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Abstract

Job satisfaction of employees plays a crucial role in determining the general productivity of workers in any organization. The general opinion was that job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria were low and a cause for concern. This study investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in Nigerian public universities. A correlational survey research design was adopted. The study population consisted of 1,254 librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria, from which 923 were selected using simple random sampling. The research instrument used was a self-developed questionnaire. The questionnaire validation was subjected to the scrutiny experts in the areas of the variables studied; it gave a reliability coefficient of 0.78 for Job Satisfaction; and 0.94 for Productivity. A response rate of 67.2% was achieved. Data were analysed using descriptive (percentage, mean, average mean and standard deviation) and inferential (Pearson Product Moment Correlation) statistics. The study revealed a significant relationship between job satisfaction and productivity (r = 0.025, P < 0.05) of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria. The study concluded that contrary to general belief, job satisfaction and productivity levels of librarians in university libraries were high. It is recommended that university library management should continue to promote values such as improved employee recognition, good leadership style and improved human capital development programmes that would increase job satisfaction and productivity of its workforce.
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INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Job satisfaction of employees plays a crucial role in determining the general productivity of workers in any organization. According to Somvir and Kaushik (2012), Job refers to
occupational act that is carried out by an individual or group of individuals in return for a reward, while satisfaction refers to the way one feels about events, rewards, people, relation and amount of mental gladness on the job. Job could also be defined as work for which one receives regular payment or appreciation. Hence, job satisfaction can be defined as an emotional response to a job situation which cannot be seen, but only be inferred. It is simply regarded as how people feel about their job and different aspects of it. It means a positive attitude that an individual has from what he does to earn a living. Similarly, Gamlath and Kaluarachchi (2014, p. 54) see job satisfaction as the rate at which “employees like or dislike their work and the extent to which their expectations concerning work have been fulfilled”. Job satisfaction is generally acknowledged as a necessary ingredient for personal fulfilment in carrying out one’s duties.

Thus in this study, job satisfaction is conceptualized to mean the level of positive attitude that a librarian displays when performing his/her duties in the university library and the rate at which his/her basic needs are met by the employers. It is interesting to note that if librarians are well catered for by the university authorities in the area of giving them due recognition for a job well done, put in place a good leadership style for the administration of the university library coupled with a career development opportunity for librarians to enhance development of their managerial skills, and conducive work environment as well as improved remunerations (good salaries and wages); their level of productivity will be greatly improved from what is presently existing in most Nigerian public universities.

Unfortunately, it is observed that the level of job satisfaction among librarians in most public university libraries in Nigeria is probably very low compared to what is obtainable among other faculty members of the same educational sector. Therefore, job satisfaction as noted by Babalola and Nwalo (2013), enhances productivity of workers in any organization especially in the academic libraries as a job satisfied worker is a happy and productive worker.

Productivity according to Parham (2014) can be defined as a measure of the rate at which outputs of goods and services are produced per unit of input (labour, capital, raw materials, etc). It is calculated as the ratio of the amount of outputs produced to some measure of the amount of inputs used. In the same vein, Ogunsanwo (2012) defined productivity as the rate at which a worker, an organization, or a country produces goods and services. It also means the expected output of manpower in ratio of the energy exerted for the job at hand, while Srivastava and Barmola (2011) defined it as the rate of power to produce an item or service in any organization. In a study conducted by Ali, Ali and Adan (2013) on productivity of workers, it was revealed that the quality of environment in the workplace simply determines the level of employee’s motivation, subsequent performance and productivity, and this shows that there is a relationship between office environment and productivity of employees; improved employee morale has direct relationship with their productivity in the organization; and that there is a positive relationship between working condition and employees productivity. Employee productivity is generally acknowledged as a necessary factor that enhances the growth and development of every organization in the human society.

However, some employees may not be productive as expected of them by their employers due to the negative attitude displayed by them towards their employers. There is a general belief that man has the natural tendency to be lazy with regard to work and he is being forced by circumstances to work. This idea about man still continues to create problems for the development process of society in the face of abundant human and material resources resulting to low productivity.

Low productivity is generally observed as a major problem that presently thrives in many organizations particularly in the developing countries. Some scholars (Ajala, 2012;
Dost, Rehman & Tariq, 2012; Suleiman, 2013; Yamoah, 2013; Ali et al, 2013, among others) investigated what constitutes low productivity among workers in different organizations; the results of their findings showed that majority of the employees had issues with their organizations ranging from perceived problem of inadequate attention to their basic needs by the organization to feelings of being marginalized, unfair treatment by their employers; some employees’ productivity problems are within the work environment such as irregular and non-payment of salaries and wages, lack of working tools, uncomfortable office design and preferential treatment of some set of employees at the expense of other members of staff in the organization while some had attitudinal issues which greatly affected their productivity. It can be deduced from their studies that conducive work environment stimulates employees’ creativity and increases their performance substantially while bad working conditions contribute to low productivity of employees in many organizations. The public university libraries in Nigeria cannot be isolated from these ugly phenomena as it is generally observed that the level of productivity in most public university libraries today is low due to job dissatisfaction of its personnel especially the librarians (Babalola & Nwalo, 2013).

Thus, in this study, productivity is conceptualized to mean the ability to produce an item or service in the organization. Also, it refers to all efforts that an individual employee exerts towards the general production of goods and services of the organization with the least input of skills, labour, material, and machines. In Nigerian public university libraries, librarians’ productivity entails providing current and relevant educational resources in the library that would encourage increase in paper publications among faculty members and librarians themselves, innovative research works in the university that would attract grants from both local and international organizations. This helps in promoting the image and status of the university among her peers.

Also, it enhances students’ academic success in their various examinations as they will have access to current and relevant library resources that would support their lecture notes and academic programmes in the university. Librarians are directly involved in the accreditation exercise in the university as they provide both electronic and printed resources to support the exercise; no meaningful accreditation exercise takes place in the university without the corresponding educational resources stocked in the university library; in other words, library assists the university authority to have more courses and programmes accredited by the National University Commission (NUC). Librarians are custodians and managers of these intellectual resources, and should be adequately motivated in order to be more productive. Hence, it becomes logical that librarians should be adequately and fairly motivated by their employers if they are to increase the rate of their productivity in the university system.

In Nigeria, there are eighty one (81) public universities (National University Commission, 2015). The list comprises of forty one (41) Federal universities and forty (40) State owned universities. About six (6) of them are described as first generation universities (1948 – 1962); ten (10) are described as second generation universities (1970 – 1975); nine (9) are described as third generation universities (1979 – 1985); nineteen (19) are regarded as fourth generation universities (1988 – 1992); twenty two (22) are described as fifth generation universities (1999 – 2007) which are mainly State owned universities; and the remaining fifteen (15) were established during the civilian administration of President Goodluck Jonathan; they are described as the sixth generation universities (2011 – 2015).

Moreover, these universities are spread amongst the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria. In the South-West zone there are eight (8) Federal universities and 10 State universities; in the South-South zone there are seven (7) Federal universities and 7 State universities; in the South-East zone there are 6 Federal universities and five (5) State universities; in the North-
Central zone there are 8 Federal universities and 6 State universities; North-East zone has 6 Federal universities and 5 State universities; while North-West zone has eleven (11) Federal universities and 7 State universities respectively. Each of these public universities have a library manned by a University Librarian working together with other professional librarians to provide relevant educational resources to support the curricula of the university programmes.

It can be succinctly summarized here that job satisfaction enhances productivity of workers in any organization especially in the public university libraries as a satisfied worker is a happy and productive worker. Contrarily, Ademodi and Akintomide (2015) posited that a dissatisfied worker will either resign his or her appointment from the organization or constitute nuisance to the organization and this will encourage inefficiency and low productivity or commitment. It is therefore expedient for every “manager to take initiative in finding out those factors that improve job satisfaction of the subordinates” (Vijayabanu & Swaminathan, 2016, p. 1638) in order to boost productivity and enhances retention of the experienced workforce in the organization.

Unfortunately, it can be observed that productivity of workers in some organizations especially in the public university libraries is generally low. Some librarians in these libraries have issues ranging from perceived problems of inadequate attention to their basic needs by the organization to feelings of being marginalized and inadequate recognition by their employers, among others. In order to achieve the optimum productivity of librarians in the public university libraries, management should pay more attention to those factors that really motivate them.

Statement of the Problem
Research has shown that the level of job satisfaction and productivity of library personnel is low (Babalola & Nwalo, 2013) although their research productivity is relatively high (Okonedo, Popoola, Emmanuel & Bamigboye, 2015). While many of these studies have been directed towards library use, library collections and library services, few if any have been carried out from the perspective of personal welfare of employees. In other words, studies have not been directed at investigating the relationships between welfare and personal issues such as job satisfaction and productivity of librarians. The aim of this research is to find out the relationships among these variables; specifically, the extent to which job satisfaction could influence the productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria.

Objective of the Study
The general objective of this research work is to investigate how job satisfaction could affect the productivity of librarians in Nigerian public university libraries. The specific objectives are to:

1. determine the degree of job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria;
2. find out the level of productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria;
3. evaluate the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria; and
4. find out the challenging issues in job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria.
Research Questions
The following are the list of research questions slated for this research work:

1. What is the degree of job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria?
2. What is the level of productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria?
3. What challenges face librarians’ job satisfaction and productivity in public university libraries in Nigeria?

Research Hypothesis
The null hypothesis for this study was tested at 0.05 level of significance:
Ho: There is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria;

Scope of the Study
The study is limited to librarians in the public (that is, federal and state) universities in Nigeria. This means that private universities and other third level institutions were excluded. Respondents were librarians in the federal and state universities that are spread across the six geopolitical regions in Nigeria. Para-professional staffers as well as other personnel of the public university libraries were thus excluded because the researchers believed that librarians are the custodians of information resources that are kept in the university library; they are the policy makers as well as managers of other library personnel.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Conceptual Discourse
The conceptual discourse for the study deals with all variables that constitute the study. The study deals with two variables: job satisfaction and productivity. These were discussed in the systematic order so as to give conceptual understanding of the study.

1. Job Satisfaction
The concept of Job Satisfactions have been widely discussed by many researchers. Job Satisfaction as a formal area of research did not exist until the mid-1930s, although it has become a much researched area of inquiry over the last thirty years (Landy, 1989). Many authors in their research work on this concept cited Locke (1976) who estimated that about 3,350 articles or dissertations had been written on this topic by 1972; but Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) suggested that more than 5,000 studies of job satisfaction had been published. Presently, it is assumed that the number of work done on the topic might have increased to over 15,500 articles or dissertations, considering the high level of interest researchers have in the subject. The growing interest in this construct in academia since the beginning of the 1990s is mainly due to the few studies on job satisfaction as relates to the productivity of librarians in the university library. Hence, the emphasis of this study is to bridge this gap and consider how job satisfaction enhances the productivity of librarians in the university library.

The concept of job satisfaction has been viewed differently by different scholars. In the view of Gamlath and Kaluarachchi (2014, p. 54), job satisfaction can be defined as the rate at which “employees like or dislike their work and the extent to which their expectations concerning work have been fulfilled”. This reflects the extent to which an individual likes his
or her job (Aamodi, 2007; Krietner & Kinicki, 2007; Court, 2012). Job satisfaction is generally acknowledged as a necessary ingredient for personal fulfillment in carrying out one’s duties. Similarly, job satisfaction can be referred to as an emotional response to a job situation which cannot be seen, but only be inferred. It is simply regarded as how people feel about their job and different aspects of it. It means a positive attitude that an individual has from what he does to earn a living (Somvir & Kaushik, 2012). Besides, McCormic and Triffin (1979) referred to job satisfaction as the attitude one has towards his or her job. In this study, job satisfaction refers to the general feelings of workers about their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs. It is conceptualized to mean the level of positive attitude that an employee displays when performing his/her duties in the organization and the rate at which his/her basic needs are met.

Still on worker’s attitude towards his or her work, Maheshkumar and Jayaraman (2013, p. 252) referred to Job satisfaction “as an employee’s attitude towards his or her work, organizational rewards and the social, organizational and physical environment in which work is performed”. Here, the authors linked job satisfaction to the organizational rewards which are otherwise regarded as extrinsic job satisfaction factors. Each organization is expected by its workforce to put in place a number of job satisfaction factors that spur workers to have positive attitude towards the performance of their assigned duties in the organization. These extrinsic factors are not necessarily to be only monetary rewards but they should also include non-monetary benefits; they should be able to stir up each employee to have the right attitude that would increase his or her productivity in the organization. The authors further stressed that “attitudes abound in organizations and people have different attitudes towards their jobs, the institute they work for, their supervisor, their co-workers, the amount of money they earn, and the way they are treated by management. These attitudes affect their behaviour” in the organization.

An employee could have a positive or negative attitude towards his or her job or express like or dislike towards his or her job based on outcome of the evaluation from the experiences associated with a particular job (Court, 2012). In the same vein, Maheshkumar Jayaraman (2013) opined that

it is possible for a person to have positive attitude towards his or her pay, negative ones towards the duties that must be performed and to feel neutral towards co-workers and employee’s benefits. Generally, individuals who are satisfied with one aspect of their job report that they are satisfied with other aspects as well. Thus, most individual’s feelings about their job are dominated by general or global feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction is one of the most crucial but controversial issues in behavioural management in an organization (p. 252).

In the workplace especially in the library, workers display different types of attitudes in relation to their moods, some workers display positive attitudes when they are happy and negative attitudes when they are sad. This could have adverse effect on the productivity of librarians within the university library system. Supporting this view, Smith, Kendel and Hulin (1979) cited in Quadri (2010); Kian, Yussoff & Rajah (2014) regarded job satisfaction as an affective response of the workers to their job. Affective Job Satisfaction states the individual’s immediate feeling towards job-related factors. It is the extent of pleasurable emotional feeling an individual has about the job he is expected to carry out. Here, the positive emotional feeling may include “feeling good about the individual job being delegated, and the particular felling is experienced from their appraised work performance, recognized professions, and even completion of work task” (Kian et al, 2014, p. 95).
2 Productivity

Generally, “productivity is a concept that depends on the context in which it employed. It is a ratio to measure how well an organization (or individual, industry, country) converts input resources (labour, materials & machines) into goods and services” (Ali et al, 2013, p. 68. Productivity is a ratio to measure how well an organization (or individual, industry) converts input resources (labour, materials & machines) into goods and services. This is usually expressed in ratios of inputs to outputs. Similarly, Chaudhary and Sharma (2012) as well as Rolloos (1997) cited in Ali et al (2013) posited productivity as that which people can produce with the least (smallest) amount of effort. It is the rate of power to produce, but productivity from the management or economic point of view is the ratio of what is produced to what is required to produce it. While in the librarianship point of view, they are tangible services which every librarian is expected to perform in order to satisfy the information needs of his/her clienteles.

In this study, the researcher conceptualized productivity as the ability to produce an item or service in the organization. Also, he sees it as efforts that an individual employee exerts towards the general production of goods and services of the organization with the least input of labour, material, and machines. In any organization, productivity is important because it allows the business to be more cost effective. The more output a business has for a specific cause, the cheaper it is to produce the product. This in turn allows the business to have a higher profit. Productivity on the part of employees is important because getting your job done will help the company's growth. If the company grows and progresses, profits will increase. If profits in the company increase, not only will the bosses be happier but they will hire more people and give increase benefits to the employees. Thus, productivity is good to everyone and serves as an important ingredient for the survival and sustainable growth of every organization.

However, Olomolaiye, Wahab and Price (1998) and Gundecha (2012) classified the productivity factors into two categories: external factors the ones outside the control of the organization management and internal factors related to the productivity factors originating within the organization. From their viewpoint, the nature and composition of the organization are the internal factors that can enhance the productivity of workers in such organization. In the university system, there are three categories of workers: academic staff, senior staff and junior staff. Librarians are classified as part of the academic staff of the university system. Every professional librarian is expected to be productive. In the university libraries, librarians are saddled with the responsibility of selecting, acquiring and organizing library educational materials for easy accessibility and retrieval by the library users as well as rendering reference and selective dissemination of information (SDI) services to meet the information needs of library users. Unfortunately, some public university authorities are not treating her faculty members equally; there are some allowances that are paid to lecturers which are regarded by the university management as “core academic staff” in the university but which are not extended to librarians. It could be noted that with such composition, the morale of librarians in such university will be low and this will invariably affect their productivity.

Employee Job Satisfaction and Productivity

The study of the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of workers (job performance) is one of the most venerable research traditions in industrial organizational psychology (Judge, Bono, Thoresen & Patton, 2001). This relationship has been described as the “Holy Grail” of industrial psychologists (Landy, 1989). Indeed, interest in the link between workplace attitudes and productivity goes back at least as far as the Hawthorne studies, and the topic continues to be written about to this day in organizational and social psychology literature (Judge et al, 2001). Early studies were based on the assumption that
individuals increased their productivity as a result of increased job satisfaction (Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2011). This direction of the relationship was attributed to human relations movement that assumed that higher morale and satisfaction would lead to improved productivity (Judge et al, 2001). Moreover, this assumption was supported by most attitude researchers in social psychology literature who believed that attitudes had behavioural consequences on employees in the organization (Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2011). Thus, this study intends to closely examine the work attitude of librarians in relationship to their productivity in the public university libraries in Nigeria.

Similarly, from the study conducted by Bockerman and Ilmakunnas (2012) on the job satisfaction-productivity nexus, the authors used the standard measures of productivity as the dependent variables. They also used various individual-level proxy variables to measure the level of worker’s job performance in the organization. These include sickness, absences, accidents, job quits, self-reported performance measures, and supervisors’ evaluations of their employees’ performance. Their submission tallied with the results of the previous studies that was carried out by a number of researchers such as: Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985); Judge et al (2001); Zelenski, Murphy and Jenkins (2008), and experimental situations used by Oswald et al (2014) to show the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of workers in the organization. Besides, the human relations movement, of Elton Mayo and other scholars believed that job satisfaction had beneficial effects, including increased work performance (Argyle, 1989).

This implies that the positive attitude of individual workers in the public university libraries especially librarians has a direct relationship with the level of their productivity; it affects the rate at which information can be processed and effectively disseminated to the information seekers. In support of this view, Pushpakumari (2008) in his study posits that employee attitudes are important to management because they determine the behaviour of workers in the organization. The commonly held opinion is that “A satisfied worker is a productive worker”. The author stresses that a satisfied work force will create a pleasant atmosphere within the organization to perform well. The result of the author’s study shows that there exists positive correlation between job satisfaction and performance of employees. To further corroborate this submission, Herzberg et al. (1959) state that (positive) satisfaction is due to good experiences, and that these are due to `motivators' - achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and employee advancement opportunity in the organization.

On the other hand, workers’ negative attitudes would affect the level of their productivity. It can be generally observed that workers usually displayed negative attitude when they are facing some unforeseen circumstances in their individual lives and also when the organization fails to provide some motivational factors that could spur them for greater performances at work. Most often, workers displayed this negative attitude in order to protest the irresponsible attitude of the authority towards their plight in the organization. Herzberg et al (1959) affirmed in their study that workers’ job dissatisfaction is due to bad experiences caused by `hygiene' factors - supervisors, fellow workers, company policy, working conditions, and personal life.

Therefore, university authorities should endeavour to put in place some motivational factors that would trigger off the positive attitude in their workforce especially the librarians and exert their productivity in the university system; for a happy worker is a productive worker; hence, employees should be happy in their work, given the amount of time they have to devote to it throughout their working lives (Haorei, 2012). This researcher believes that most workers spend the greater part of their lives at the workplace; so, they should display a
happy positive mood towards their job performance and among their fellow counterparts in the organization.

**Theoretical Framework**

Due to inter-relationship of the variables that made up of this study, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs theory shall be employed to discuss job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in the public university libraries in Nigeria.

**Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory**

The hierarchy of needs theory was developed by a psychologist, Abraham Maslow in 1943. In the theory, he proposed that people are motivated by a predictable five-step hierarchy of needs.

![Maslow Hierarchy of Needs Theory](image)

**Figure 1: Maslow Hierarchy of Needs Theory**

**Source: Maslow (1954)**

This theory is related to: job satisfaction, productivity, employee motivation and human capital development variables of the study. Abraham Maslow in his theory broadly classified human needs into five groups that consist of: physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization needs. According to Zameer, Ali, Nisar and Amir (2014), if organizations fulfil basic need, safety need, belonging need, self-esteem need, self-actualization, training and career development needs of their employees then the performance of employee would easily increase.

Abraham Maslow broadly classified human needs into five groups as shown in Figure 1. The different levels of needs on Maslow’s hierarchy are discussed as follows:
Physiological needs. These are biological needs which consist of the need for oxygen, food, gender, sleep, water, and a relatively constant body temperature. They are the strongest needs because if a person were deprived of all needs, it is these physiological ones that would come first in the person's search for satisfaction.

Safety needs. These needs consist of the need for protection, security, law, stability, order and limits. When all physiological needs are met and are no longer controlling thoughts and behaviours, the needs for security can become active. While adults have little awareness of their security needs except in times of emergency or periods of disorganization in the social structure (such as widespread rioting), children often display the signs of insecurity and the need to be safe.

Needs for love, affection and belongingness. When the needs for safety and for physiological well-being are satisfied, the next class of needs for love, affection and belongingness can emerge. Maslow states that people seek to overcome feelings of loneliness and alienation. This involves both giving and receiving love, affection and the sense of belonging.

Self-esteem needs. When the first three classes of needs are satisfied, the needs for esteem can become dominant. These involve needs for both self-esteem and for the esteem a person gets from others. Humans have a need for a stable, firmly based, high level of self-respect, and respect from others. When these needs are satisfied, the person feels self-confident and valuable as a person in the world. When these needs are frustrated, the person feels inferior, weak, helpless and worthless.

Self-actualization needs. When all of the foregoing needs are satisfied, then and only then are the needs for self-actualization activated. Maslow describes self-actualization as a person’s need to be and do that which the person was "born to do." "A musician must make music, an artist must paint, and a poet must write." These needs make themselves felt in signs of restlessness. The person feels on edge, tense, lacking something, in short, restless. If a person is hungry, unsafe, not loved or accepted, or lacking self-esteem, it is very easy to know what the person is restless about. However, it is not always clear what a person wants when there is a need for self-actualization.

However, despite the manifold benefits of Maslow theory yet it has the limitation of little evidence to support its hierarchical aspect although it makes sense from an intuitive standpoint. In fact, there is evidence that contradicts the order of needs specified by the model. For example, some cultures appear to place social needs before any others. Maslow's hierarchy also has difficulty explaining cases such as the "starving artist" in which a person neglects lower needs in pursuit of higher ones.

Moreover, when those employees’ needs as spelt out in the Maslow hierarchy of need theory are fairly and adequately met by the university administrators, employees in such institutions of higher learning especially librarians in the university library will be happy discharging their duties, a happy worker is a satisfied and productive worker. There is little evidence to suggest that people are motivated to satisfy only one need level at a time, except in situations where there is a conflict between needs. “Even though Maslow's hierarchy lacks scientific support, it is quite well-known and is the first theory of motivation to which many people are exposed. To address some issues in Maslow's theory, Clayton Alderfer developed the ERG theory, a needs-based model that is more consistent with empirical findings” (Arab British Academy for Higher Education, 2014).
Finally, the relevance of this theory on the study is that it helps university administrators to know various needs that are applicable to workers especially librarians in the university library and how to meet them in order to improve the productivity of librarians in the university system. This implies that when librarians’ needs are systematically and adequately addressed by the university management, their morale will be boosted and the level of their job satisfaction and productivity in the university library will be greatly increased. Also, it helps librarians to ascertain those needs that have been adequately met by their employers and how those needs that are yet to be attended to will be met in future. This fosters peaceful relationship between university administrators and librarians, and it helps in boosting the morale of librarians in the university library to be more productive.

**Conceptual Model for the Study**

![Conceptual model for the Study](source: Yaya (2016))

**Discussion of the Conceptual Model**

The conceptual framework for this study was built on the theory and literatures reviewed. The model is broadly divided into two parts: Job satisfaction and Productivity of librarians in the university library. It can be observed from the literatures reviewed that several factors affect the job satisfaction of workers and therefore their levels of productivity. Job satisfaction of workers in the organization especially librarians in the university library is very crucial as it enhances their effective job performance. Job satisfaction factors like motivational factors can be intrinsic or extrinsic in nature; these would positively affect librarians’ job performance in the university library. They consist of recognition, leadership styles, career advancement opportunity, and conducive work environment among others that are discussed in the study. It could be noted here that when a librarian is fairly and adequately motivated, he/she would be happy carrying out his/her duties and thereby increase his level of job performance in the entire university community. Zelenski, Murphy and Jenkins (2008), Tam and Rigsbee (2013), and Addady (2015) affirmed that a happy worker is a productive worker while Leviticus (2014) posited that an unhappy worker is an unproductive one. Librarians’ productivity would lead to increase in number of paper publications among librarians themselves as well as the faculty members, innovative research work that would attract more grants to the university, organizational growth and development, and among other benefits.
Research Design
The correlational research design was used for this study. According to Cheng (2016), correlational research design could be used to describe the relationship between two or more variables, as well as how strongly these variables relates to one another. In other words, it aims to determine the relationship between two or more variables and the strength of this relationship. In the same vein, Kowalczyk (2015) posits that the whole purpose of using correlations in research is to figure out which variables are connected. The researcher concurs with these authors’ assertions. Thus, correlational research design was adopted for this study in order to establish the relationships between the variables.

Population
The population for this study consisted of 1,254 librarians from the 81 public universities (Federal & State) in Nigeria. The list comprised of 41 Federal universities and 40 State owned universities. The four which have not taken off at the time of conducting this study were excluded.

From the analysis of States, each geopolitical zone has the following records of university libraries and librarians: North-Central (including Federal Capital Territory) has 13 university libraries with 244 librarians; North-East has 11 university libraries with 128 librarians; North-West has 16 university libraries with 272 librarians; South-East has 10 university libraries with 167 librarians; South-South has 13 university libraries with 203 librarians; and South West has 15 university libraries with 240 librarians. Thus, all the university libraries and their librarians are potential respondents of this study.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique
The sample size for this study is 923 librarians. Random sampling technique was adopted for this study. The sampling was done by first stratifying the country (Nigeria) along the existing six geopolitical zones (strata); these include: North-Central, North-East, North-West, South-East, South-South and South-West. Each zone (stratum) is made up of six States except North-West and South East that are made up of seven and five States respectively.

Consequently, the researchers surveyed all the librarians in all the public university libraries established in the four selected geopolitical zones and states. The selected zones and states were listed as follow: North-Central (Benue, Kogi, Kwara, Nasarawa, Niger, Plateau and Federal Capital Territory); North-West (Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Kebbi, Jigawa, Sokoto and Zamfara); South-East (Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo); and South-West (Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Osun and Oyo). The choice of these states was to give a wider coverage of all the professional librarians working in all public (federal & state) universities sited in each state of the geopolitical zones selected for the study. Also, each state has public universities to be surveyed, similar cultural and economic activities, as well as similar religious settings.

The researchers randomly selected 60% sample size from the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria which give approximately four zones; these included: North-Central, North-West, South-East and South-West. According to Nachimias and Nachimias (1987), the rate between 50-75% of sample size were considered acceptable in research; hence, the choice of 60% of the geopolitical zones in the country was to give fair representation of the entire country (two geopolitical zones were selected from each part of the country i.e. North & South) as all the
geopolitical zones in Nigeria might be too large and cumbersome to handle within the stipulated time frame. Also, to enable the researcher complete the study within the limited resources available for the study.

Besides, each of the geopolitical zones selected for the study has the following records of university libraries and librarians: North-Central has 13 university libraries with 244 librarians; North-West has 16 university libraries with 272 librarians; South-East has 10 university libraries with 167 librarians; and South-West has 15 university libraries with 240 librarians. The number of librarians in the fifty four (54) selected public university libraries considered for this study was calculated at 923.

**Research Instrument**

The researchers employed the questionnaire in collecting data for this study. The questionnaire for this study was designed by the researchers. The researchers postulated three research questions for the study and designed the questionnaire along the identified research questions. Hence, the research instrument is divided into four sections: A, B, C and D. Items in the instrument were gathered from the literature reviewed for the study.

**Section A:** Demographic information. It contained questions relating to demographic data of the respondents as per their institution, age, sex, marital status, educational qualification, designation, department and working experience.

**Section B:** Level of job satisfaction. It was sub-divided into six parts: employee recognition, good leadership styles, career advancement opportunities, conducive work environment, employee promotion opportunities, and remuneration.

**Section C:** Level of Productivity. It was sub-divided into four parts: increase number of paper publication, innovative research work, students’ academic success and accreditation of more courses. It contained questions relating to the level of productivity of librarians in the university community like: library collection boosts regular paper publications of faculty members; it enhances my regular paper publications, my job performance contribute to innovative research work in the university; it provides resources for innovative research work; library collection enhances academic success of students in the university; it provides conducive learning environment that encourages academic success of students; my job performance contribute greatly to the accreditation exercises of the university; and I actively involved in the accreditation exercises.

**Section D:** Challenging issues. It contains questions that mostly affected job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in the university library. These include: undemocratic leadership styles, lack of employee recognition, among others.

**Validity of the Instrument**

The research instrument was subjected to the scrutiny of some university librarians especially those with PhD degree in the field of librarianship and other experts in the areas of the variables studied; these were approached for their useful advice and input in order to validate the research instrument used for the study. Both face and content validity were employed in order to standardise the instrument and to make it more adequate for the study. Based on their useful feedback, the research instrument was modified where necessary.
Reliability of the Instrument
A pilot study was conducted. The researcher through friends and research assistants administered 56 questionnaires and retrieved 38 copies (67.9%); among professional librarians of three public university libraries that were not part of the sample for the main study, these included: University of Benin, Delta State University and Ambrose Alli University all in the South-South geopolitical zone of Nigeria. These were subjected to Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis and with alpha reliability coefficient results as follows: Job Satisfaction of Librarians $\alpha = 0.78$; and Productivity of Librarians $\alpha = 0.94$. With these results, the instrument was used for the study as the alpha reliability coefficient results for all the variables are more than 0.5 level of significant.

Research Procedure and Method of Data Collection
The corrected copies of the questionnaire were administered to professional librarians in all the fifty four (54) university libraries slated for the study. The respondents were assured that information supplied by them would be treated with utmost confidentiality and used solely for the purposes of academic research. Also, such information will not be divulged to a third party. The researcher intended to personally administer copies of the questionnaire to the affected librarians; but due to the wide geographical zones to be covered for the study and limited time frame, the researcher engaged the services of research assistants, electronic administration of the instrument to most of the respondents, friends working in most of these university libraries, NLA online forum and even the University Librarians so as to add credibility to the data collected and analysed for the study. On the whole, 923 copies of the corrected questionnaire were administered to librarians in all the 54 public university libraries slated for the study; out of which, a total number of 620 copies were retrieved. This gives 67.2% return rate of the administered research instrument for the study.

Method of Data Analysis
Data collected for this study was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), 22.0 latest versions. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics, especially for research questions 1-3, while the hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis. The result was to attest to the mutual relationship that existed between Job satisfaction and Productivity variables in the study.

Presentation of Demographic Information of Respondents
Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>DEMOGRAPHIC STATEMENT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 1, it reveals that (56.9%) of the respondents were male. This implied that there were slightly more men in the librarianship profession than women in Nigeria. It was also revealed that majority of the respondents were married (73.4%). This implies that they would display maturity while discharging their duties to the library users in their various universities. It was revealed that there were more librarians in the age bracket of 41-50 years than any other age group closely followed by those in the age bracket 31-40. This simply meant a larger percentage of the respondents were relatively young and active.

Pertaining to the educational qualifications of the respondents, 50.3% were holders of Masters Degree in Library Science (MLIS) and others 20.6% were holders of Bachelor Degree in Library Science. This means that at least 71% of respondents were professionally qualified librarians. If it is assumed that the 6% who had Ph.D degrees got them from the field of librarianship, then this figure will increase to 77%. This shows that about a quarter (23%) of people working in Nigerian university libraries today hold degrees outside librarianship. This is understandable considering the role that information technology is playing in today’s information provision services.

It was revealed from the table that 70% of librarians in Nigerian universities occupied the low level positions (Assistant Librarians, Librarian II, Librarian I) in the library. Assistant Librarians constituted the largest number in this group. Almost 80% of the respondents had spent less than 15 years as Librarians or Assistant Librarians, while almost half (34.4%) had
spent less than 6 years. Those that had spent over 20 years on the job amounted to only 15% of respondents.

Data Analysis and Presentation Based on Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the degree of job satisfaction of librarians in public University Libraries in Nigeria?

Table 2: Degree of job satisfaction of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VHD (%)</th>
<th>HD (%)</th>
<th>LD (%)</th>
<th>NA (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Employee recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My opinion on work issues is respected</td>
<td>385 (62.1)</td>
<td>171 (27.6)</td>
<td>60 (9.7)</td>
<td>4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I am allowed to use my initiative on the job</td>
<td>355 (57.3)</td>
<td>206 (33.2)</td>
<td>53 (8.5)</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>I am well respected</td>
<td>343 (55.3)</td>
<td>220 (35.5)</td>
<td>30 (8.1)</td>
<td>7 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Good leadership styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My immediate boss is caring and considerate</td>
<td>296 (47.7)</td>
<td>246 (39.7)</td>
<td>66 (10.6)</td>
<td>12 (1.9)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>My immediate boss is interested in my career progress</td>
<td>282 (45.5)</td>
<td>279 (45)</td>
<td>41 (6.6)</td>
<td>18 (2.9)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Leadership style is generally democratic in my library</td>
<td>294 (47.4)</td>
<td>240 (38.7)</td>
<td>78 (12.6)</td>
<td>8 (1.3)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Employee promotion opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My promotion boosts the level of my job performance</td>
<td>308 (49.7)</td>
<td>224 (36.1)</td>
<td>60 (9.7)</td>
<td>28 (4.5)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>My promotion corresponds with the level of my input in the library</td>
<td>279 (45)</td>
<td>230 (37.1)</td>
<td>85 (13.7)</td>
<td>26 (4.2)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>My boss recommends me for promotion regularly</td>
<td>262 (42.3)</td>
<td>271 (43.7)</td>
<td>53 (8.5)</td>
<td>34 (5.5)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>My promotion is regular</td>
<td>258 (41.6)</td>
<td>249 (40.2)</td>
<td>99 (16)</td>
<td>14 (2.3)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Remuneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My present designation in the library corresponds with my current salary.</td>
<td>315 (50.8)</td>
<td>212 (34.2)</td>
<td>67 (10.8)</td>
<td>26 (4.2)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I get salary increment as at when due.</td>
<td>319 (51.5)</td>
<td>199 (32.1)</td>
<td>60 (9.7)</td>
<td>42 (6.8)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>My salary is regular and it has been paid as at when due</td>
<td>277 (47.7)</td>
<td>258 (41.6)</td>
<td>63 (10.2)</td>
<td>22 (3.5)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>My salary corresponds with the level of my input in the library</td>
<td>295 (47.6)</td>
<td>217 (35)</td>
<td>68 (11)</td>
<td>40 (6.5)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>The allowances paid to me are the same with other faculty staff of the university</td>
<td>290 (49.8)</td>
<td>191 (30.8)</td>
<td>74 (11.9)</td>
<td>46 (7.4)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>My salary is enough to meet all my basic needs.</td>
<td>241 (38.9)</td>
<td>235 (41.1)</td>
<td>73 (12.1)</td>
<td>49 (7.9)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Some allowances are paid to other academic members without paying such to librarians in my university.</td>
<td>263 (42.4)</td>
<td>199 (32.1)</td>
<td>82 (13.2)</td>
<td>76 (12.3)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Conductive work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>I have the resources I used to work effectively</td>
<td>271 (43.7)</td>
<td>251 (40.5)</td>
<td>89 (14.4)</td>
<td>9 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I am happy to go to work everyday</td>
<td>272 (43.9)</td>
<td>233 (37)</td>
<td>88 (14.4)</td>
<td>27 (4.4)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>My office is air-conditioned</td>
<td>291 (46.9)</td>
<td>186 (30)</td>
<td>101 (16.3)</td>
<td>42 (6.8)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>My work mates are friendly</td>
<td>275 (44.4)</td>
<td>216 (34.8)</td>
<td>69 (11.1)</td>
<td>60 (9.7)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Career advancement opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>I am sponsored by the library to local conferences/workshops</td>
<td>291 (46.9)</td>
<td>199 (32.1)</td>
<td>110 (17.7)</td>
<td>20 (3.2)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I am allowed to attend conferences/workshops</td>
<td>280 (45.2)</td>
<td>227 (36.6)</td>
<td>80 (12.9)</td>
<td>33 (5.3)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>My boss encourages and seats with me to plan my career development</td>
<td>236 (41.3)</td>
<td>172 (27.7)</td>
<td>161 (26)</td>
<td>31 (5)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>I am sponsored by the library to international conferences</td>
<td>248 (40)</td>
<td>196 (31.6)</td>
<td>101 (16.3)</td>
<td>75 (12.1)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2016
It can be deduced from Table 2 that librarians in Nigerian Universities considered their degree of job satisfaction to be high judging by the average mean score of 3.13 on the scale of 4. They considered their being recognised by the authorities as well as the good leadership styles that were practised as the most important reasons for their job satisfaction in the university system. Each had average mean scores of 3.48 and 3.33 respectively. Specifically, librarians were satisfied with their job as their opinions on work related issues were respected (mean = 3.51), followed by the revelation that most librarians working in the university libraries were allowed to use their initiatives on some complex jobs (mean = 3.47). Also, it was revealed that their immediate boss showed keen interest in their career development efforts (mean = 3.33) so as to improve their productivity.

Other degrees of satisfaction enjoyed by librarians in the university libraries were their promotion opportunities (average mean = 3.25), remuneration (average mean = 3.21), conducive work environment (average mean = 3.20) as well as career advancement opportunities (average mean = 3.13). Specifically, promotions privileges that librarians enjoyed in their various university libraries boosted their level of their job performance (mean = 3.31), it was revealed that their immediate bosses regularly recommended them for promotion to the next position they were to occupy in their libraries (mean = 3.23). Also, it was revealed by respondents that their present designations in their libraries corresponded with their current salaries (mean = 3.32) and they got salary increments as and at when due (mean = 3.28). Librarians were provided with some resources that enabled them to discharge their duties effectively. Librarians were also sponsored by their university library authorities to attend local conferences/workshops within the country (mean = 3.23).

Research Question 2: What is the level of productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VH (%)</th>
<th>H (%)</th>
<th>M (%)</th>
<th>L (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Students’ academic success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Library collection enhances academic success of students in the university</td>
<td>411 (66.3)</td>
<td>181 (29.2)</td>
<td>26 (4.2)</td>
<td>2 (0.3)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Library provides conducive learning environment that encourages academic success</td>
<td>376 (60.6)</td>
<td>211 (34)</td>
<td>29 (4.7)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>With current and relevant library collections, students will excel in their academic programmes</td>
<td>323 (52.1)</td>
<td>260 (41.9)</td>
<td>32 (5.2)</td>
<td>5 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>My job performance often lead to students’ success in their examinations</td>
<td>356 (57.4)</td>
<td>221 (35.6)</td>
<td>38 (6.1)</td>
<td>5 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Accreditation of more courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My job performance contribute greatly to the accreditation exercises of the university</td>
<td>394 (63.5)</td>
<td>194 (31.3)</td>
<td>28 (4.5)</td>
<td>4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I actively involved in the accreditation exercises</td>
<td>390 (62.9)</td>
<td>203 (32.7)</td>
<td>22 (3.5)</td>
<td>5 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Relevant and current library collections help the university authority to have more courses accredited</td>
<td>385 (62.1)</td>
<td>189 (30.5)</td>
<td>40 (6.5)</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>It encourages growth and development of the university</td>
<td>367 (59.2)</td>
<td>224 (36.1)</td>
<td>22 (3.5)</td>
<td>7 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>It enriches the university curricula and programmes</td>
<td>356 (57.4)</td>
<td>221 (35.6)</td>
<td>38 (6.1)</td>
<td>5 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Innovative research work

i. It provides resources for innovative research work.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>362 (58.4)</td>
<td>226 (36.5)</td>
<td>27 (4.4)</td>
<td>5 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. My job output greatly contribute to the innovative research efforts of the university community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>346 (55.8)</td>
<td>252 (40.6)</td>
<td>18 (2.9)</td>
<td>4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. It promotes the image of the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>351 (56.6)</td>
<td>241 (38.9)</td>
<td>24 (3.9)</td>
<td>4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. My job performance contribute to innovative research work in the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>369 (59.5)</td>
<td>205 (33.1)</td>
<td>35 (5.6)</td>
<td>11 (1.8)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Increase number of paper publication

i. Library collection boosts regular paper publications of faculty members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>436 (70.3)</td>
<td>156 (25.2)</td>
<td>25 (4)</td>
<td>3 (0.5)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. It provides resources for regular paper publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>330 (53.2%)</td>
<td>256 (41.3)</td>
<td>30 (4.8)</td>
<td>4 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. My regular paper publications assures me of promotion as at when due

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>331 (53.4)</td>
<td>248 (40)</td>
<td>31 (5)</td>
<td>10 (1.6)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. Three of my publications are in international journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>335 (54)</td>
<td>176 (28.4)</td>
<td>70 (11.3)</td>
<td>39 (6.3)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v. It enhances my regular paper publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>395 (63.7)</td>
<td>180 (29)</td>
<td>36 (5.8)</td>
<td>9 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vi. I have produced at least five papers in the past two years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305 (49.2)</td>
<td>202 (32.6)</td>
<td>82 (13.2)</td>
<td>31 (5)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2016

Key: VH = Very High, H = High, M = Medium, L = Low, SD = Standard Deviation; AM = Average Mean

It can be seen from Table 3 that librarians in Nigerian Universities considered their level of productivity to be very high judging by the average mean score of 3.39 on the scale of 4. They considered their contribution to the academic success of students as well as the universities’ success in getting more courses accredited as the greatest measures of their productivity in the university system. Each had an average mean scores of 3.56 and 3.55 respectively. Specifically, having the relevant library collections (mean = 3.64) and conducive reading and learning environment contribute to students’ academic success while active involvement in accreditation activities (mean = 3.58) plus having the right collection (mean = 3.58) contributed to the increase in the number of courses accredited.

Other activities of librarians’ productivity were their contribution to innovative research work in the university (average mean = 3.51) and increase in the number of papers published by them (average mean = 3.39). Specifically, providing resources for innovative research work (mean = 3.52) coupled with having relevant collections to boost paper publications of faculty members (mean = 3.61) in the university system.

Research Question 3: What challenges face librarians’ job satisfaction and productivity in public university libraries in Nigeria?

Table 4: Challenging issues affecting job satisfaction and productivity of librarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VGE(%)</th>
<th>GE(%)</th>
<th>ME(%)</th>
<th>NE(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff in the university</td>
<td>264(42.6)</td>
<td>209(33.7)</td>
<td>85(13.7)</td>
<td>62(10)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Lack of employee recognition</td>
<td>273(44)</td>
<td>192(31)</td>
<td>88(14.2)</td>
<td>67(10.8)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Marginalization of librarians by the</td>
<td>266(42.9)</td>
<td>190(30.6)</td>
<td>85(13.7)</td>
<td>79(12.7)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv. Irregular payment of salary and wages

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269(43.4)</td>
<td>172(27.7)</td>
<td>107(17.3)</td>
<td>72(11.6)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v. Lack of conducive work environment in my university

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256(41.3)</td>
<td>194(31.3)</td>
<td>101(16.3)</td>
<td>69(11.1)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vi. Irregular promotion opportunities

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237(38.2)</td>
<td>221(35.6)</td>
<td>93(15)</td>
<td>69(11.1)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vii. Lack of effective job design that would enable library services to be effectively carried out

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250(40.3)</td>
<td>200(32.3)</td>
<td>96(15.5)</td>
<td>74(11.9)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

viii. Inadequate provision for my basic needs by the organization

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218(35.2)</td>
<td>236(38.1)</td>
<td>111(17.9)</td>
<td>55(8.9)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ix. Inadequate security of lives and library resources

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221(35.6)</td>
<td>248(40)</td>
<td>65(10.5)</td>
<td>86(13.9)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x. Undemocratic leadership styles in my library

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>236(38.4)</td>
<td>196(31.6)</td>
<td>114(18.4)</td>
<td>74(11.9)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Field, 2016

Key: VGE = Very Great Extent; GE = Great Extent; ME = Moderate Extent; NE = Not Extent; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; AM = Average Mean

Table 4 reveals that librarians in Nigerian Universities considered those issues affecting librarians’ job satisfaction and productivity to be high judging by the average mean score of 3.02 on the scale of 4. Major challenging issues facing Nigerian university librarians were non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff (mean = 3.09), lack of employee recognition (mean = 3.08) and marginalization of librarians by the university authorities (mean = 3.04), irregular payment of salary and wages (mean = 3.03), lack of conducive work environment (mean = 3.03). Others were irregular promotion opportunities (mean = 3.01), lack of effective job design (mean = 3.01), inadequate provision of basic needs to librarians (mean = 3.00), inadequate security of lives and properties (mean = 2.97) as well as undemocratic leadership styles (mean = 2.96).

Hypothesis Testing and Interpretation

The hypothesis for this study was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis; thie could be used to test differences or relationship between the variables. The result was to attest to the mutual relationship that existed between Job satisfaction and Productivity) in the study.

Ho: There is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria.

Table 5: Correlation analysis between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria
The mean of job satisfaction of librarians in Nigerian university libraries was 3.47, SD = 0.62, while that of productivity was 3.55, SD = 0.67. The correlation of coefficient obtained was 0.025 with p-value < 0.05. The result showed positive correlation between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians. There was a positive significant relationship between the variables as indicated in the above table as \( r = 0.025, N = 620, P < 0.05 \). Null hypothesis one is rejected. This indicates that there is significant relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria.

**Discussion of Findings**

The major findings of this study were discussed in relation to past studies. The discussion followed the research questions on which sources of relationships between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians were established through past empirical studies. Each of the three research questions and the hypothesis were based on determining the influence that job satisfaction has on productivity of librarians. The findings of the study are discussed as follows:

Research question one showed that librarians considered their being recognised by the authorities as well as good leadership styles that were practised as the greatest measures of their job satisfaction in the university system. The results were supported by the submissions of Singh and Jain (2013); Chuks-Ibe and Ozioko (2014); Noor et al (2015) who submitted that job satisfaction of an employee in the organization was the collection of positive and/or negative feelings that an individual holds toward his or her job. They reported that achievement depends on employee satisfaction and in turn contribute to organizational success and growth. They concluded in their studies that job satisfaction boosts productivity of employees in the organization.

The findings were also supported by Russell (2008) as well as Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2014) who submitted in their findings that employee recognition was a motivational element that could be applied in the managerial level to motivate the employees for better job performance and being more innovative. They further stressed that recognition was a positive feedback that enabled employees to know that they were valued and appreciated by their employers and co-workers.

Research question two showed that librarians’ contribution to the academic success of students as well as the universities’ success in getting more courses accredited as the greatest measures of their productivity in the university system. The findings implied that library was fundamental to research productivity and that it supported the curricula of the universities. These were consistent with the research conducted by Okonedo et al (2015) in which the research productivity of various academic staff in the university was found relatively high in order to assure their chances of being promoted to the next position. It was revealed in the study that librarians’ job performance often lead to students’ academic success in their examinations; library provided students with current and relevant library collections and these help students to excel in their various academic programmes. Also, library equally provided conducive and quiet learning environment that encouraged users’ personal reading
and students’ academic success as its collections enhanced academic success of students in the university.

Besides, librarians were actively involved in the accreditation exercises; as well as enriching the curricula of both old and new programmes that were offered. This encouraged growth and development of the university. Periodically, every university in Nigeria sought for approval of Nigerian Universities Commission (NUC) before the commencement of any new programme; to facilitate this, library must be well stocked with relevant and current educational resources that would support such programme. In absence of this, no university programme will be accredited by the government statutory organization – NUC. This concurred with the study of Singh and Jain (2013) who listed accreditation of courses in the university as part of the factors through which an employee could derive job satisfaction and this would enhance the level of his/her productivity.

Research question three showed that librarians were facing some challenges that affected their level of job satisfaction and productivity in the university libraries. Specifically, it was showed that non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff followed by inadequate employee recognition and marginalization of librarians by the university authority greatly affected job satisfaction of librarians in the university. It could be reiterated here that job satisfaction of employees plays a crucial role in determining the general output of workers in any organization. “Job is an occupational act that is carried out by an individual in return for a reward” while satisfaction is “the way one feels about events, rewards, people, relation and amount of mental gladness on the job” (Somvir & Kaushik, 2012, p.1). In other words, job satisfaction of workers in any organization especially the university library, is the pivotal of its growth and development. Therefore, job satisfaction is important to librarianship as it is to other professions (Murray, 1999). Librarians like other faculty members in the university, should be made to enjoy job satisfaction factors that would enable them to be more productive in the university library.

The study revealed unequal payment of allowances payable to other academic staff in the university as the highest problem affecting job satisfaction of librarians in most university libraries. This finding confirmed the submission of Nwosu et al (2013) that majority of librarians in Nigeria were being poorly paid and motivated. Unfortunately, some public university authorities maintained segregation administrative system; they were not treating their faculty members equally; there were some allowances paid to lecturers which were regarded by the university management as “core academic staff” but which were not paid to the librarians. It could be noted that with such composition, the morale of librarians in such university would be low and this would as well affected the level of their job satisfaction and productivity. It showed that librarians were not recognized as full academic staff of the university management and they were being treated as second class academic staff in the same university. Hence, this apartheid management style must stop; if not there would be high rate of staff turnover in the public university library.

The result of inadequate recognition of librarians in most Nigerian university system has contradicted the submissions of Russell (2008) as well as Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2014) who noted in their findings that employee recognition is a motivational element that could be applied in the managerial level to motivate the employees for better job performance and being more innovative. They further stressed that recognition is a positive feedback that enables employees know that they are valued and appreciated by their employers and co-workers.
Thus, job satisfaction enhances productivity of workers in any organization especially in the public university libraries as a satisfied worker is a happy and productive worker. In contrary, Ademodi and Akintomide (2015) posited that a dissatisfied worker will either resign his or her appointment from the organization or constitute nuisance to the organization and this will encourage inefficiency and low productivity or commitment. It is therefore expedient for every “manager to take initiative in finding out those factors that improve job satisfaction of the subordinates” (Vijayabanu & Swaminathan, 2016, p. 1638) in order to boost productivity and enhances retention of the experienced workforce in the organization.

Furthermore, it is revealed from the findings and analysis presented in Table 5, the null hypothesis one was rejected. This indicates that there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in the public university libraries in Nigeria ($r = 0.025, P < 0.05$). The result tallied with the previous studies that was carried out by a number of researchers such as: Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985); Judge et al (2001); Zelenski, Murphy and Jenkins (2008), Oswald, Proto and Sgroi (2008) who established the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of workers in the organization. This had confirmed the assertion that job satisfaction enhances productivity of workers in any organization especially in the public university libraries as a job satisfied worker is a happy and productive worker.

Summary of Findings
The major findings of the study were as follows:

1. Librarians in Nigerian Universities saw their level of job satisfaction as very high judging by the average mean score of 3.13 on a scale of 4. They attributed this to being recognised by the authorities as well as good leadership styles that were practised as the greatest measures of their job satisfaction in the university system.
2. Librarians’ level of productivity was also high judging by the average mean score of 3.39 on the scale of 4. They considered their contribution to students’ academic success and the universities’ success in getting more courses accredited as major measures of their level of productivity.
3. Challenging issues facing university librarians’ job satisfaction and productivity was very high judging by the average mean score of 3.02 on the scale of 4. They attributed these to non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff as well as lack of adequate recognition and marginalization of librarians by the university authorities.

Conclusion
The study had succeeded in disabusing the earlier submission of low level job satisfaction and productivity of library personnel judging from its findings. It was directed towards librarians’ welfare and personal issues such as job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in the Nigerian public university libraries. Besides, the study confirmed the assertion that job satisfaction enhances productivity of workers in any organization especially in the public university libraries as a job satisfied librarian is a happy and productive librarian.

Therefore, in the public university institutions, the welfare of librarians should be taken seriously. They should be adequately and fairly motivated so as to enable them discharge their duties effectively. It is expedient for the university authorities to seek and put in place those motivating factors that would enhance job satisfaction and productivity of
workers in the university community. Hence, the findings and recommendations that emanated from this study would be relevant to our local needs in Nigeria.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings and challenges that were revealed in this study, the following recommendations are hereby proffered as the way forward:

1. Lower level of career advancement opportunities when compared with employee recognition job satisfaction factor, suggests that librarians may lack adequate sponsorship to attend international conferences. The researchers recommend that the university authorities should allocate reasonable fund in her annual budget mainly for sponsoring librarians to attend both local and international conferences, seminars, and workshops in order to equip them to effectively discharge their professional duties.

2. The study revealed decrease in paper publications among librarians and other faculty members in the last two years. This was attributed to general observation that most Nigerian public university libraries were stocked with irrelevant, old and obsolete resources that could not be used for any meaningful research work. It is therefore imperative for the university libraries in Nigeria to be stocked with current and relevant educational resources that would boost high class research works.

3. The study equally revealed that job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in most Nigerian public university libraries were been challenged by non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff as well as inadequate employee recognition and marginalization of librarians by the university authorities. The university authorities should mete out equal treatment to every academic staff and none should be marginalized nor given higher priority over the others. In other words, no academic staff should be treated as a core staff or regarded as a very important personality (VIP) over the others. Hence, they should be paid equal salaries and allowances in line with the government approved salary structures. Also, librarians should be given adequate recognition as custodians and managers of information resources needed in supporting the curricula of each academic programme in the university system.

**Implication of the Study**

The findings of this study indicate that Librarians in Nigerian Universities saw their level of job satisfaction and productivity as very high. They attributed this to being recognised by the authorities as well as good leadership styles that were practised as the greatest measures of their job satisfaction in the university system. They considered their contribution to students’ academic success and the universities’ success in getting more courses accredited as major measures of their level of productivity. These would improve growth and development of the university system as there will be increase in students enrolment and more new programmes will be accredited for the university. Also, the study affirmed that a satisfied worker is a productive worker.

On the whole, the study showed some challenging issues facing university librarians’ job satisfaction and productivity was very high. They attributed these to non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff as well as lack of adequate recognition and marginalization of librarians by the university authorities. If these problems were not
checked, they will lead to low productivity and loss of experienced librarians in the university system. Also, the finding of this study in the area of inadequate funding of library resources will result in inadequate provision of relevant educational resources to support the curricula and programmes in the university system.

**Contribution to Knowledge**

The centrality of the findings of this study established the link between job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public university libraries in Nigeria.

The study provides detailed information on those employees’ job satisfaction factors that would boost the productivity of librarians in the university community. Also, it would enable the university authorities to effectively meet the basic needs of her workforce especially librarians and thereby help in retaining the experienced workforce in the university libraries.

The findings of this study confirmed the dearth of research in investigating the relationships between welfare and personal issues such as job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in the public university libraries in Nigeria. Thus, this study has created a platform through which the existed gap has been filled and a bedrock through which future research could be based.

**Suggestions for Further Studies**

The present study focused on the job satisfaction and productivity of librarians in public University libraries in Nigeria. The study surveyed all the public universities in North-Central, North-West, South-East and South-West geopolitical zones in Nigeria. Therefore, the following areas of study are suggested for further research:

1. An investigation on how librarians in the Public Universities in North-East and South-South geopolitical zones of Nigeria perceive the factors identified in this study in relationship to their job satisfaction and productivity.

2. A study on how librarians in the Private Universities in Nigeria perceive the factors identified in this study in relationship to their job satisfaction and productivity.

3. A study on how librarians in other Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria perceive the factors identified in this study in relationship to their job satisfaction and productivity.

4. A study on how the perceptions of librarians in the Public Universities in Nigeria compare with those of the librarians in Private Universities.

**Limitation of the Study**

One of the major constraints of this study was that it was difficult to retrieve the administered research instrument from many librarians as most of them refused to complete it with an excuse that the instrument is too voluminous, some even refused to participate in the study. This situation was solved by the researchers and those that worked with them as they had to
convince and persistently pleaded with the respondents through constant telephone calls and regular emails sent to remind them. They personally pleaded with others that were in nearby universities for their assistance in completing the research instrument. Also, they sent money to some of these Research Assistants as their compensation and to buy soft drinks for the respondents. This motivating factor greatly improved the return rate of the research instrument. Nevertheless, many librarians especially in the Northern States of Nigeria showed great enthusiasm towards the study and they completed the instrument sent to them promptly. Even some University Librarians reproduced the instrument, administered it to their librarians and sent the retrieved copies to us without charging any fee. May God bless them greatly.
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