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INTRODUCTION

Background to the study

Job is an occupational related act that is performed by an individual or group of people as an end-result of a reward. A job is a task, frequently, consistently and regularly performed in return for compensation. For this study, a job is conceived by the researchers as a remunerated position of normal employment. Job satisfaction connotes the way one feels about occasions, rewards, individuals, relation and measure of mental happiness at work (Afshar & Doosti, 2016). Despite the fact that job satisfaction is affected by numerous external elements, it remains an internal thing that has to do with the way an employee feels; which implies that job satisfaction brings a sense of fulfillment. Job satisfaction has been conceptualized by the researchers as the outcome felt when one’s expectations have been fulfilled. Therefore, among the factors that make employees such as librarians to be satisfied with their job are job security, staffs esteem, good and regular salary, career advancement opportunities, conducive work environment and promotion opportunities among other factors.

Quite a lot of works had been done concerning job satisfaction in the field of librarianship. However, librarians appear not to have done justice to what gives them fulfillment in their work when compared with experts in other fields. Thus, most of the literature in librarianship have concentrated on library patrons; how library material assets could be tailored towards meeting the needs of library clients as well as the most ideal method through which librarians can make these materials accessible to them. What is oftentimes overlooked is that librarians are not machines. Hence, librarians' job satisfaction is equally crucial like any other professionals (David & Damilola, 2017). Therefore, librarians, like any other university staff, should be provided with quality job satisfaction that would enhance their efficiency in the university library. According to Yaya, Opeke, and Onuoha (2016), job satisfaction enhances the efficiency of workers in any organization especially in the academic libraries as a job satisfied worker is a
happy and productive worker. It is however presumed that self-efficacy may help an individual to enhance job satisfaction.

Self-efficacy has been described in various ways. However, according to Mensah and Lebbaeus (2013), it is “the belief about ones capability to perform in a certain manner to attain certain goals; a person’s belief about his/her capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives” (p.195). Similarly, self-efficacy has been viewed by the researchers as knowledge systems which demonstrate the level to which individuals deal with the occasions that impact their lives. The higher a man's self-efficacy, the better the certainty and capacity to prevail in a given undertaking. Therefore, individuals with low self-efficacy will probably surrender or lose trust in burdensome conditions while, individuals with high self-efficacy regularly push further to overcome the test. It is then suffice to say that, the self-efficacy competence of any librarians lies in his/her practical ability to demonstrate commitment to a job processes which largely depends on the mastery experience of the job; being aware of and understanding technological innovation, in the profession (Adio & Popoola, 2010). Bandura (1993) asserts that the sources of self-efficacy are mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion and physiological/emotional response.

**Statement of the problem**

In every organization, the issue of job satisfaction is very important. This is because for an organization to achieve its stated goals, it should have satisfied and happy employees. On the other hand, lack of job satisfaction could cause low job productivity and complaints. It has however been observed that job satisfaction of librarians is on the decline, because there appears to be total neglect of librarians in the aspect of job security, recognition for a job well done, career development opportunities, conducive work environment, promotion and improved salary package (David & Damilola, 2017). The above-mentioned issues affect the job satisfaction of librarians adversely. Could it then be that the librarians’ inability to demonstrate self-efficacy like their other counterparts in the organization is responsible for their declined state of job satisfaction? The need to proffer solutions to this problem has informed the carrying out of this research to find out how self-efficacy correlate with job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria.

**Objective of the Study**
The main objective of this study is to investigate how self-efficacy could affect the job satisfaction of librarians in public universities in South-West, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to:

1. determine the level of job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria;
2. examine the level of self-efficacy of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria;
3. ascertain the relationship that exist between self efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria; and
4. find out the challenges undermining the job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following research questions will guide the study:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?
2. What is the level of self-efficacy of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?
3. What challenges undermine librarians’ self-efficacy and job satisfaction in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?

Hypotheses

The following null hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance:

Ho 1: There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria

Scope of the Study

The study is limited to public (that is, federal and state) university libraries in South-West, Nigeria. Respondents were restricted to librarians in the federal and state university libraries that were spread across the South-West geopolitical region of Nigeria. Other supportive personnel of the libraries were excluded because the researchers believed that librarians are the major custodians of information resources housed by the university library. The researchers measured
the specific indicators of self-efficacy such as mastery experience, vicarious learning, physiological response and verbal persuasion against librarians’ levels of job satisfaction.

Table 1: Figures of University libraries and Librarians in South-West, Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Administered Questionnaire</th>
<th>Frequency Retrieved Questionnaire</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumm %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South West,</td>
<td>Ekiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Federal University, Oye-Ekiti</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Lagos, Lagos</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>National Open University of Nigeria, Lagos.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ogun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Federal Univ of Agriculture, Abeokuta.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Olabisi Onabanjo University Ago-Iwoye</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijebu-Ode</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ondo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Federal University of Technology, Akure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adekunle Ajasin University, Akunba.</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ondo State University of Sci. &amp; Tech. Okitipupa</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Medical Sciences, Ondo</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osun</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Osun State University, Osogbo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of Ibadan, Ibadan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>First Technical University, Ibadan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ladoke Akintola Univ. of Tech., Ogbomoso</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University Administration’s Office of each Federal and State University listed above, (2018)

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Discourse

1  Self-Efficacy
The construct of self-efficacy is one major focus of Bandura's Social Cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977, 1997, 2000, 2001). The possibility of self-efficacy feelings was brought into the field of psychology by the paper published by Bandura in cognitive review journal. The psychological importance of self-efficacy incorporates the desire by a man to gaining ground in a task or a spectacular result through individual activities. Self-efficacy is the inside thought of Bandura's social-cognitive theory and it suggests one's limits in dealing with an issue and playing out an appropriate action (Tojjari, Esmaeili, & Bavandpour, 2013). In librarianship, a higher degree of professional self-efficacy with respect to information retrieval skills has been associated with a higher probability to collaborate with management and be involved in planning, evaluating and conducting educational activities. Adeeko et al (2017) posited that the level of self-efficacy of library personnel in southwest Nigeria is high. Furthermore in their study, the authors affirmed that library personnel have high coping capabilities based on high self-perception of themselves on the job regardless of the heavy workload in Nigerian university libraries. In addition, Popoola, Tella, and Ayeni (2007) submitted that librarians in research and academic libraries in Oyo State of Nigeria perceived that inspiration impacts their level of self-efficacy. Jungert, Koestner, Houlfort, and Schattke (2013) recommended that it is vital to look at how self-efficacy can assist workers with being more satisfied and prevailing at work. As an individual believes in his/her capabilities to handle own affairs, he/she builds up self-efficacy after the process of achieving difficult tasks (Turkoglu, Cansoy & Parlar, 2017).

Similarly, Naderi, Heidrai, and Mashal (2009) examined the conceivable connection amongst flexibility and positive/negative affections from one viewpoint and self-efficacy and job satisfaction from another viewpoint. The authors discovered from their investigation that self-efficacy and job satisfaction can be anticipated by flexibility and negative love. Subsequently, their outcomes demonstrated that while employee pay may be viewed as determinant of job satisfaction, it does not demonstrate same significance as other job satisfaction factors. According to Adio and Popoola (2010), organizational behaviour of workers will go a long way in determining their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The authors attested to the fact that there is a vital association between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Their study further showed that mean scores of self-efficacy of librarians in eleven government school libraries were high when compared with the general mean score of self-efficacy. This, as demonstrated by the authors,
may be as a result of the limit of librarians to overcome difficult conditions rather than accepting failure.

1 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction plays a crucial impact on employees’ effectiveness in any organization (Perera, Khatibi, Navaratna & Chinna, 2014). This may be the reason why job satisfaction still stands to be a major field of study for researchers since its inception in 1900s (Noor, Khanl, & Naseem, 2015). Moreover, employees’ job satisfaction in the view of Singh and Jain (2013, p.105) is described as a “collection of positive and/or negative feelings that an individual holds towards his or her job”. Likewise, Adeeko, Aboyade and Oyewole (2017) posited that it is necessary to provide an improved working environment in the Nigerian university libraries so as to enhance high performance on the job for librarians at all levels. A librarian is relied upon to possess sufficient knowledge and techniques of dealing with the library patrons that consult his/her collections for a piece of information needed or the other (Ogungbeni, Ogungbo, & Yaya 2013). Librarians’ job satisfaction has impact on their career progression, work motivation and leadership styles (Fanimehin & Popoola, 2013). Burd (2003) noted that librarians working in organizations that embrace open communication, participatory management, achievement opportunities and trust based relationships seem more satisfied and committed and less likely to resign.

A few organisations utilize anonymous job satisfaction overviews which are regulated occasionally to gauge the levels of employees’ satisfaction (Fu & Deshpande, 2014). In some other organisations, meetings are held amongst administration and small cells of employees where the workers are asked questions relating to their job satisfaction (Ybema, Smulders & Bongers, 2010). However, in some other organizations, post employment interviews are the essential employees’ satisfaction measurement apparatuses (Schulz, 2001). Thornton (2000) reiterated in her publication that: job satisfaction is critical to the retention and recruitment of librarians. It is quite difficult to say precisely when the concept of job satisfaction in libraries began to surface in the literature; however after an analysis, it is found that while the literature is considerable in its range and quantity, it is not global nor of immediate concern to library scholars. However, it is presently assumed that the number of work done on librarian job
satisfaction might have increased to over 15,500 articles or dissertations, considering the high level of interest researchers have in the subject (Yaya et al., 2016).

Somvir and Sudha (2012) in their investigation uncovered that job satisfaction among library experts is not related with their sex, the kind of library in which they worked, or their professional needs. However, it is identified with the qualities of their job environment. Meanwhile, the discoveries of the investigations conducted by some researchers: Hossain (2014); Khan and Parveen (2014) affirmed that job satisfaction has the relative consequences for the general job performance of workers in the light of current organisational realities. It can be found from these discoveries that a few factors could influence job satisfaction of librarians while a few factors would prompt their lack of job satisfaction. Furthermore, a few authors in their different investigations call attention to the need for job satisfaction among librarians in any organisation particularly in the public funded university libraries. Oluchi and Ozioko (2014) investigated job satisfaction among librarians in academic libraries in Niger State, Nigeria. The outcomes demonstrated that there is excellent level of job satisfaction among the librarians. Sickness is not a factor for retrenchment, and the librarians do not resolve on lateness to work or neglect of obligations when they are not satisfied. Khan and Ahmed (2013) investigated the job satisfaction of library professionals serving in public university of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The outcome revealed that despite the fact that library experts working in these foundations were marginally happy with their temperament of work, they were dissatisfied with supervision, benefits, advancement. Correction of administration structure, promotion policies, change in academic qualification and advanced training were recommended by the analysts.

3 Self-efficacy and Job Satisfaction

Self-efficacy is viewed as one of the real determinants of job satisfaction. Tojjari, Esmaeili, and Bavandpour (2013) examined the impact of self-efficacy on job satisfaction of game officials. The exploration populace comprised 380 head football referees. The example comprised 191 arbitrarily chosen officials; Sherer's general self-efficacy scale was utilized for data gathering. The experts’ self-efficacy was additionally assessed in the light of this poll. Likewise, to gauge the job satisfaction, Weiss et al. (2002) job satisfaction scale was utilized; the outcomes demonstrated that the general self-efficacy of game referees significantly affects inherent and outward factors of job satisfaction, while this impact was not critical for general variables of job
satisfaction. The apparent self-efficacy of the officials demonstrated no significant impact on none of the inherent, outward or general components of job satisfaction. Likewise, Judge, Bono, Thoresen, and Patton (2001) in their own position on self-esteem, self-efficiency, locus of control and neuroticism to job satisfaction, asserted that core evaluation of self has had predictable impact on job satisfaction independent of the characteristics of the job itself.

According to Adio and Popoola (2010), organizational behavior of workers will go a long way in determining their self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The authors attested to the fact that there is a vital association between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Their study further showed that mean scores of self-efficacy of librarians in eleven government school libraries were high when compared with the general mean score of self-efficacy. Iis and Yunus (2016) investigated the impacts of self-efficacy, strengthening and organizational culture on job satisfaction and employees’ performance; and in addition tested the intervening impact of job satisfaction. The sample in this investigation was one hundred and twenty (120) workers. The analytical instrument utilized is path analysis by Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) technique using Analysis of Moment Structures AMOS. The results demonstrated that every factor strengthening, self-efficacy and organizational culture positively and significantly affect job satisfaction and employee performance.

In an investigation carried out by Torkoglu, Cansoy, and Parlar (2017) on the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction, the outcome showed a noteworthy positive connection between instructor self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Teachers’ self-efficacy was observed to be an important indicator of job satisfaction. The authors analyzed the connections between instructors' self-efficacy convictions and their job satisfaction. Members of the examination were 489 basic, center and secondary teachers in the region of Beyoglu, Istanbul. Two hundred and ninety five (61%) of the members were female and 194 (39%) were male. The outcomes revealed a huge positive connection between instructor self-efficacy and job satisfaction, and educator self-efficacy was observed to be a critical indicator of job satisfaction.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

The theories that were employed to underpin the discussion of variables in this study are Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene theory and Social Cognitive theory. Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene
theory was employed to discuss job satisfaction while the Social Cognitive theory was used to discuss self-efficacy of librarians in the public university libraries in South-West Nigeria.

**Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene Theory**

Herzberg’s theory of motivator-hygiene was employed to discuss job satisfaction. The theory was actually propounded by Frederick Herzberg in 1959. Herzberg while emphasizing the motivator-hygiene factors sought to explain satisfaction and motivation in the organization.

Frederick Herzberg, considered by many to be a pioneer in motivation theory, interviewed a group of employees to find out what made them satisfied and dissatisfied on the job. He asked the employees essentially two sets of question:

1. Think of a time when you felt especially good about your job. Why did you feel that way?
2. Think of a time when you felt especially bad about your job. Why did you feel that way?

From these interviews Herzberg proceeded to build up his theory that there are two dimensions to job satisfaction: “motivation” and “hygiene”. Hygiene issues, according to Herzberg, cannot motivate employees but can minimize their not being satisfied, if handled properly. In other words, they can only become not satisfied if they are absent or mishandled. Hygiene issues include company policies, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions. They are issues relating to the employee's environment. Motivators, on the other hand, create satisfaction by fulfilling individuals' needs for meaningful and personal growth. They are issues such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement. Once the hygiene areas are addressed, according to Herzberg, the motivators will promote job satisfaction and encourage productivity.

Herzberg explained that the factors that lead to satisfaction or to dissatisfaction are different. Accordingly, he states that “the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction but, rather, no satisfaction; and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction but no satisfaction” (Herzberg, 2003 p. 91). This theory states that job satisfaction and no satisfaction is a product of different factors; motivation and hygiene respectively. Motivation is seen as an intrinsic force that drives individuals to attain personal and organizational goals. To apply Herzberg’s theory to real-world practice, it begins with the hygiene issues. In spite the fact that hygiene issues are not
the source of satisfaction, it is important to deal with them first so as to create an environment in which employee satisfaction and motivation are even possible.

According to Herzberg, hygiene factors are;

**Working conditions:** The environment in which people work has a tremendous effect on their level of pride for themselves and for the work they are doing. Do everything you can to keep your equipment and facilities up to date. Even a nice chair can make a world of difference to an individual's psyche.

**Salary:** The old adage “you get what you pay for” tends to be true when it comes to staff members. Salary is not a motivator for employees, but they do want to be paid fairly. Consult salary surveys or even your local help-wanted ads to see whether the salaries and benefits you're offering are comparable to those of other offices in your area.

**Interpersonal relations:** Part of the satisfaction of being employed is the social contact it brings, so allow employees a reasonable amount of time for socialization (e.g., over lunch, during breaks, between patients). This will help them develop a sense of camaraderie and teamwork.

**Company and administrative policies:** An organization's policies can be a great source of frustration for employees if the policies are unclear or unnecessary or if not everyone is required to follow them. Dissatisfaction can decrease in this area by making sure your policies are fair and apply equally to all. Also, make printed copies of your policies-and-procedures manual easily accessible to all members of your staff.

While according to Herzberg, the motivation factors are:

**Achievement:** One premise inherent in Herzberg's theory is that some individuals sincerely want to do a good job. To help them, make sure you've placed them in positions that use their talents and are not set up for failure. Set clear, achievable goals and standards for each position. Be careful, however, not to overload individuals with challenges that are too difficult or impossible, as that can be paralyzing.

**Recognition:** Individuals at all levels of the organization want to be recognized for their achievements on the job. Their successes don't have to be monumental before they deserve
recognition, but your praise should be sincere. Publicly thank them for handling a situation particularly well. Write them a kind note of praise. Or give them a bonus, if appropriate.

**Work itself:** This involves helping employee believe that the task they are doing is important and meaningful. Setting goals and reminding and emphasizing that their efforts lead to and contribute to positive outcomes and goal accomplishment is crucial. Success stories and cases should be shared on how a Librarian’s actions made a real difference in the organization.

**Responsibility:** Responsibility is taken action for ones actions. Granting additional authority to employees in their activity, giving them enough job freedom and power so that they feel they ‘own’ the results are ways of giving librarians responsibility. As Librarians grow, they can be provided opportunities for added responsibility by adding challenging and meaningful work.

**Opportunity for advancement or promotion:** This involves electing employee from the present job or position to a higher one or level in the organization. If possible permit and support them to acquire higher certificates so that they could become experts themselves and make them more valuable to the practice and more fulfilled individuals.

**Advancement:** Reward loyalty and performance with advancement. If you do not have an open position to which to promote a valuable employee, consider giving him or her a new title that reflects the level of work he or she has achieved. When feasible, support employees by allowing them to pursue further education, which will make them more valuable to your practice and more fulfilled professionally.

**The relevance of the theory to the study**

Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene Theory is relevant to this study because the theory is flexible and can be applied by university administrators to know various needs that are applicable to workers especially librarians in the university library. This implies that when librarians’ needs are adequately and equitably addressed in terms of employee recognition, leadership style, career advancement opportunities, conducive work environment, employee promotion and remuneration by the university management; their morale will be boosted and their level of job satisfaction in the university library will be greatly increased. Also, it helps university administrators to recognize the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that could drive librarians’ job satisfaction towards attaining personal and organizational (library) goals. These factors are those aspects of the job that make librarians want to perform and provide them with job satisfaction.
Thus, the Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene theory has wide-reaching implications for librarians’ efficiency and job satisfaction.

Social Cognitive Theory
Self-efficacy theory was propounded by Bandura in 1982. It is described as Bandura’s personal construct of social cognitive theory. Social cognitive theory refers to an individual’s belief about his/her abilities to perform duties and responsibilities. Bandura’s theory explains how behavior and other cognitive factors influence and interrelate with each other in different ways. Albert Bandura fashioned one of the notable cognitive theory in the 80’s when he published his book titled “Self-efficacy: towards a Unifying theory of behavioral change”. The theory emphasized the belief of individual or group of peoples’ abilities to mobilize and motivate cognitive resources and courses of action necessary to meet an occasional need. This theory equally suggest that an individual’s believe pertaining to his/her self-efficacy determines to a large extent their self awareness.

Self-efficacy according to Bandura mediates between an individual’s knowledge and his actions (Bandura & Bandura, 2006). In essence an individual may possess the required knowledge and skills needed to execute a given task, but may still not achieve success due to self doubt, or lack of confidence among other contextual factors. Therefore, Bandura believes that in creating and changing self-efficacy believe system in individuals, certain steps should be taken, he then proposes that four kinds of experiences can affect an individual’s self-efficacy belief system through his/her performance, namely; mastery experience, vicarious experience, social encouragement and physiological responses.

Mastery experience implies that every achievement brings about confidence; likewise, every disappointment debilitates it. However, a high feeling of self-efficacy conviction based on past triumphs can encourage the individual to continue regardless of failed attempts. Watching others perform effectively can give people a feeling of trust in their capacity to perform similar undertakings. Vicarious experience is more efficient when people perceive a typical connection between their capacities and the capacities of others. The impact of vicarious experience upon self-efficacy observation is more grounded in a few circumstances than in others. A person's personal appraisal of task competence might be profoundly impacted in settings that normally include a solid measure of comparative assessment. Also, verbal persuasion is frequently used by
instructors basically out of simplicity and convenience (Bandura, 1977). Sensible self-certification and affirmation from others can support efficacy recognitions. In any case, verbal persuasion may not be as intense or compelling particularly when compliments are given freely and without substantiation. Lastly, Physiological response is particularly persuasive in a task that requires physical strength and stamina (Bandura, 1997). It is another approach to build self-efficacy of an individual and to moderate their negative emotional states. Physiological response impacts self-efficacy convictions in negative emotional responses, such as, uneasiness, stress, and fear which can bring down self-efficacy discernments (Pajares, 1996).

The relevance of the theory to the study

The social cognitive theory is relevant to this theory because it will serve as a predictor of the librarian’s ability towards attaining a level of proficiency. This will be juxtaposed with the four kinds of experience indentified by this theory namely, Mastery experience, Vicarious experience, Social persuasion and Physiological responses. Besides, the theory equally suggests that librarians’ believe pertaining to his self-efficacy determines to a large extent their self awareness. Thus, the social cognitive theory has wide-reaching implications for librarians’ efficiency and job satisfaction.

Conceptual Model for the Study

**Self-Efficacy (SE)**

i. Mastery experience
ii. Vicarious experience
iii. Verbal persuasion
iv. Physiological response

**Job Satisfaction (JS)**

**Hygiene**

i. Leadership styles
ii. Conducive work environment
iii. Remuneration

**Motivator**

i. Employee recognition
ii. Career advancement opportunity
iii. Employee promotion

**Figure 1:** Conceptual model of Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction

Source: Ikonne et al. (2019)

Discussion of the Conceptual Model
The conceptual model for this study is built on the theories and literature that were reviewed. The model is broadly divided into two parts: Self-efficacy and job Satisfaction of librarians in the university library. Self-efficacy has been regarded as an individual’s perceived ability to attain designated types of performance and achieve a specific result (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996). Self-efficacy factors consist of indicators like mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal/social persuasion and physiological response. Each of these experiences is expected of every librarian to possess in order to be more effective while discharging their duties in the library. Self-efficacy as a key variable in this study is one of the powerful motivational predictors of how a librarian will perform at almost any endeavor. A librarian’s self-efficacy could be a strong determinant of his/her efforts, doggedness and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is crucial to every worker in any organization; this is because it increases efficiency of workers in the organization. Indicators of job satisfaction include recognition, leadership styles, career advancement opportunity, conducive work environment employee promotion and remuneration. Consequently, if a librarian possesses adequate training in self-efficacy capabilities in the library there is the tendency that such librarian would be happy being in the profession and therefore his/her degree of satisfaction on the job is likely to increase tremendously. Several studies conducted in the area of job satisfaction attested to the fact that a satisfied worker is a happy one (Ahmed, 2014; Awoyemi & Odefadehan, 2017).

Research Design
The survey research design was adopted for the study. Survey as a research design describes the relationship between two or more variables; it also interprets the strong relationship that exists among the different variables (Cheng, 2016). In other words, it aims to determine the relationship between two or more variables and the strength of this relationship. Hence, survey research design was adopted for this study so as to find out the relationships between self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

Population
The population for this study comprised of all the 240 librarians in the 17 public universities (Federal & State) in South-West geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Total enumeration technique was used for this study. This means that the researchers surveyed all the librarians in all the public university libraries established in the South-West geopolitical zone of Nigeria. The states are
listed as follow: Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Osun and Oyo. The is to give a wider coverage of all the professional librarians working in all public (federal & state) universities sited in the geopolitical zone slated for the study.

**Sample Size and Sampling Technique**
Total enumeration technique was used for this study. The researchers were interested in utilizing the total population in the South-West because of its manageable size. This means that the researchers surveyed all the librarians in all the public university libraries established in the South-West geopolitical zone of Nigeria. The is to give a wider coverage of all the librarians working in all public (federal & state) universities in the geopolitical zone slated for the study.

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

**Section A:** Demographic information of the librarians such as age, sex, marital status, educational qualification, designation, department and working experience were inquired in this aspect.

**Section B:** Level of job satisfaction. This section contained six items: employee recognition, good leadership styles, career advancement opportunities, a conducive work environment, employee promotion opportunities, and remuneration. Respondents were required to choose from available options regarding their job satisfaction. Respondents were to assess librarians on a 4-point Likert-type scale of assessment viz: Very high level = 4; High level = 3; Low level = 2 and Zero level =1.

**Section C:** This section elicited information on the level of Self-efficacy of librarians. It was evaluated based on the following sub-headings: Mastery experience, Vicarious experience, Verbal/ social persuasion, and Physiological responses. Items were developed by the researchers on factors affecting Level of Self-efficacy (SE) of librarians under this section; respondents were
to tick as appropriate. Respondents were to assess librarians on a 4-point Likert-type scale of assessment viz: Very high level = 4; High level = 3; Low level = 2 and Zero level = 1.

**Section D:** this section has to do with challenging issues. It contained questions that mostly affect self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians in the university library. These include undemocratic leadership styles, lack of employee recognition, among others. Respondents assessed librarians on a 4-point Likert-type scale of assessment viz: Very great extent – 4; Great extent – 3; Moderate extent – 2; and No extent – 1.

**Validity and reliability of the Instrument**

The validity of the instrument was tested to ensure that it accurately measured the construct developed for the study. To ensure the validity of the instrument for this study therefore, the researchers with the assistance of the supervisors, some experienced university librarians and other experts in the areas of the variables under study scrutinized the questionnaire. Based on the experts' useful feedback, the research instrument was modified where necessary. A pilot study was conducted. The researchers carried out the pilot study at University of Ilorin, 42 questionnaires were distributed among the librarians. The University of Ilorin, Kwara State of the North-Central geopolitical zone of Nigeria was used for the pilot study. Reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.7 and above. Cronbach’s alpha of below 0.7 indicates a low level of internal consistency among the items in the research instrument. However, Cronbach’s alpha of 0.7 and above implies a high level of internal consistency among the items in the research instrument (Khanal & Raj Poudel, 2017).

The result of the reliability test is as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Procedure and Method of Data Collection**

The corrected copies of the questionnaire were administered to librarians in all the public university libraries slated for the study. The respondents were assured that information supplied by them would be treated with the utmost confidentiality and used solely for the purposes of
academic research. As such, information will not be divulged to a third party. The researchers with the help of two research assistants that were personally trained by the researchers administered the copies of the questionnaire to the librarians in the various university libraries. The researchers also engaged the use of electronic administration of the instrument to some 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 analyzed for the study. On the whole, 240 copies of the questionnaire were administered to librarians in all the 17 public university libraries slated for the study; out of which, a total number of 189 copies were retrieved. This gives 78.8% return rate of the administered research instrument for the study.

**Method of Data Analysis**

The data from the research questionnaire was analyzed using the version 22 of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentages, mean and standard deviation, especially for research questions. The hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product Moment correlation (PPMC) analysis. The result was used to attest to the mutual relationships that existed between Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction variables in the study.

**Presentation of Demographic Information of Respondents**

The respondents for this research were library librarians. The socio-demographic characteristics examined in this study included gender, marital status, age, highest educational qualification, designation and length of service of respondents

**Table 3: Demographic characteristics of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Demographic Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41-50 | 74 | 39.2 | 73.5  
51-60 | 47 | 24.9 | 98.4  
61 and above | 3 | 1.6 | 100.0  
Total | 189 | 100.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Educational qualification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc/BA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLIS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLIS</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian II</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian I</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Librarian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Librarian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy University Librarian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 6 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researchers’ Field survey, 2019

From Table 3, it uncovers that 117 (61.9%) of the respondents were male. This implies there were somewhat a larger number of men in the librarianship profession than their ladies counterpart in South-West Nigeria. It additionally uncovered that larger parts of the respondents 169 (89.4%) were married. This implies that they would show maturity while carrying out their obligations to the library users in their different universities. It also uncovered that there were more librarians in the age bracket of 41-50 years 74 (39.2%), intently followed by those in the age bracket 31-40 years (50 (26.5%). This just implies a greater level of the respondents were generally youthful, active and dynamic.

Relating to the educational qualifications of the respondents, 120 (63.5%) were holders of Masters Degree in Library and Information Science (MLIS) while 40 (21.2%) were holders of Bachelor Degree in Library and Information Science. This implies that above 60% of the respondents were professionally qualified librarians. Only about 10% had PhD degrees. This
demonstrates that about (90%) of librarians working in Nigerian university libraries today do not possess a PhD degree. This is not encouraging, considering the role that information plays in our present day knowledge driven society. It may be one of the reasons librarians are not recognized as full academics like their other counterpart in the faculties.

Analysis of the Research Questions

Research Question one: What is the level of job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria?

Table 4: Level of Job Satisfaction of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VHL (%)</th>
<th>HL (%)</th>
<th>LL (%)</th>
<th>ZL (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Leadership styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the management style in my library</td>
<td>55 (29.1%)</td>
<td>74 (42.5%)</td>
<td>54 (25.9%)</td>
<td>6 (2.1%)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>My relationship with my supervisor is very satisfactory</td>
<td>58 (30.7%)</td>
<td>84 (44.4%)</td>
<td>44 (23.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1.6%)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>In my library the leadership gives recognition when job is properly done</td>
<td>55 (29.0%)</td>
<td>75 (39.3%)</td>
<td>57 (30.2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iv</td>
<td>The leaders have the interest of the subordinates at heart in my library</td>
<td>58 (30.0%)</td>
<td>72 (38.3%)</td>
<td>48 (25.1%)</td>
<td>11 (5.6%)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>In my library the leadership gives room for team work</td>
<td>62 (32.7%)</td>
<td>82 (43.6%)</td>
<td>40 (21.7%)</td>
<td>5 (2.6%)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Conducive work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My office is air-conditioned</td>
<td>75 (39.7%)</td>
<td>72 (38.8%)</td>
<td>26 (13.4%)</td>
<td>16 (8.1%)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>My working condition is satisfactory</td>
<td>63 (33.9%)</td>
<td>78 (41.8%)</td>
<td>38 (20.0%)</td>
<td>10 (5.3%)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the task varieties</td>
<td>59 (31.4%)</td>
<td>81 (42.4%)</td>
<td>46 (24.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.3%)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iv</td>
<td>My job duties/job schedules are very satisfactory</td>
<td>36 (19.6%)</td>
<td>104 (55.4%)</td>
<td>47 (24.3%)</td>
<td>2 (1.7%)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>I have the resources I need to work effectively</td>
<td>47 (24.2%)</td>
<td>79 (41.9%)</td>
<td>51 (27.8%)</td>
<td>12 (6.1%)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My salary is being paid as and when due</td>
<td>44 (23.3%)</td>
<td>70 (37.5%)</td>
<td>62 (32.2%)</td>
<td>13 (6.9%)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>The allowances paid to me are the same with other faculty staff</td>
<td>55 (29.9%)</td>
<td>69 (36.3%)</td>
<td>31 (16.4%)</td>
<td>11 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>My fringe benefit are very satisfactory</td>
<td>17 (9.4%)</td>
<td>91 (48.9%)</td>
<td>65 (34.5%)</td>
<td>16 (8.2%)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>My salary is sufficient to meet all my essential needs</td>
<td>13 (6.2%)</td>
<td>54 (28.3%)</td>
<td>81 (42.3%)</td>
<td>41 (21.2%)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>My present designation in the library corresponds with my current salary.</td>
<td>29 (15.2%)</td>
<td>81 (42.0%)</td>
<td>53 (28.1%)</td>
<td>26 (13.7%)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Motivator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>My job status/recognition at work is satisfactory</td>
<td>40 (21.0%)</td>
<td>74 (39.9%)</td>
<td>51 (27.6%)</td>
<td>24 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>My superiors acknowledge my creative suggestions that improve performance</td>
<td>45 (23.3%)</td>
<td>88 (46.3%)</td>
<td>42 (22.5%)</td>
<td>14 (7.9%)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>The senior management values my initiatives at work</td>
<td>35 (18.9%)</td>
<td>104 (55.2%)</td>
<td>37 (19.3%)</td>
<td>13 (6.6%)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv. I am very respected at work
   - VHL: 37 (19.5%)
   - HL: 121 (64.9%)
   - ML: 26 (13.8%)
   - LL: 5 (2.8%)
   - Mean: 3.01, SD: 0.66

v. My manager values my feedback
   - VHL: 32 (16.2%)
   - HL: 126 (66.7%)
   - ML: 25 (13.4%)
   - LL: 5 (2.8%)
   - Mean: 2.97, SD: 0.66

e. Career advancement opportunities
   i. I am permitted to attend conferences/workshops
      - VHL: 59 (31.1%)
      - HL: 76 (40.7%)
      - ML: 47 (24.7%)
      - LL: 7 (3.5%)
      - Mean: 2.75, SD: 0.84

   ii. I am supported by the library to attend local conferences/workshops
       - VHL: 43 (22.6%)
       - HL: 78 (41.2%)
       - ML: 45 (23.1%)
       - LL: 23 (12.1%)
       - Mean: 2.75, SD: 0.95

   iii. I am supported by the library to attend international conferences/workshops
        - VHL: 43 (22.7%)
        - HL: 49 (25.7%)
        - ML: 50 (26.9%)
        - LL: 47 (24.7)
        - Mean: 2.47, SD: 1.09

   iv. My supervisor designs with me my career advancement
       - VHL: 36 (19.5%)
       - HL: 66 (34.6%)
       - ML: 56 (29.2%)
       - LL: 23 (12.1%)
       - Mean: 2.75, SD: 0.95

   v. There are opportunities for professional advancement in my library
       - VHL: 55 (29.9%)
       - HL: 84 (44.7%)
       - ML: 40 (21.7%)
       - LL: 10 (5.7%)
       - Mean: 2.97, SD: 0.85

f. Employees’ promotion opportunities
   i. My promotion is regular
      - VHL: 63 (33.5%)
      - HL: 58 (30.9%)
      - ML: 54 (28.9%)
      - LL: 14 (7.6%)
      - Mean: 2.90, SD: 0.95

   ii. My boss recommends me for advancement frequently
       - VHL: 54 (28.3%)
       - HL: 83 (43.7%)
       - ML: 36 (19.1%)
       - LL: 16 (8.9%)
       - Mean: 2.93, SD: 0.90

   iii. I receive promotion as at when due
        - VHL: 49 (25.7%)
        - HL: 80 (42.7%)
        - ML: 45 (23.2%)
        - LL: 15 (7.4%)
        - Mean: 2.86, SD: 0.89

   iv. I am satisfied with the opportunities for regular promotion
       - VHL: 34 (18.1%)
       - HL: 87 (45.2%)
       - ML: 53 (28.3%)
       - LL: 17 (8.4%)
       - Mean: 2.71, SD: 0.85

Overall mean = 2.84

Source: Researchers’ Field Survey, 2019

Key: VHL = Very High level, HL = High Level, LL = Low Level, OL = Zero level, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation; AM = Average Mean

***Decision Rule: if mean falls between 1 - 1.49 = Zero level; 1.5 - 2.49 = Low Level; 2.5 - 3.49 = High level; 3.5 - 4 = Very High level

From Table 4, it can be deduced that librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria considered their level of job satisfaction to be high making a decision by the overall mean score of 2.84 on the scale of 4. Another important implication that can be drawn from the table is that all the indicators both under Hygiene and motivator were considered high to the librarians’ job satisfaction, each of them had average mean scores of 2.99, 2.97, 2.62, 2.88, 2.75 and 2.84 respectively. Specifically, ‘My office is air-conditioned’ has the highest score and was considered ‘very high, with an average mean of 3.09, followed by ‘In my library the leadership gives room for team work’ (mean = 3.06) Whereas ‘My salary is sufficient to meet all my essential needs’ had the lowest score although was considered high with average mean of 2.21.

Research Question Two: What is the level of self-efficacy of librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria?

Table 5: Level of Self-efficacy of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>VHL</th>
<th>HL</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Mastery experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>If I cannot do a job the first time, I keep attempting until the point when I can</td>
<td>113 (59.3%)</td>
<td>58 (30.2%)</td>
<td>9 (4.9%)</td>
<td>9 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful</td>
<td>23 (13.0%)</td>
<td>32 (16.1%)</td>
<td>57 (30.5%)</td>
<td>77 (40.4%)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>When things look excessively troublesome for me, I abstain from attempting to do them</td>
<td>22 (11.0%)</td>
<td>33 (17.8%)</td>
<td>75 (39.6%)</td>
<td>59 (31.6%)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>I lose courage whenever I fail on an assigned job/duty</td>
<td>7 (3.8%)</td>
<td>33 (17.1%)</td>
<td>81 (42.6%)</td>
<td>68 (36.5%)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vicarious experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>I am better at doing my job when I work as a team member</td>
<td>63 (33.5%)</td>
<td>88 (46.4%)</td>
<td>27 (14.7%)</td>
<td>11 (5.4%)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I can solve a problem when I watch my colleagues/someone performing such task</td>
<td>60 (34.9%)</td>
<td>113 (55.7%)</td>
<td>11 (6.0%)</td>
<td>5 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>I find it difficult to attempt or carry out a particular task when I have watched someone having some difficulties in achieving a similar task</td>
<td>24 (12.2%)</td>
<td>23 (12.6%)</td>
<td>89 (47.2%)</td>
<td>53 (28.1%)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>I find it difficult to attempt a task when I have watched someone attempted such task unsuccessfully which I have never attempted doing it before myself.</td>
<td>11 (5.8%)</td>
<td>46 (24.3%)</td>
<td>66 (34.9%)</td>
<td>66 (34.9%)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbal/ social persuasion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to achieve what I want done.</td>
<td>64 (33.7%)</td>
<td>85 (45.7%)</td>
<td>31 (16.0%)</td>
<td>9 (3.6%)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I can perform a task effectively, even when I have been told that I am not capable of achieving it and have never attempted it before or watched anyone do it</td>
<td>83 (43.1%)</td>
<td>84 (44.9%)</td>
<td>11 (5.8%)</td>
<td>11 (5.8%)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>I can achieve a better result, when I am told I am capable and would have no difficulty in achieving such task.</td>
<td>119 (63.1%)</td>
<td>65 (34.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>I can perform my duty better whenever I am acknowledged for my effort</td>
<td>123 (65.3%)</td>
<td>51 (27.6%)</td>
<td>13 (6.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physiological response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping strength and abilities</td>
<td>97 (51.6%)</td>
<td>85 (45.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1.7%)</td>
<td>4 (2.4%)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>I am good at solving problems when I feel physically and emotionally normal</td>
<td>97 (51.0%)</td>
<td>84 (44.3%)</td>
<td>6 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Whenever I feel fatigued and stressed, I rarely complete a task</td>
<td>57 (30.8%)</td>
<td>79 (41.6%)</td>
<td>46 (24.3%)</td>
<td>7 (3.3%)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>If I am trouble, I can rarely think of a solution</td>
<td>47 (24.1%)</td>
<td>65 (34.1%)</td>
<td>52 (27.3%)</td>
<td>25 (13.4%)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall mean= 2.87**

**Key:** VHL = Very High Level, HL = High Level, ML = Medium Level, LL = Low Level, SD = Standard Deviation; AM = Average Mean

***Decision Rule: if mean falls between 1 - 1.49 = Zero level; 1.5 - 2.49 = Low Level; 2.5 - 3.49 = High level; 3.5 - 4 = Very High level***

Table 5 shows that librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria considered their level of self-efficacy to be high. The overall mean score is 2.87 on the scale of 4. They considered their level of verbal/ social persuasion to be very high with 3.37 average mean. However, their mastery experience scored was considered low (average mean = 2.37). They considered their physiological response (average mean = 3.15) which is also high. Furthermore,
there level of vicarious experience is seen to be high (average mean = 2.60). Specifically, under mastery experience ‘If I cannot do a job the first time, I keep attempting until the point when I can’ is also high (mean = 3.46) while ‘I lose courage whenever I fail on an assigned job/duty’ is low (mean =1.89). Meanwhile, under vicarious experience, ‘I am better at doing my job when I work as a team member’ is seen to be high (mean =3.07) while ‘I find it difficult to attempt a task when I have watched someone attempted such task unsuccessfully which I have never attempted doing it before myself’ is considered low (mean =2.01). also, under the indicator ‘verbal/ social persuasion’, ‘I can achieve a better result, when I am told I am capable and would have no difficulty in achieving such task’ is seen to be high (mean = 3.59) while ‘If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to achieve what I want done’ is though the least but also high (mean = 3.08) Lastly, under physiological response, ‘I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping strength and abilities’ is high (mean =3.46) while ‘If I am troubled, I can rarely think of a solution’ is the least but is equally seen to be high (mean =2.71).

Research Question 3: What challenges undermine librarians’ self-efficacy and job satisfaction in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?

<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>Undemocratic leadership styles in my library</td>
<td>49 (25.2%)</td>
<td>58 (30.5%)</td>
<td>50 (26.6%)</td>
<td>32 (18.7%)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Lack of workers’ recognition</td>
<td>45 (23.7%)</td>
<td>62 (32.3%)</td>
<td>63 (33.0%)</td>
<td>19 (10.9%)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Marginalization of librarians by the university authority.</td>
<td>42 (22.2%)</td>
<td>67 (35.1%)</td>
<td>47 (24.9%)</td>
<td>33 (17.8%)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff in the university</td>
<td>55 (29.9%)</td>
<td>60 (31.7%)</td>
<td>49 (25.6%)</td>
<td>25 (13.8%)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Inadequate provision for my basic needs by the administration</td>
<td>38 (20.5%)</td>
<td>71 (37.2%)</td>
<td>50 (26.4%)</td>
<td>30 (15.9%)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Lack of effective job design that would enable library services to be effectively carried out</td>
<td>48 (25.2%)</td>
<td>67 (35.1%)</td>
<td>51 (27.5%)</td>
<td>23 (12.8%)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Lack of conducive work environment in my university</td>
<td>55 (21.1%)</td>
<td>54 (28.3%)</td>
<td>42 (29.2%)</td>
<td>38 (21.4%)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 reveals that librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria considered those issues affecting their job satisfaction on a high extent judging by the average mean score of 2.63 on the scale of 4. The challenging issues facing Nigerian university librarians in their order of ranks were ‘Non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff in the university’ (mean = 2.77 high extent), ‘Lack of effective job design that would enable library services to be effectively carried out’ (mean = 2.74 high extent), Lack of effective job design that would enable library services to be effectively carried out’ (mean = 2.57 high extent), followed by ‘Undemocratic leadership styles in my library’ (mean = 2.66 high extent), the least on the rank is ‘Irregular promotion opportunities’ (mean = 2.41 low extent).

**Test of Hypotheses and Interpretation**

The only hypothesis for this study was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis which was used to assess the differences or relationship that exist between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The result generated was used to attest to the mutual relationship that existed among the variables (self-efficacy and Job satisfaction) in this study.

**Decision rule**

The level of pre-test of significance for this study is 0.05. It is presumed that there is no significant relationship between the variables under consideration if the p-value is seen to be less than or equal to 0.05 i.e. (p≤0.05) then the hypothesis is rejected

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria.
Hypothesis one was to determine the relationship that exists between self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria. The result is shown in table 7;

**Table 7: Showing partial correlation between Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction of librarians in Public University in South-West, Nigeria.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r.-value</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.484**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researchers’ Field survey, 2019

The mean of job satisfaction of library personnel in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria was 2.84, SD = 0.53, while that of Self-efficacy was 2.87, SD = 0.40. The correlation of coefficient obtained was 0.484 with p-value < 0.05. The result showed positive correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians. There was a positive significant relationship between the variables as indicated in the above table as \(r = 0.484, \ N = 189, \ P < 0.05\). Hence, null hypothesis one is rejected. This indicates that there is significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction of library personnel in public university libraries in South-West, Nigeria.

**Discussion of Findings**

The discussion follows the research questions; it is on this basis that sources of relationships between self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians were established through past empirical studies. Each of the three research questions and the single hypotheses were based on determining the relationship they had on the job satisfaction of librarians in public universities in South-West Nigeria. The findings of the study are discussed as follows:

Research question one sought to find out the level of job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria, the result showed that librarians considered the leadership styles that were practiced as well as good and conducive work environment in their library as their greatest measures of job satisfaction in the university system. The results were supported by the submissions of Fanimehin & Popoola (2013) and Burd (2003) who noted that
librarians working in organizations that embraced open communication, participatory management, achievement opportunities and trust based relationships seem more satisfied and committed and less likely to resign. Likewise, the position of Singh and Jain (2013) buttress this finding as they discovered that on the job satisfaction level is further enhanced by leadership style.

Research question two sought to find out the level of self-efficacy of librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria. Findings from research question two showed that Verbal/social persuasion and physiological response of librarians contributed immensely to their self-efficacy level. The findings implied that librarians were more inclined in the areas of self efficacy. It equally shows that librarians posses the ability to accomplish that which they intended to achieve. These were not consistent with the research conducted by Ash-Argyle and Shoham (2014) who found out from their research on self-efficacy and role perception of school librarians that school librarians provided a low degree of self-efficacy in professional and technological skills.

Research question three sought to find out the challenges faced by librarians with regards to their job satisfaction in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria. Findings from research question three showed that librarians were faced with some challenges that really affected their level of job satisfaction in the university libraries. Noticeably, it was discovered that Undemocratic leadership styles in the library, followed by Lack of workers’ recognition by the university authority greatly affected job satisfaction of librarians in the university. It is pertinent to reemphasis here that job satisfaction of employees plays a very important role in determining the 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 & Sudha, 2012, p.1). Therefore, job satisfaction of workers in any organization especially a university library, is the major reason for its growth and development. Thus, librarians like other staff members in the university, should be provided with those needful that will bring about satisfaction for them on the job.

The study revealed that librarians were not properly recognized as full academic staff of the university by the management and they were being treated as second class academics in the
university system. This type of segregation in management style should be discontinued; hence, there would be high rate of staff turnover in the public university library. Also, the issue of unequal payment of allowances payable to other academic staff in the university was seen as a problem affecting job satisfaction of librarians in most public university libraries. This is quite unfortunate, a situation in which some allowances were not paid to the librarians but were paid to lecturers because they were regarded by the university management as “core academic staff” while librarians were referred to as defacto academics. This usually leads to low morale of librarians in such universities. The result of inadequate recognition of librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigerian was contradicted by the findings of Russell (2008) who pointed out in their discoveries that employee recognition is a motivational factor that could be put to use at the managerial level to encourage the workers for better job performance. They further submitted that recognition can be regarded as a positive feedback that shows workers how they are valued by their management and co-workers.

Furthermore, as revealed from the findings of the hypothesis tested in Table 6, the null hypothesis one was rejected. This indicates that there was a significance relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians in the public university libraries in South-West Nigeria. The result agreed with the previous studies carried out by some researchers such as: Adeeko et al (2017); Popoola, Tella, and Ayeni (2007); Judge, Bono, Thoresen, & Patton (2001); who asserted that core evaluation of self-esteem, self-efficiency, locus of control and neuroticism had predictable impact on job satisfaction independent of the characteristics of the job itself. They also submitted that the level of self-efficacy of library personnel in southwest Nigeria is high. Furthermore, in their study, the authors affirmed that library personnel have high coping capabilities based on high self-perception of themselves on the job regardless of the heavy workload in Nigerian university libraries. In addition, they affirmed that self-efficacy of librarians in research and academic libraries in Nigeria have inspirational impacts on their job satisfaction.

Furthermore, as was revealed in the findings of this study, librarians could not achieve job satisfaction at its peak in the university system due to a number of challenging issues that negatively affected them. Therefore, it is very necessary for the library and the university management to attend to those unpleasant situations pointed out by the study such as
undemocratic leadership styles in the library, lack of workers’ recognition, non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff in the university, lack of conducive work environment in the university that would enable library services to be effectively carried out before they wreck more havoc against librarians in relation to their job satisfaction.

**Summary of findings**

The main objective of this study was to investigate how self-efficacy correlate with job satisfaction of librarians in public university in South-West, Nigeria.

The major findings of the study were as follows:

1. Librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria saw their level of job satisfaction as high. They ascribed this to good leadership styles in operation in their library as well as recognition given to them by the authorities as the greatest measures of their job satisfaction in the university system.

2. Librarians’ level of self-efficacy was similarly high. They ascribed this to higher degree of verbal/social persuasion coupled with their physiological response ability. These supported their level of self-efficacy in the university library.

3. Challenging issues confronting library personnel’s job satisfaction was high. This was attributed to factors such as non-payment of similar allowances payable to other academic staff, lack of adequate recognition, marginalization of library personnel by the university authorities, Irregular promotion opportunities and irregular payment of salary and wages among others.

**Conclusion**

Job satisfaction is crucial in any organization particularly in the public university libraries. However, to achieve quality job satisfaction of librarians, a lot of commitment is expected particularly on the part of university management. Past studies have shown association between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. However, the current study had succeeded in annulling the improper use of the earlier submission of low level job satisfaction of librarians judging from its findings. The study established that self-efficacy was positively related to job satisfaction of librarians in the South-West public university libraries in Nigeria. Moreover, this study affirmed the statement that job satisfaction enhances efficiency of workers in any organization particularly
in the public university libraries as a job satisfied employee is a happy and productive worker. In this manner, the welfare and personal issues of librarians ought to be considered important in the public-funded university libraries. They should be adequately and genuinely inspired in order to enable them perform their obligations effectively. It is important for the university authorities to look for and set up those spurring factors that would improve job satisfaction of librarians in the university community. Hence, the discoveries and recommendations that exuded from this study would be important to our needs in South-West Nigeria.

**Recommendations**

In view of the findings that were uncovered in this study, the accompanying recommendations are therefore proffered as the way forward:

1. Contrasting the lower dimension of career advancement opportunities with employee recognition under job satisfaction factors, suggests that librarians may need satisfactory sponsorship to attend international conferences. It is therefore recommended that the University Management should set aside meaningful allocation in her yearly budget plan mostly to support librarians to attend both local and international conferences. This will enhance the job satisfaction of the librarians.

2. Because it was discovered that librarians may lack some physiological needs. This was ascribed to absence of favorable workplace in most Nigerian public funded university libraries. The university management should provide the librarians with a befitting and conducive work environment that would encourage and facilitate their job satisfaction.

3. The study similarly uncovered that job satisfaction of librarians in South-West Nigerian public university libraries were being challenged by non-payment of similar allowances such as salaries and compensations payable to other staff. Therefore it recommended that the university authorities should ensure equal treatment is given to all staff and that no worker should be marginalized or given better consideration over another.

4. Lastly, librarians should be given adequate recognition as custodians and providers of information resources required in supporting the educational curricula of every academic programme in the university system.

**Contribution to Knowledge**
1. The study would empower the university authorities to successfully meet the fundamental needs of her workforce particularly librarians and in this manner help in retaining the experienced ones in the university libraries.

2. This study also serves as an eye opener to librarians heading university libraries to recommend to the management of their universities the need to embrace self-efficacy practices to step up the qualities of librarians in their universities.

3. A conceptual model of self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians developed by the researchers could serve as a reference for scholars carrying out researches on related topics.

4. Finally this study has added to the existing body of knowledge on library and information science. It affirmed the dearth of literature in the connections between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Along these lines, this study has created a stage through which the existed gap has been filled and a bedrock through which future research could be based.

**Limitation of the Study**

One of the major constraints of this investigation was the National industrial action embarked upon by Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) in the country at the time of data gathering of the study. It was extremely difficult to retrieve the administered research instrument from numerous academic librarians as the vast majority of them declined to accept it with a reason that they were on strike. Some others after reluctantly collecting it came up with excuse that the instrument is excessively voluminous; some even declined to take an interest in the study. Most of these circumstances were surmounted by the researchers and those that worked with them as they needed to persuade and tirelessly pleaded with the respondents through consistent phone calls and regular messages sent to remind them. Be that as it may, these limitations were not insurmountable, as the researchers still worked around them to achievement success.

**Suggestions for Further Studies**

The present study concentrated on the self-efficacy and job satisfaction of librarians in public university libraries in South-West Nigeria. The study surveyed all the public universities in the South-West geopolitical zones in Nigeria. Consequently, the following areas of study are recommended for further research:
1. An investigation into how librarians in the Public Universities in the other geopolitical zones of Nigeria perceiving the factors identified in this study in relationship to their job satisfaction

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

3. A comparative study between the Public and Private University in South-West Nigeria in relationship to the factors identified in this study on job satisfaction

4. It is imperative to further investigate into the various ways of achieving employees’ job satisfaction, so that the strategies that motivate workers most could be determined by various employers of labor and applied.
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