of discipline, ignorance, inability to easily locate materials when needed were some of the factors that encouraged users to carry out disruptive acts in most academic libraries in the developing nations including Nigeria.

Findings on challenges showed that, ill-training of library security to carry out effective security measures, inadequate library materials to circulate among the users at the same time, insufficient funds to acquire all needed materials, lack of basic facilities such as electricity and photocopying machines and high cost of CCTV installation for close monitoring of library users and facilities, and inadequate staff training were all found to be major challenges working against the staff of the selected libraries in curbing incidences of disruptive behaviours by some of their users. In support of this finding, Ewing (1994), Omoniyi (2001), and Gerlenter (2005) found out in their study that many of the security personnel posted to the library are often not literate enough to identify library materials and prevent them from being stolen. They are always gullible as library users often play on their intelligence. Similarly, many respondents in a study by Dyszlewski, Moore, and Tung (2015) indicated that their training arose primarily through informal discussions among colleagues. Several others relied on consultations, lectures, or workshops arranged by consultants or outside library organizations. A few respondents said that their training was largely self-directed, while others mentioned that their training was unsatisfactory in some ways. Also, Ubogu (2019) reported in Delta State University Library, Abraka, that students' frustration or unfamiliarity with library services, harsh economic situation, lack of security, lack of photocopying services, lack of orientation and pressure for academic success as some of the challenges frustrating the staff in curbing disruptive behaviours.

Conclusion and recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that disruptive behaviours have been identified to have negative impact on the orderly use of the selected university libraries as learning environments. These behaviours if not curbed on time have a tendency to weaken, staffs' capacity to deliver effective information services and innocent users'

ability to access the helpful privileges of the library. This development which has posed great concerns to the selected libraries is a result of the poor strategy of protection employed by them. It is on this note that a proactive and new method of deviance control is advocated to be necessary. Hence, the following recommendations were made:

1. Instead of relying only on manual method of monitoring, the use of electronic surveillance camera also known as Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) system for close surveillance within and outside the library premises should be considered to effectively monitor the users as a way of being proactive in disruptive behaviours control.
2. Staff should be made to undergo effective and systematic training in workshops or seminars and conferences on security matters to develop basic techniques and knowledgeable skills on how to effectively apply security measures to curb or minimize incidences of disruptive behaviours.
3. The library should provide a stable and uninterrupted power supply in order to maintain the electronic security network and other ICT equipment alongside funds that should be generated for the building of additional reading rooms to solve the problem of misuse/ fight of seats and library space by the users.
4. Stiff penalties should be well spelt out for dishonest users associated with theft, mutilation, vandalism, struggle, fight and misuse of library space, incessant noise-making and sleeping in the library, and other forms of disruptive behaviours.
5. A good library policy should be formulated to guide library users who should be made to be aware of it through regularly organized orientations.
6. Departmental libraries should be established in the universities to reduce the pressure on the main library and more books should be made available for the users in the process.
7. Provisions of photocopying services in the library to enable library users make quick photocopies for their need of library materials.

References

- Aba, J., Kwaghga, B. and Doods, A. (2014). Strategies for Combating Theft and Vandalism in Francis SuleimanuldachabaLibrary, University of Agriculture, Makurdi. *Erudite Journal of Educational Research Reviews and Essay (EJERRE)*, 1(1), 7-15.
- Awujoola, O. A. and Olapade, T. C. (2015). Curbing Deviant Behaviour among Library Users: The Control Perspective View. *International Journal of Education and Evaluation*, 1(7), 1-7.
- Bajpai, Y. (2013). Disruptive Behaviour of the Readers: A Study of Mekelle University Main Campus Libraries (Ethiopia). *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 2(11), 20-25. Retrieved September 15, 2020 from www.ijssr.net
- Charles, C.M. (1996). *Building Classroom Discipline: from Models to Practice* (4th Ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.
- Cobblah, M. and Walt, T. V. (2016). The Contribution of Effective Library and Information Services to Academic Achievements at some Selected Universities in Ghana. *LIBRI*. 66(4): 275-289.
- Dyszlewski, N.P., Moore, K. R. and Tung, G. B. (2015). Managing Disruptive Patron Behavior in Law Libraries: A Grey Paper. *LAW LIBRARY JOURNAL*, 107(4), 491-542.
- Ekere, J. N., Akor, P. U. and Akor, S. O. (2019). The Use of ICT for Security and Theft Prevention in two University Libraries in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2366. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2366>
- Eruvwe, U., Akpojotor, O. L. and Okonoko, V. N. (2015). Defiant Attitude among Library Users in Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library Effurun (FUPRE) Nigeria. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(3), 131-141.
- Ewing, D. (1994). Library Security in the UK: are our Libraries of Today used or abused? *Library Management* 15(2), 18-26. Retrieved December 21, 2020 from http://cliffsnotes.com/study_guide/topicArticleId-26957articleId-26873.html
- Gadekar, S. J., Dhakne, B. D. and Chavan, S. P. (2013). Preventive and Control Measures of Library Crime and Vandalism in Engineering College Libraries. *Research Front*, 1(3), 23-34.

- Gelernter, J. (2005). Loss Prevention Strategies for the 21st-Century Library: Why Theft Prevention should be high priority. Information outlook, Retrieved 7 August, 2015 from www.highbeam.com/doc/IGI-140670078.html
- Herbert, M. (1998). Clinical Child Psychology: Social Learning, Development, and Behavior. (2nd Ed.). Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Ikuomola, A. D., Okunola, R. A. and Fabunmi, S. O. (2014). "Qualitative Engagement of Nigerian Students and Librarians in the Analysis of Deviance in Library Utilization". Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). Paper 1111. [Http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1111](http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1111)
- Jato, M. (2005). Causes and Effects of Delinquent Behaviour in Academic Libraries: Kenneth Dike Library as a Case Study. *Owena Journal of Library and Information Science*, 2(1): 25-34.
- Katushabe, R. (2018). Enhancing Security of Information Resources for Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST) Library. Unpublished undergraduate dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- Oruc, N. (2011). Disruptive Behaviors: The Conception and Reaction of Instructors in Higher Education. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 43, 183-198.
- Omoniyi, J.O. (2001). The Security of Computer and other Electronic Installations in Nigerian University Libraries. *Library Management*, 22(6/7), 272-277.
- Popoola, S.O. and Haliso, Y. (2009). Use of Library Information Resources and Services as Predictor of the Teaching Effectiveness of Social Scientists in Nigerian Universities. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 19(1), 65-77.
- Quadri, G.O. (2017). Review of security management practices in Kenneth Dike Library. *Journal of Library, Educational Media and Information Studies (JOLEMIS)*, 9(1): 85-92.
- Ubogu, J. (2019). Causes of Delinquent Acts among Library Users: A Case Study of the Delta State University Library, Abraka. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2374. [Https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2374](https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2374)
- Yamson, G. C. and Cobblah, M. (2016). Assessments of Collection Security Management in Academic Libraries: A Case Study of Central University Library. *European Scientific Journal Special/edition*, 392-405.