

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

April 2023

Perceived Effects of Theft and Mutilation on the Utilization of information Resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwun Tarka university, Makurdi Nigeria

Richard Iorver TONDO CLN, MNLA

Benue State School of Midwifry, Makurdi Nigeria, tondorichard@gmail.com

Iorfa TSAFA CLN, TRCN

Joseph Sarwun Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria, ngotsapha@gmail.com

Aondowase Augustine MCHIH I CLN, MNLA

Department Of General Studies, Federal Polytechnic, Wannune, Benue State Nigeria, aondowaseaugustine@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#)

TONDO, Richard Iorver CLN, MNLA; TSAFA, Iorfa CLN, TRCN; and MCHIH I, Aondowase Augustine CLN, MNLA, "Perceived Effects of Theft and Mutilation on the Utilization of information Resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwun Tarka university, Makurdi Nigeria" (2023). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 7553.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7553>

**PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF THEFT AND MUTILATION ON THE UTILIZATION
OF INFORMATION RESOURCES IN FRANCIS IDACHABA LIBRARY JOSEPH
SARWUAN TARKA UNIVERSITY, MAKURDI NIGERIA**

By

Comr. TONDO Richard Iorvcer CLN, MNLA

Benue State School of Midwifery, Makurdi Nigeria

Phone Number: 08065067151

Email: tondorichard@gmail.com

Comr. TSAFA Iorfa CLN, TRCN

Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria

Phone Number: 07030106588

Email: ngotsapha@gmail.com

MCHIH I Aondowase Augustine CLN, MNLA

Department of General Studies, Federal Polytechnic, Wannune, Benue State Nigeria

Phone Number: 08065917364

Email: aondowaseaugustine@gmail.com

Background of the Study

Academic library, which is the ‘heart’ of any learning institution, is the library attached to post-secondary institutions such as the universities of education, polytechnics, etc. University library therefore, is the academic heart of university systems and its basic purpose is to provide the university staff, students and researchers with materials assistance and an enabling environment that would facilitate teaching, learning, research and advance the frontiers of knowledge. The institutions advance the knowledge of the citizenry through their libraries with the help of the information resources that are the bedrock for the services provided to the users. This explains why Idris, Hassan and Abdul-Qadir (2013) referred to the university libraries as multipurpose institutions set up by the university to cater for the educational and in some cases, cultural, recreational and informational needs of the students and staff of the institution. However, one of the major challenges that university libraries have been faced with is security problems, that is, how to secure their information resources against theft and mutilation.

Theft, according to Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary (2010), is an act of stealing something from a person or a place. It is also the act of stealing. Specifically, it is the felonious taking and removing of personal property with the intent to deprive the rightful owner of it. While mutilation in the library, is an act of tearing or removing part of a book. It should be noted that libraries are ‘systems’ and security is a vital part of maintaining balance in the system. Library security is typically best understood as a system that reflects the strategies of librarians and other library staff to prevent or ameliorate the negative consequences of a realized threat in the libraries. Therefore, library security management is a professional effort to deal practically with knotty problems of information resources safety and security. For university libraries to achieve their aim of information dissemination there

must be proper security management of information resources against theft and mutilation which are the common threats to university libraries. However, one of the important duties of any library is the preservation and security of its information resources. In spite of all efforts to preserve and secure information resources, users still employ different tricks to fault library management strategies. Hence, constant need for devising security measures to stop or reduce the rate of theft and mutilation of information resource. This can be achieved if a great interest is taken in effective theft and mutilation risks management. Information resources refers to all those media for storing information such as textbooks, journals, newspapers and magazines, patents and standards, handbooks and manuals, directories, gazetteers, encyclopedias, atlases and maps, calendars and diaries, vertical files, theses and dissertations, tapes, videos, films, optical discs, cassettes, magnetic tapes among others (IFLA, 2010).

The issue of theft of library information resources is extensively discussed by various authors. Theft of information resources is considered as the oldest library problem which has continued to exist even in present day libraries. Rude and Hauptman (2013) report that theft of library collection has always presented a problem for library administrators particularly in university libraries: A person is guilty of theft if he dishonestly appropriates property belonging to another with the intention of permanently depriving the other of it; and thief and steal shall be construed accordingly. In the context of this study therefore, theft of information resources is seen from this perspective. It is therefore necessary and essential for librarians to understand the essential requirements of theft and its effects on information resources. Theft of library collections is an anti-social; unlawful act and an offence, the perpetrators of which can be subjected to legal punishment. Ugah (2007) considers theft of library collection as a criminal activity and formidable obstacle to information access and use. He describes theft and mutilation of information resources as issues that need urgent attention. Theft is a common phenomenon to all types of libraries. As guardians of

intellectual freedom, librarians should be aware of items taken and protect the collection. Cuddy and Marchok (2015) notes that the library is not a viable resource to users if the books notated in the catalogue are not on the shelf and that, it is a loss of money and the librarians' time.

Martell (2012) who has reported incidences of theft and its effects on libraries admitted theft as a serious problem in libraries. He further advises library managers to combine planning strategies, policies and procedures with speed of action in order to combat collection security incidences like theft and mutilation of library materials. In other words, Martell (2012) called for an enshrined collection security where staff and administrators have the 'will to act' for the protection of library collections. Some authors have expressed concerns with the types of materials that are being stolen in the library. The writers report both print and non-print materials as important targets in the library. In addition, Forley (2010) reports that all libraries and information resources which include books, journals, as well as rare books and archives are at risk of theft and mutilation. Most of these items are unique and have high monetary and historical value, and may therefore be irreplaceable.

Other researchers have also commented on the causes of theft of collections in university libraries. Many studies have identified the patterns of use, increased student and staff population, and growth of library collections as the main factors for theft in libraries. Ratcliffe (2010) admits that there have been some striking examples of theft and mutilation in the libraries due to increasing staff and students' population in universities. Abareh (2011) establish the motives for book theft and mutilation in libraries. He identifies selfishness, non-availability or insufficiency of books, poverty, and denial from using books as the main reasons for book theft and mutilation in libraries. In addition, Forley (2010) mentions that the reasons for theft are varied but have not changed significantly through time. He identifies

greediness and selfishness and lack of respect for other users' information needs as the main reasons for theft in libraries. To Holt (2009), poor library security culture, ignorance of consequences of theft and mutilation are the major rationale for mutilation in university libraries.

Some studies have revealed that, not all theft of library collections is perpetuated by patrons; some library staff takes materials from the library without properly circulating it. This is what they called insider theft which according to Olorunsole (2008) is one of the hardest thefts to prevent. Holt (2009) also shares this view on staff theft, describing it as 'a hot potato issue' which may have direct impact because of the complications and economic consequences involved. Berlin (2011) studies insider theft and reports incidences where staff often steals library seal to be used for documenting that a particular book has legitimately left the library stock. Burrows and Cooper (2012) expressed very strong views on the extent to which librarians themselves are directly responsible for book theft and mutilation and while there seems little empirical evidence to support such views, there have certainly been numerous cases of library staff being prosecuted for the theft of many books. They cited a case where a rare book curator from the University of Georgia was sentenced to 15 years on probation and a \$45,000 fine for the theft of more than a million dollars' worth of rare books.

The concept of mutilation on the other hand, entails defacement or damage of library materials/collection. It involves removal of book pages, articles from periodicals, of illustrations and, or the whole text block from monographs. The practice is becoming a serious, disheartening and unfortunate fact of library life. Lorenzen (2014) reported high incidence of book and periodical mutilation in some academic libraries studied. The researcher indicated that, collection mutilation takes many forms, ranging from underlining and highlighting in library books, tearing and or removing some pages of the books and

tempering with the editorial comment in the library books. Abareh (2011) affirms that mutilation of library materials is a common phenomenon in university libraries. He identifies different forms of mutilation to include misuse of library collections such as bending the spine of a book to ensure that it stays open at the right page, using wet fingers to turn book pages, marking or shading book pages with pencil, or biro, tearing book pages, and damage to the book spine. Several reasons were responsible for the cause of mutilation of library collections. Ratcliffe (2010) insists that necessity rather than criminal drive is responsible for students' mutilation of books. Students' dissatisfaction or unfamiliarity with library services, the lack of knowledge of replacement costs and time; lack of concern for the needs of others often may cause students to mutilate or damage collection.

Ajayi and Omotayo (2012) describe mutilation of library materials as a global phenomenon that should be handled effectively by library managers and administrators. They suggest the provision of more photocopiers, cheaper photocopying services, and publicizing the effects of collection mutilation to users as some of the approaches for the effective management of mutilation incidences in university libraries. In addition, they suggest a campus-wide campaign through display and exhibition of mutilated books and other library materials. Teaching of library culture and ethics through training and education of staff will help instill security culture for ensured protection of the library collections.

Literatures on theft and mutilation of information resources in libraries go beyond financial consideration to include the negative consequences to scholarship and information access. Theft in libraries should be handled effectively because of its implication to scholarship and to the nation's heritage. In addition, theft and mutilation can result in access frustration for both library staff and users particularly in university libraries. Abusing and Zaina (2014) reported how theft and mutilation of information resources in libraries can lead to negative

perception towards the library environment and frustration among the library users, the effect of which can result to devastating psychological and educational consequences in terms of effective access to the library and its collection. In addition, Martell (2012) describes the social consequences which theft and mutilation may cause to the library users. According to the writer, theft and missing books cause difficulties in searching for the books while not on shelf and can therefore lead to frustration to the patrons'. The study of Ajayi and Omotayo (2012) reveal that theft and mutilation has negative consequence on students' academic performances. In particular, the duo has impact on student's assignment, library use, getting recommended list by lecturers, as well as impact on independent study and study for examination. The analysis of the estimates of the financial, social, psychological and financial consequences of theft and mutilation as presented above strongly suggest the need for library managers to be aware of collection security breaches incidences, especially theft and mutilation in university libraries. It also calls for a framework of action for strategic collection protection.

Aspect of the framework focuses on ensuring building security using both manual and electronic security strategies. Hence, security regulations and procedure should transcend to building maintenance through supervision and monitoring, patrolling and insurance coverage of the library and its collection. The need for physical safety has also become necessary. Kenreich (2011) emphasizes that, physical safety in library should be considered so as to provide protection from harmful or unwanted stimuli in line with Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Librarians should ensure strategies aimed at protecting their collection. In this period of technological advancement, the use of electronic security devices will undoubtedly increase the efficiency and effectiveness of collection protection in university libraries. McGinty and Trapskin (2013) believe that, adding CCTV (Closed-Circuit Television) cameras to monitor the perimeter of libraries can alleviate risks as it allows staff to view

customers entering or leaving the library. In general, modern electronic security systems such as book security systems like the RFID technology, surveillance cameras, metal detectors, door intrusion alarms, delay devices, panic alarms, a heat sensor are found to be useful in preventing theft and mutilation of information materials in libraries.

Theft and mutilation of library materials has been identified as one of the major obstacles against discharging effective library services especially in academic libraries. The developing countries, specifically, Nigeria is not left out of this menace. Several studies have been carried out on issues about theft, mutilation and other forms of abuse of library materials in libraries in Africa and Nigeria, while none have dwelt on this in libraries in Benue State. Hence, this study is therefore carried out to find out the perceived effects of theft and mutilation on the utilization of information resources in Francis Idachaba library Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University Makurdi.

Statement of the Problem

Information resources which are unique in nature because of the information they contain deserve to have the maximum protection against theft and mutilation in order to retain the information they contain for a very long period of time. University libraries in developing countries such as Nigeria, there is a dearth of valuable publications because most of these library materials are not properly protected. Despite that these libraries struggled and suffered to acquire these information resources which are not easy to be replaced when they are lost and not properly secured yet, the information contained in these library resources can serve library users for decades.

It has been observed that in these university libraries that houses these information resources are not properly protected. Some of these information resources are lost as a result of theft and mutilation which is perpetrated by both students and library staff in various forms such as

tearing of pages of books, hiding materials in their cloths, hiding materials in their bags, hiding materials in their notebook, handling of books during processing of new collections, defecation of shelf, defacing library materials, offering in documents, folding pages of books, un-authorized borrowing, failure not to return borrowed materials, shelving of materials in a wrong shelve, book spine ripped off to remove magnetic strip, writing on pages of the materials and excessive downloading from subscribed online database. This can lead to negative perception towards the library environment and frustration among the library users, the effect of which can result to devastating psychological and educational consequences in terms of effective access to the library and its collection.

However, in spite of many benefits derived from effective utilization of information resources in university libraries, the tendency is that Francis Idachaba library will face the risk of losing the intellectual contents as well as cultural heritage and other sources of information available within the library. This is because there is a little or no security practices in this university library. As a result of this, the contributions of these information resources in Francis Idachaba library for effective service delivery are nothing to write home about. Furthermore, the skeletal nature of collection protection process leads to frequent loss of resources due to theft and mutilation. Hence the need to investigate the perceived effects of theft and mutilation on the utilization of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University Makurdi

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to investigate the perceived effects of theft and mutilation on the utilization of information resources in Francis Idachaba library Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University Makurdi. The specific purposes of the study are;

1. To ascertain the forms of theft and mutilation of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria.
2. To find out the effects of theft and mutilation on the use of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria.
3. To suggest ways of preventing theft and mutilation of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria.

Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions;

1. What are the forms of theft and mutilation of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria?
2. What are the effects of theft and mutilation on the use of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria?
3. What are the ways of preventing theft and mutilation of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi Nigeria?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theft has of late become a canker worm, which has eaten deep into the university library system without distinction. These problems have remained unabated even though a lot of efforts and resources have been expended by librarians and information centers managers to stop these unwholesome acts. This unpopular and deviant behaviour of library clients are as a setback to library development especially now that the importance of library and its resources are being recognized and utilized as major partner in the educational development of any higher institution. Theft, according to Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (2010) is an act of stealing something from a person or a place. It is also the act of stealing. Specifically, it is

the felonious taking and removing of personal property with the intent to deprive the rightful owner of it. Theft is considered as the oldest library problem which has continued to exist even in present day libraries. Olajide (2017) reports that theft of library materials has always presented a problem for library administrators particularly in university libraries. A person is guilty of theft if he dishonestly appropriates property belonging to another with the intention of permanently depriving the other of it. In the context of this study, theft of information resources is seen from this perspective. Ugah (2007) considers theft of library collection as a criminal activity and formidable obstacle to information access and use. The author describes theft as serious security issues that need urgent attention. Theft is a common phenomenon to all types of libraries. As guardians of intellectual freedom, librarians should be aware of items taken and protect the collection. Olajide (2017) notes that the library is not a viable resource to users if the books notated in the catalogue are not on the shelf and that, it is a loss of money and the librarians' time.

On the other hand, mutilation entails defacement or damage of information resources. It involves removal of book pages, articles from periodicals, illustrations and, or the whole text block from monographs. The practice is becoming a serious and unfortunate fact of library life (Olajide, 2017). According to Fasae and Adedokun (2016), mutilation of library materials is in different forms ranging from underlining and highlighting in library books, tearing and/or removing some pages of the books and tempering with the editorial comment. Other forms of mutilation include misuse of library materials such as bending the spine of book to ensure that it stays open at the right page, using wet finger to turn book pages, marking or shading book pages and damage to the book spine (Maidabina, 2012).

Information resources to Popoola and Haliso (2009) are those information bearing materials that the library collect, store, organize and disseminate to users in order to satisfy their

present and future information needs. They are the materials in the library that make services possible. These are the materials which users come to consult, read, or borrow. Information resources are many and varied; they include paper based and machine readable materials. Paper based information resources include books, dictionaries, encyclopedias, journals, newspapers, magazines, vertical files materials, maps and atlases, gazetteers to mention a few while machine readable materials include CD-ROM, databases, electronic journals and electronic books, tapes and records, films and many more (Popoola & Haliso, 2009).

Ovowoh and Iwhiwhu (2010) stated that libraries acquire information resources to meet the information and recreational needs of its clientele. It is the responsibility of the library staff to keep these resources in good physical condition to make them available for users at all times. It is the legal and social responsibility of libraries and archives makes it imperative for them to protect their information resources.

Forms of Theft and Mutilation of Information Resources

According to Barda (2007), in his study of materials theft and mutilation in some selected higher institutions in Katsina, report how a librarian of one of those institutions confessed and having accurate record of the stock-taking which was not completed. This librarian got to know about missing books through reader's reports and a check on the issue. Library thieves in this library throw books through the windows and pick them later. Jama'a (2014) report that the first library stock taking by Bayero University, Kano library attempt to prove a failure and no further attempts were made. There were therefore no statistical records that can be relied upon to measure the magnitude of book theft. Information on book theft was obtained from unions and interview. For instance, the Muslim student society of the university alerted the authority on the mysterious disappearance of the few relevant books in the library. A student who tries to beat the security check at the circulation desk was reported

and destroyed book cards that show records of books borrowing tickets. Jama'a (2014) further reports that some library staff themselves steal especially newly acquired materials. Before processing these materials, they immediately write their names on the books that got their interest to signify ownership. These materials only bear their own identity but not library stamp, thus comfortably beating the traditional security check at the circulation counter. Another device is by borrowing tickets, they later some and remove them and have book cards destroyed. Some of them secretly take away materials out of the institutions library without the permission of the relevant authority, some of them therefore; disappear with library books loaned to them. On the foreign scene, Bahr (2011) has given extensive statistical data of library stock losses from some selected schools and public libraries in some of the developed countries of the world. She says, the Suffolk country senior high school reported that about 22% of its newly acquired books had disappeared from the shelves. Library stock losses in individual public libraries are believed to be higher than the National average citing examples of individual public libraries. Obikoya (2014) in a study on theft and mutilation in academic libraries reports that 78.6% of library materials are taken away illegally under clothes. Hence mode of dressing is gradually becoming a source of concern in terms of library security. Bello (2007) reveals that stealing of library materials via tearing and damage accounts for 66% of library crimes in Nigerian universities of technologies. Hence, he concludes that security problems of stealing and mutilation in academic libraries are mostly through tearing valuable parts of library materials. In this regard, tearing of pages may be seen as mutilation. Similarly, Akinfolarin (2014) reports that users take advantage of tiny windows that have no barrier to hinder book passage and throw books outside, while Relay (2007) identifies staff involvement as an unfortunate means through which books are either stolen or mutilated. He notes further that employees of libraries and thieves are not themselves immune from temptation of removing items for sale to legitimate businessmen. In

the same vein, Afolabi (2016) reports this method when he notes that an unscrupulous user can use the date-due-slip of legally borrowed books to steal other circulation books from the library. All that the person does is to remove and take the data-due-slip of a book that has been properly charged out to him by the library and then takes another circulation book of his choice and replaces the date-due-slip of the book with that of previous book borrowed. This method is regarded as very subtle method because with this method, there is no limit to the number of books that can be stolen. Vandalism: Book mutilation stands out in this crime of vandalism by library patrons. They engage in this by cutting some pages, parts of a page, pictures, colour plates, with the intent to steal them.

Apart from this, loss of books, non-return of books, physical and verbal abuse, misuse of reading material, over borrowing, unauthorized borrowing, problem patron behaviour, delinquent readership, misplacement, and illegal incidences also constitute theft and mutilation in the library. Gadekar and Golwal (2013) reported that forms of theft and mutilation in libraries include hiding of information materials in cloths and tearing out pages from books and periodicals, throwing books through window, offering inducement and removing due date slip. Again, Tefera (2016) stated that other forms of theft and mutilation in the library include: throwing out books and other information resources through the windows at night during power outage, carrying books and other information resources out of library without getting them properly charged out, tearing off pages of books and other information resources. It could also arise from using chemical to clean off library stamps in books and removing date due slips, removing the jacket cover and preliminary pages of books so that those books cannot be identified, stealing other registered library user borrower's ticket and using them to borrow books, some library staff cooperate with users such that the user can be issued with more borrowers tickets allowed by the library, while library staff at times assisting users to borrow books illegally and destroy the records thereafter.

Perceived Effects of Theft and Mutilation on Information Resources

Rude and Hauptma (2013) noted that getting statistics on collection security are difficult due to the unclear aspect of security and the epistemological price of vandalism and theft. They capitalize on the general assumption that, until a book is needed, there may be no indication that it is missing. In Nigeria, the submission of Rude and Hauptman may well be true as noted by Ajala and Oyeboade (2012) who emphatically stated that, the statistics of book theft and losses are however scanty, if not unknown, in Nigerian academic libraries. Even though, there are no available official statistics or lost estimations due to theft, mutilation and other collection security breaches in Nigerian university libraries, writers and commentators have indicated that, there are, visibly, a sizeable number of such breaches. Abareh for example, acknowledges how an unregistered library user carried away 56 textbooks from the Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University (ATBU), Bauchi, Nigeria, library between the month of May and June 1998 without being caught in the process. The books were later recovered and returned to the library. Theft and mutilation of library material has great financial, scholarship and socio-cultural consequences.

Burrows and Cooper (2014) in their study reported the financial consequences of theft and mutilation in the UK libraries with the aggregate cost running to a total of 50 million pounds per annum and could very likely be in the order of 100 million pounds. In today's value, the financial loss may probably have increased looking at the rapid increase in the cost of books and other library materials. Two years later, another study was conducted by Edem, John and Graham (2014), which further report the estimated cost of books losses in the UK libraries. According to them, researches carried out by the home office estimated that annual book losses in UK public and academic libraries alone amounted to 159 million pounds and 3 million pounds respectively (direct book replacement only at 1989/90 prices). Ratcliffe

(2010) described the financial consequences of theft inflicted upon American universities library collections. He points out that, between 1979 and 1986 alone, American libraries reported thefts and missing materials of rare books worth \$6,000 from the University of New Hampshire; \$20,000 in rare science books from the deGolyer collection at the University of Oklahoma; \$1.1 million in plates, engravings, maps, books and manuscripts from the University of Georgia Library; \$130,000 in rare books and manuscripts from the George Washington University; and more than \$100,000 in incunabula from the Boston College. The figures above are some of the more widely reported examples and other cases which might not have been reported may further inflict more devastating financial and scholarship consequences to university libraries. Literatures on theft and mutilation incidences in libraries go beyond financial consideration to include the negative consequences to scholarship and information access. Theft in libraries should be handled effectively because of its implication to scholarship and to the nation's heritage. In addition, theft and mutilation incidences can result in access frustration for both library staff and users particularly in academic libraries.

In a study on library anxiety among the Sudanese University students, Abusin and Zainah (2014) reported how security issues in libraries can lead to negative perception towards the library environment and frustration among the library users, the effect of which can result to devastating psychological and educational consequences in terms of effective access to the library and its collection. In addition, Martell describes the social consequences which theft and mutilation may cause to the library users. According to the writer, theft and missing books cause difficulties in searching for the books while not on shelf and can therefore lead to frustration to the patrons. The study of Ajayi and Omotayo (2015) reveal that theft and mutilation has negative consequence on students' academic performances. In particular, the duo has impact on student's assignment, library use, getting recommended list by lecturers, as well as impact on independent study and study for examination. The analysis of the estimates

of the financial, social, psychological and financial consequences of theft and mutilation as presented above strongly suggest the need for library managers to be aware of collection security breaches incidences, especially theft and mutilation in university libraries. It also calls for a framework of action for strategic collection protection.

Ways of Preventing Theft and Mutilation of Information Resources

Theft and mutilation of information resources is a global phenomenon that should be handled effectively by library managers and administrators. Ajayi and Omotayo cited by Maidabino (2012) suggests the provision of more photocopiers, cheaper photocopying services, and publicizing the effects of collection mutilation to users as some of the approaches for the effective management of theft and mutilation incidences in university libraries. In addition, Maidabino (2012) suggests a campus-wide campaign through display and exhibition of mutilated books and other library materials. Teaching of library culture and ethics through training and education of staff will help instill security culture for ensured protection of the library collection.

Library managers should provide regular training of personnel particularly on detection techniques of theft and mutilation. Olajide (2017) asserts that the issue of theft and mutilation would still continue to be the order of the day unless libraries install electric security system and Close Circuit Television (CCTV) so as to monitor the activities of both staff and students in and around the library, provide photocopying services at subsidized rate to enable both the library users to photocopy materials, that are in few copies in the library and sanctioning/punishment of the offenders to serve as deterrent to others.

Chandra and Basu (2013) in their study reports measures to stem the incidence of book theft and mutilation to include provision of multiple copies of book, better library services, allowing all library materials for borrowing, giving orientation, granting of amnesty on

regular basis, periodic searching of hostels and staff offices, placing potters'/security men at the entrance and exit of the library. Other measures to stem the incidence of theft and mutilation in library as reported by Chandra and Basu (2013) include installation of wire mesh in windows, reorientation of programmers, increase of security men, installation of electronic devices and rustication of students' offenders/suspension of staff offenders.

METHODOLOGY

The study used descriptive research design; the population of the study was 150 library staff. All the 150 library staff was used for the study as they were relatively small as such there were no need for sampling. A self-designed questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection. The collected data was analyzer using descriptive statistical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Forms of theft and mutilation of information resources in Francis Idachaba library

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total	X	Decision
1.	Tearing of pages of library materials	90	10	30	20	470	3.13	Accepted
2.	Hiding materials in cloths	30	50	40	0	350	2.33	Rejected
3.	Hiding materials in handbags	55	60	25	10	460	3.07	Accepted
4.	Hiding materials in notebooks	75	30	5	10	410	2.73	Accepted
5.	Mal-handling of books during processor new collection	25	65	20	10	345	2.30	Rejected
6.	Defection of shelf	20	40	45	45	335	2.30	Rejected
7.	Defacing of library materials	90	30	20	10	500	3.33	Accepted

8.	Offering inducements	20	41	65	24	357	2.38	Rejected
9.	Folding pages of information resources	10	120	10	10	430	2.87	Accepted
10	Un-authorized borrowing	48	10	72	20	386	2.57	Accepted
10.	Failure to return borrowed materials	48	45	20	40	395	2.65	Accepted
11.	Deliberate shelving of materials in a strong place	120	10	10	10	540	3.60	Accepted
12.	Book spine ripped off to remove magnetic strip	20	20	80	30	330	2.20	Rejected
13.	Collaboration with library staff	10	20	70	50	290	1.93	Rejected
14.	Writing on pages of materials	20	30	60	50	340	2.67	Accepted

15.	Excess downloading from subscribed online database	85	20	20	25	465	3.10	Accepted
16.	Cracking and scratching of sound disc	20	45	55	30	355	2.37	Rejected

Table 1 shows the response on the forms of theft and of mutation of information resources. From the table, the respondents accepted that the highest form of the theft and mutilation is debrating shelving of materials in the theft wrong place with mean score of 3.60, followed by defacing of materials with mean score of 3.33. Other forms of theft and mutilation include, tearing of pages library materials (3.13) excess downloading from subscribed online database (3.10), Handing materials in handbags (3.07), Folding Pages of information resources (2.87), Binding materials in notebooks (2.73), writing on pages of materials (2.67) failure to return borrowed materials (2.63), and unauthorized borrowing (2.57).

Table 2: Effects of theft and mutilation on the use of information resources in Francis Idachaba Library

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total	X	Decision
1	Theft and mutilation lead to information access frustration to the library user	75	30	5	10	410	2.73	Accepted
2	It lead to no-availability of	90	30	20	10	500	3.33	Accepted

	information resources in the library								
3	It also lead to loss of information resources	45	45	20	40	395	2.63	Accepted	
4	It lead to waste of money	55	60	25	10	410	2.73	Accepted	
5	It cause difficulties in searching for information resources they may not be on the shelf	20	30	60	50	340	2.67	Accepted	
6	Lead to poor academic performance of the students	225	15	10	-	565	3.77	Accepted	
7	It develop psychological problem to the library user	20	85	35	10	415	2.77	Accepted	
8	It lead to negative perception about the library	100	10	20	20	490	3.27	Accepted	

Table 2 shows response on the effects of theft and mutilation on the use of information resources. From the table the respondents accepted to all the items as the effects of theft and mutilation on the utilization of information resources.

Table 3: Ways of preventing theft and mutilation resources in Francis Idachaba library

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD	Total	X	Decision

1.	Having qualified library staff	25	65	25	35	380	2.53	Accepted
2.	Having enough library portals	49	20	50	31	387	2.58	Accepted
3.	Organizing regular training for library staff on proper ways of handling information materials	45	39	20	46	383	2.55	Accepted
4.	Present of effective photocopying facilities	92	31	20	06	507	3.38	Accepted
5.	Provision of effective library services	69	34	20	27	445	2.97	Accepted
6.	Regular acquisition of relevant and current information	31	95	4	20	441	2.94	Accepted
7.	Acquisition of multiple copies of book	73	30	20	27	449	2.99	Accepted
8.	Proper examination of returned books at the circulation desk	50	19	31	50	369	2.46	Rejected
9.	Proper checking of users when leaving the library	100	20	20	10	510	3.40	Accepted
10	Mounting of (CCTV) in the library	120	20	10	0	560	3.73	Accepted
11	The use of flash drive and CDs should be prevented	99	20	20	11	507	3.38	Accepted
12	Prevent of effective library policies	75	29	20	26	453	3.02	Accepted

13	Criminals should be subjected to heavy and we'll defined penalties	120	10	10	10	540	3.60	Accepted
14	Reporting offenders in the library bulletins	94	28	20	8	508	3.39	Accepted

Table 3 shows response on the ways of preventing theft and mutilation of information resources. From the table, respondents accepted that proper checking of users when leaving the library is the major way of preventing theft and mutilation of information resources with mean score of 3.40 followed by mounting of cameras (CCTV) in the library with a mean score of 3.73, other.

4.3 Discussion of findings

The findings of the study also revealed that, tearing of pages of liberty materials, hiding materials in handbags, hiding materials in notebooks, defacing of library materials, folding pages of information resources, unauthorized borrowing, failure to return borrowed materials, deliberate shelving of material in a wrong place, writing on pages of material and excess downloading from subscribed online database are the forms of theft and mutilation of information resources this finding is in consonance with that of Olajide (2017) who revealed that, the forms of theft and mutilation in libraries including hiding library materials in handbags, pockets and exercise book, unauthorized borrowing and failure to return borrowed books. This also corresponds with the findings of Fasea and Adedokun (2016) who revealed that the forms of theft and mutilation in libraries include, writing on pages of material, folding pages of books, excess downloading, and deliberate shelving of materials in a wrong place.

The findings of the study also attested that the effects of theft and mutilation of information materials in libraries include it lead the to information access frustration to the library user, non-availability of information resources in the library, loss of information resources, waste of money and energy, difficulties in searching for information resources because they may not be on the shelf, poor academic performance of the students, develop psychological problem of the library user and lead to negative perception about the library. This findings agreed with that of Enojirho (2012) who revealed that theft and mutilation of information resources in the library have lots of effects which include information access frustration loss of information resources and negative perception about the library to mention but a few.

The findings of the study equally identified the ways of preventing theft and mutilation of information materials in libraries to include, having qualified library staff, enough library portals, organizing regular training for library staff on proper ways of handling information resources, mounting of close circuit television (CCTV) amongst others. This finding is in agreement with that if Fasea and Adedokun 2016) who reported that, mounting of CCTV in the library, provision of photocopying facilities, proper checking of users when leaving the library among others as ways of minimizing theft and mutilation of information materials.

Summary of Findings

1. Several forms of theft and mutilation of information resources are identified which include tearing of pages of library materials folding pages of information resources unauthorized borrowing among others.

2. Several effects of theft and mutilation of information resources are identified which include information access frustration, non-availability of information resources and waste of money and energy among others
3. Ways of preventing theft and mutilation of information resources include mounting of close circuit television (CCTV) having qualified library staff and having enough library portals among others

Conclusion

Theft and mutilation has a lot of perceived effects on the utilization of information resources in academic libraries. If academic libraries are to justify their existence, that is to support teaching, learning and research activities of their parent institutions, they should as a matter of urgent attention, provide a lasting solution to all the problems that prevent effective use of information resources which theft and mutilation is one of them.

Recommendations

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

1. Installation of electronic security system and close circuit television (CCTV) to monitor the activities of both staff and students in and around the library.
2. Staff should always move around to monitor the activities of library users, especially in the reader services unit.
3. Photocopying services should be provided at affordable rates to enable library users make certain pages of books that are relevant to them.
4. Installation of window burglary with net, to prevent throwing of library materials through the window
5. In-service training should be organized once in a while to non-professional librarians in handling of library materials
6. Proper orientation should be given to library users on handling of library materials
7. Abusers of library materials should be subjected to heavy and well defined penalties.

REFERENCES

- Abdulrazaq, A. B. (2015). Preservation and conservation of information resources in libraries and archives. In Ozioko, R. E. (ed.) *Book of Readings in Library and Information Science*. Makurdi: Climax Graphics and Publishers.
- Afolabi, M. (2016). Factors influencing book theft and mutilation among library users and staff in Nigeria. *Lending Libraries and Information Centers*, 1(3&4), 62.
- Aguolu, C. C., & Aguolu, I. E. (2012). *Libraries and information management in Nigeria*. Maiduguri: Ed-L Inform Services.
- Ajayi, O. A., & Omotayo, S. (2015). *User delinquency in Nigeria academic libraries: An empirical perspective*. Library philosophy and practice. Available at <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu>.
- Akinfolarin, W. (2011). Towards improved security measures in Nigerian university libraries. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 2(1), 52-58.

- Antwi, I. K. (2009). The problems of library security: Bauchi experience. *International Library Reviews*, 21, 363-372.
- Anyaoobi, G., & Akpoma, O. (2012). Abuse of library materials in academic libraries: A case study of Delta Study Polytechnic Library, Ogwashi-Uku, Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, 3(1), 54-58.
- Bahr, A. H. (2011). *Book theft and library security system*. New York: Knowledge Industry Publication Inc.
- Barda, A. M. (2007). Book theft and mutilation in some selected libraries in Katsina. *Thesis Library*, 108, 28-33.
- Burrows, J., & Cooper, D. (2012). *Theft and loss in UK libraries: A national survey*. London: Home Office Police Research Group.
- Chandra, S., & Busa, A. (2013). Users attitude to book theft and mutilation: A case study with Pailan Engineering and Management College Library, West Bengal. *International Journal of Multi-disciplinary Academic Research*, 1(3), 10-15.
- Edibo, D. (2009). Nigerian libraries and delinquent users. *New Nigeria*, 2nd June, p.5.
- Eruvwe, U., Akpojotor, O. L., & OKonoko, V. N. (2015). Defiant attitude among library users in Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library, Effurum. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(3), 131-141.
- Fasae, J. K., & Adedokun, F. O. (2016). *Abuse of information materials in academic libraries by students of tertiary institutions in Ekiti State*. Library Philosophy and Practice. Retrieved on 1st June, 2016, from <http://digital.com>.....
- Forley, A. M. (2010). *Conastar Dissertation*, University Minols. Retrieved on 25th May, 2007, from; Academic Index.
- Gadekar, S. J., & Golwal, M. D. (2013). Illegal practices in engineering college libraries. *Online International Inter-Disciplinary Research Journal*, 3(6), 461-470.
- Holt, G. E. (2007). Theft by library staff. The bottom line. *Managing Library Finances*, 20(2), 85-92.
- Idris, M., Hassan, U., & Abdul-Qadir, F. (2013). Theft and mutilation of library materials in academic libraries: the case study of Katsina State University of Science and Technology, Wudil. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, 4(3), 63-71.
- IFLA (2010). Principles for the care and handling of library materials. *International Preservation Issues*, 3(1), 7-12.
- Isebe, L. E. M. (2015). Vandalism of information materials in colleges of education in Delta State. *International Journal of Library and Information Science Studies*, 1(1), 1-11.

- Jama'a, T. J. (2014). *Security threat and deterrent measures, Bayero University Library, Kano*. A thesis in the Department of Library Science, Bayero University (Unpublished).
- Lonrenzen, M. (2014). *Security issues of academic libraries*. A seminar paper presented to the Faculty of the College of Education, Ohio University, ERIC. IR055930.
- Maidabino, A. A. (2016). Theft and mutilation of print collection in university libraries: A critical review of literature and proposed framework for action. *Analysis of Library and Information Studies*, 59, 240-246.
- Mullen, K. L., & Gaumond, G. (2009). *Safety and security in academic libraries: The administrator's role*. Available at <http://teach.valdosta.edu>...
- Obikoya, A. A. (2014). Theft and mutilation in academic libraries: A case study of polytechnic library Ibadan. *Nigeria Libraries*, 27(28), 192-201.
- Olajide, O. (2017). Theft and mutilation challenges and management in academic libraries: A case study of Federal University Oye-Ekiti. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*, 10(1), 78-84.
- Ovowoh, R. O., & Iwhiwhu, B. E. (2010). *Preserving information bearing materials in higher education institutions in Nigeria*. Library Philosophy and Practice. Retrieved on September 15th, 2015, from <http://www.edu/mbolin.htm>.
- Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (2010). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oyesiku, F. S., Buraima, O., & Olusanya, O. F. (2012). *Disruptive readers in academic libraries: A study of Olabisi Onabanjo University Library*. Library Philosophy and Practice. Retrieved on 1st June, 2016, from <http://digital.com>.....
- Popoola, S. O., & Haliso, Y. (2009). Use of information resources and services as predator of teaching effectiveness of social sciences in Nigerian universities. *African Journal of Library and Information Science*, 19(1), 66-77.
- Ratchiffe, F. (2010). Changing times? Crimes and security as a major issue in libraries. In Chaney, M. A. F. (ed.) *Securities and Crime Protection in Libraries*. Vermont: Gower.
- Relay, W. (2007). Library and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. *College and Research Libraries*, 38, 105.
- Robert, C. (2014). Theft and mutilation exhibit. *Special Libraries*, 6(12), 583-589.
- Tefera, B. (2016). Security management of collection in Ethiopian academic libraries. *African Journal of Libraries, Archives and Information Science*, 6(2), 121-128.
- Timothy, W. (2013). The improvement of library security. *Colleges and Research Libraries*, 2, 102-103.

Ugah, D. (2007). *Evaluating the use of university libraries in Nigeria: A case study of Michael Okpara University of Agriculture*. Available at <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu..>