

6-17-2016

Impact of Electronic Surveillance Systems on Theft and Mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi

Victor Ozowa
ozowavictor@gmail.com

Jane Aba
aba.jane@uam.edu.ng

Titi Aba
titi.anthonia27@gmail.com

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



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Ozowa, Victor; Aba, Jane; and Aba, Titi, "Impact of Electronic Surveillance Systems on Theft and Mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi" (2016). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1429.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1429>

**Impact of Electronic Surveillance Systems on Theft and Mutilation in Francis Suleimanu
Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi**

BY

Aba, Jane (Ph.D CLN)

Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Nigeria

aba.Jane@uam.edu.ng

&

Abah, Titi

Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Nigeria

titi.anthonia27@gmail.com

&

Ozowa, Victor

Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Nigeria

ozowavictor@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study focused on impact of electronic surveillance systems on book theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture, Makurdi. In this study, electronic surveillance is the use of modern technological security devices to detect book theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Descriptive survey design was used as design of the study. The population of the study was 300 library users drawn from the nine (9) colleges in University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Sample size for this study was made up of entire population. Research instruments was Questionnaire and interviewed guide developed by researchers titled "Questionnaire on the Impact of Electronic Surveillance Systems on Book Theft and Mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library (QIESBTMFSIL). A response rate of 300 (100%) was recorded. Data collected were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages (%), mean (\bar{X}) and standard deviation (SD). The findings revealed that (34.0%) use the library. It also showed that male (87.05%) undergraduate use the library more than female undergraduate once in two weeks (26.3%). The Grand mean of (\bar{X} = 2.69) revealed that insufficiency of library materials, selfishness of some library users and absent mindedness of library staff were the major reasons for theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library. While the Grand mean of (\bar{X} = 23.26) revealed numbers and duration of loans, high cost of photocopying, insufficient number of recommended textbooks and inadequacy of library materials to users as the major factors that cause theft and mutilation in the Library. The Grand mean of (\bar{X} = 13.20) showed that the suggested surveillance systems were appropriate. The Grand mean of (\bar{X} = 10.42) revealed inadequate funding of library; poor power supply and high cost of installing electronic surveillance affect the effectiveness of electronic surveillance in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library. The strategies for addressing constraints facing theft and mutilation (\bar{X} = 15.72) were appropriate. It was recommended among others that there should be policy on theft and vandalism, detective barcode machines should be provided; installation and maintenance of electronic surveillance system, provision of adequate resources and photocopying services to check book theft and mutilation.

Keyword: Electronic Surveillance, Theft and Mutilation, University Library

INTRODUCTION

Libraries do not only provide information services but also catered for users informational needs such as the provision of physical and bibliographic access to information sources. University libraries are often plagued with collection security which includes theft and mutilation. This affects the realization of its primary goal of providing resources for teaching, learning and research. According to Ogunyade (2005) Book theft is an intentional removal of books from the library in an unauthorized manner. Theft and mutilation in university libraries have become a major concern to researchers, information professionals; institutions and the society. Thus, it has been suggested in many fora that electronic security systems can help control these practices in university libraries since the traditional way of manually checking patrons are found to be ineffective and unfriendly. This will ensure a better, safer and effective way of dealing with security of library materials from theft and mutilation (McKean, 1985; McComb, 2004 and Rajendran&Rathinasabapathy, 2007).

Historical Background

The Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi is a specialized university established by the Federal Government of Nigeria in 1988. The vision and mission is aimed at achieving its mandate of promoting human resource development in Agriculture, Science, Engineering and Technology through teaching, research and extension services. University of Agriculture, Makurdi is a major player in the process of national and global human resource capacity building. The university main campus occupies approximately nine hundred (900) hectares of land located at North Bank Makurdi, Benue State. The student population of 14,428 and total staff strength of 2,498. The university has ten colleges and a postgraduate (PG) school. The library is housed in its ultra-modern building located around the ring road in the North Core area. The University library has a centralized organizational structure. The library which was planned to be built in three phases had only the first phase constructed and completed and is now fully occupied and utilized. As the heart beat of the university, the library serves as the educational life-wire of every user. In March, 2005, library services was brought to the doorstep of its users through establishment of eight (8) college libraries namely Science, Food Science and Technology, Engineering, Forestry, Management Science and Veterinary Teaching Hospital, Animals Science, Agronomy. Colleges of Agriculture Economics and Extension, Agronomy and Agriculture and Science Education are about having college libraries. Presently, the university library has about 40,826 volumes of books and 10,542 journals titles.

Statement of the problem

Thefts in library especially University libraries have become increasingly alarming as it continues to grow daily. Library collection security has been a major concern of libraries especially university libraries. To meet the expectation of the user community, there is need to completely eliminate stock losses. This will enable libraries in Nigeria to meet the demands of their users (Thanuskodi, 2009). Theft and mutilation of library materials is a serious problem which affects students' educational development and jeopardize the efficiency of library services to users. Hence, the security management for prevention of incessant thefts and mutilation of information resources in university libraries in Nigeria is posing a great threat. The existing security in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library cannot cope with incessant pressure from users who either steal or mutilate materials. This had led to loss of valuable materials in the library. Studies have shown that theft and mutilation in university libraries can be remedy through the use of modern technologies (Ajegbomogun, 2004; Ogunleye, 2005; Ugah, 2007; Maidabino, 2010; Odaro, 2011 and Aba, Kwagha and Ahom (2015). Despite these researches, there is dearth

of literature on the use of modern technological security devices to remedy the increasing wave of theft and mutilation, duplicating ownership stamps; use of patrons' library card (impersonation). Therefore, the problem of this study is to investigate the impact of electronic surveillance systems on book theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library.

Objectives of the study

The objective of this study is to determine the impact of electronic surveillance systems on theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library.

Specifically the study seeks to:

1. determine the causes of theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library.
2. investigate the means of theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library.
3. determine the impact of electronic surveillance systems on theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library.
4. ascertain the constraints that affect the use of electronic surveillance systems on book theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library.
5. suggest possible measures to prevent theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library.

Research Questions

This study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. what are the causes of theft and mutilation of library materials in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library?
2. what are the means of theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library?
3. what are the impact of electronic surveillance systems on theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library?
4. what are the constraints that affect the use of electronic surveillance systems on theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba?
5. what are the possible ways of preventing theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Electronic security systems are modern technological devices that are used with the aid of electrical apparatus to secure library materials. Nancy (1976) wrote extensively on the use of electronics to combat book theft and the experiences involved in their installation in the United States. McComb (2004) stated that video surveillance and closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems serve as a way to monitor and record security, deter crime, and ensure safety. The author suggested that, CCTV can be used to identify visitors and employees, monitor work areas, deter theft, and ensure the security of the premises and other facilities. The system can also be used to monitor and record evidence on clientele and employee misconduct. Ogunyade (2005) reported that after installing electronic security system in University of Kentucky Library, book loss rates had decreased.

There are two basic elements of electronic surveillance. Primarily, the device or ‘trigger’ that is fitted into each book- hardback, paperback or journals; cassettes, records, discs etc. This trigger is very discreet and when concealed within books are virtually undetectable. Secondly, the free standing sensing installed at the exit such as the metal detective door of the library also serves as means for curbing theft and mutilation. Books left on the shelf or on the reading tables are sensitized and remain so until a book to be borrowed by a patron is desensitized at the issue desk by the library staff and the patron then exits from the library. Except the book is checked out, the trigger always ring an alarm that alert the security personnel at the gate. Both the human body, handbags and briefcases cannot prevent books sensor (Tinuade, 2007). Furthermore, McGinty (2008) and Trapskin (2008) stated that Closed Circuit Television (CCTV), Cameras; Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system, Surveillance Cameras; metal detectors, door intrusion alarms; delay devices, panic alarms and heat sensors are useful in detecting security pattern and ensuring effective security strategies in the protection of library materials.

Similarly, Ramana (2010) stated that Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) used in the libraries can enhance the ability to control book thefts and tearing off the pages from books and magazines. The use of electronic surveillance as an effective way to curbing book theft and mutilation cannot be overemphasized. It not only controls but minimizes and averts theft and unethical losses in the library. Odaro (2011) suggested that electronic security devices such as Electronic Surveillance Cameras (Closed Circuit Television-CCTV), 3M library security systems (electronic gates), Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system, Perimeter Alarm System, Movement Detectors could be useful to university libraries in curbing theft and mutilation.

Theft and mutilation of books can be traced to 539 BC in Egypt when the Persian conquerors removed rolls of papyrus from the Library of Ramses II around 41BC. During the middle Ages, library books were chain-locked to prevent theft. Akor (2013) indicated that among the security problems encountered by their libraries, theft ranked highest, followed by mutilation. The concept of mutilation entails defacement or damage of library materials/collections. Mutilation of library collections has been reported by many researchers (Aba, Beetseh and Ahom, 2014; Akor, 2013; Maidabino 2010; Bello 1998; Lorenzen 1996). Mutilation or vandalism occurs when users knowingly tear, mark, damage or destroy materials. Lorenzen (1996) observed that collection mutilation are numerous forms, ranging from underlining and highlighting text; tearing and or removing pages and tampering with the content.

Studies have revealed that most theft of library materials are also committed by staff and Holt (2007) referred to this as ‘insider theft in the library.’ Some library staff take materials from the library without properly circulating them (Bello, 1998). This kind of theft, according to Lorenzen (1996) is one of the hardest to prevent, since library employees know how to defeat security system. Theft and mutilation of library materials can also be committed due to selfishness, unavailability; insufficiency of books, poverty and denial from using book (Abareh, 2001). It was also revealed by Bosah (2009) that mutilated books lead to frustration of patrons. In studying theft and mutilation in the College of Medicine Library, University of Lagos, Ogunyade (2005) discovered that users of the library have devised various means of stealing from the library either by throwing books through windows or borrowing a book legally and using the date due slip to remove another book illegally while others stock their clothes with books out of the library. He also discovered that losses resulting from theft and mutilation during periodic or regular stock taking are enormous. Typically, libraries loose between 5% and 10% of their collections annually to theft and mutilation. Mansfield (2007) reported that most book theft and mutilation are perpetuated by young offenders, predominantly male undergraduates.

In studying security and crime prevention in academic libraries, Ogbonyomi (2011) observed that the nature and causes of crimes in libraries are in two perspectives: Crimes caused by human agents and crimes caused by natural agents or phenomenon. The crime caused by human agents relate to complete or partial loss of library materials and this loss can be either permanent or temporary, making the materials unusable by other patrons of the library. This includes theft, mutilation and non-return of borrowed materials. Natural agents or disaster in the library include fire, flood, rodents, insects that destroy materials. Reitz (2004) observed that mutilation takes place in various forms ranging from tearing book covers and pages, cutting out illustrations or passages of text, marking or writing on margins underlining and highlighting text, removing

protective covers, label and date due slip. Damages to library materials can also be caused through shelving of books or jamming too tightly on the stacks, bending books backward or pressing their backs for the purpose of photocopying. Thus, theft and mutilation is an unlawful removal of books or pages of books from the library (Ogunyade, 2005).

Salaam and Onifade (2009) studied the perception and attitude of students in relation to vandalism in Nimbe Adedipe library, University of Agriculture Abeokuta. It was discovered that restriction in the use of some materials; number and duration of loans; insufficient number of copies of recommended textbooks and unaffordable cost of personal textbooks, high cost of photocopying as well as peer-influence were among the factors that influenced book theft and vandalism in the library. Ogbodo (2011) studied security of information sources in libraries of government owned polytechnics in south east states of Nigeria. Questionnaire was used as instrument of data collection and 33 respondents were randomly selected from the population. The result revealed that inadequate funding of the library, lack of security policy; inadequate infrastructure, lack of trained staff; and power failure were constraints to security sources of information. It was recommended among others that libraries should embark on training of security personnel to maintain tight security, incentive in terms of remuneration and welfare package to reduce the possibility of been seduced by users; introduction of users education in the polytechnic curriculum to educate users on basic ethics of the library, effect of book theft and mutilation; provision of generating plant to supply power. This study is relevant because it addresses the causes and constraints of book theft and mutilation in the library.

Akor (2013) examines the security management for prevention of book thefts in Benue State University Library, Makurdi, Nigeria. To identify the causes of book thefts and mutilation in University libraries and how to curb and preserve the continuous use of this information resources in the library. Survey research method was employed. Questionnaire were the main instrument for data collection. The findings revealed that the university library books are stolen and mutilated due to inadequate library materials, financial constraint and selfishness on the part of library users. It was also discovered that various methods were adopted for stealing and mutilating of the library books which include: tearing of book page(s) off, removing of the book jacket cover, hiding of books under their clothes and their pockets. Recommendations were proffered to eradicate theft and mutilation in university libraries to include provision photocopying services and provision of adequate library materials to meet the information needs of their users.

Aba, Beetseh and Ahom, (2014) examined strategies for combating theft and vandalism in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library (FSIL), University of Agriculture Makurdi. Random

sampling technique was used to select sample size of 60 from the population. Research instruments used was the Questionnaire. The findings revealed that materials affected by theft and vandalism were reference, graphical (audio-visuals), rare and books containing disc/pictures. Theft and vandalism were high and was caused by user's selfishness/laziness and lack of vigilance on the part of security guards. The strategies for combating menace were provision of adequate and cheaper photocopying services, use of electronic detention system to protect library materials and increased public awareness/staff training. It was recommended among others: formulation and implementation of policy on theft and vandalism, provision of detective barcode machines; proper shelving and shelve reading, frequent patrolling of security guards in the library; proper orientation on access and location of library materials and stiff penalties for dishonest users.

Sequel to the above studies, the effect of theft and mutilation of materials on libraries, institutions and users cannot be underestimated. The security of surveillance system cannot be guaranteed as it may be stolen or faulty. The problem of theft and mutilation is costly and disruptive to the library and users. Although many scholars have identify theft and mutilation in the library, ways by which theft and mutilation is carried out; there is still a gap as it has been found that studies relating to the use of modern technological security devices to address this area are very scanty and no similar study has been carried out in the Francis Sueimanu Idachaba Library to the knowledge of these researchers. It is therefore necessary that library administration should put in place measures in combating theft and mutilation in the library.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted descriptive research design. The population of the study was 300 library users drawn from the nine (9) Colleges in University of Agriculture, Makurdi. Sample size for this study was made up of entire population. Research instruments was Questionnaire and interviewed guide developed by researchers titled "Questionnaire on the Impact of Electronic Surveillance Systems on Book Theft and Mutilation in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library (QIESSBTMFSIL)". A response rate of 300 (100%) was recorded. Data collected were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages (%), mean (\bar{X}) and standard deviation (SD).

Discussion of Findings

Table 1 captures the demographic information of respondents in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture, Makurdi.

Table 1: Percentages of Demographic Information of Respondents in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library University of Agriculture, Makurdi N= 300

S/N	Variable	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Age		
	15-25	99	34.0
	26-35	82	24.9
	36-45	78	20.1
	46-55	30	11.6
	55 and above	11	9.4
2	Gender		
	Male	209	87.0
	Female	91	13.0
3	Qualification		
	Postgraduate	42	10.4
	Undergraduate	213	52.9
	Non academic staff	21	5.2
	Academic staff	24	6.0
4	Use of Library		
	Once in a month	101	25.1
	Once in two week	106	26.3
	Once a week	33	8.2
	Every day	60	14.9

Results revealed that respondents age bracket were 15-25 years (34.0%), 26-35 years (24.9%); 36-45 years (20.1%), while 46-55 were (11.6%) and 55 years (9.4%). Results on gender revealed that male (87.05) and female (13.0%). Their qualification revealed that undergraduates (52.9%), postgraduates (10.4%), non academic (5.2%) and academic staff (6.0%). On use of library, once in two weeks (26.3%); once in a month (25.1%), every day (14.9%) and once a week (8.2%). These findings revealed that the highest percentage (34.0%) use the library more than any other age range. It also showed that male (87.05) undergraduate used the library. This contradicts Odaro (2011) findings that more female undergraduate used the library but confirms Mansfield

(2007) that most book theft and mutilation are perpetuated by young offenders, predominantly male undergraduates. More users patronize the library once in two weeks (26.3%).

Table 2 considered reasons for theft and mutilation in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents on Reasons for Theft and Mutilation in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi. N=300

S/N	Item	Mean	SD	Decision*
1	Insufficiency of library materials in the library	3.3867	.92376	A
2	Denial from using library materials	2.8867	.66480	A
3	Poverty on the part of users	2.9167	.84386	A
4	Short duration of loaning period	2.9400	.84782	A
5	Lack of appropriate security system in the library	2.7900	1.03415	A
6	Absent-mindedness on the part of library staff	3.3167	1.05202	A
7	Selfishness on the part of some library users	3.4467	.80580	A
	Grand Mean	2.69	6.17	A

SA- Strong Agreed, A-Agreed; D-Disagreed, SD-Strongly Disagreed

Results in table 2 revealed the reasons for theft and mutilation in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library: insufficiency of library materials ($\bar{X} = 3.39$), selfishness on the part of some library users ($\bar{X} = 3.45$), absent-mindedness on the part of library staff ($\bar{X} = 3.32$), poverty on the part of users ($\bar{X} = 2.94$), short duration of loaning period ($\bar{X} = 2.92$), denial from using library materials ($\bar{X} = 2.89$), lack of appropriate security system in the library ($\bar{X} = 2.79$). The Grand mean of ($\bar{X} = 2.69$) revealed that insufficiency of library materials, selfishness of some library users and absent mindedness of library staff were the major reasons for theft and mutilation in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library. This confirmed the findings of Salami and Onifade, 2009; Bosah, 2009 and Ogbodo, 2011 that non availability or insufficiency of library materials, poverty and denial from using library materials were some of the reasons for theft and mutilation in University Libraries.

Table 3 showed causes of theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents on Causes of Theft and Mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi. (N=300)

S/N	Item	Mean	SD	Decision*
1	High cost of photocopying	3.5733	.80423	A
2	Insufficient number of recommended textbooks	3.4233	1.03974	A
3	Unaffordable cost of personal textbook	3.1700	.76357	A
4	Number and duration of loans	3.5767	.70173	A
5	Inadequacy of library materials to users	3.2700	1.03957	A
6	Lack of photocopy facilities	3.1467	.94594	A
7	Lack of concern for the needs of other users	3.1033	.83365	A
	Grand Mean	23.26	6.13	A

SA- Strong Agreed, A-Agreed; D-Disagreed, SD-Strongly Disagreed

Table 3 revealed that causes of theft and mutilation are due to: number and duration of loans ($\bar{X} = 3.58$), high cost of photocopying ($\bar{X} = 3.57$); insufficient number of recommended textbooks ($\bar{X} = 3.42$), inadequacy of library materials to users ($\bar{X} = 3.27$); unaffordable cost of personal textbook ($\bar{X} = 3.17$), lack of photocopy facilities ($\bar{X} = 3.14$) and lack of concern for the needs of other users ($\bar{X} = 3.10$). Grand mean of ($\bar{X} = 23.26$) implied that numbers and duration of loans, high cost of photocopying, insufficient number of recommended textbooks and inadequacy of library materials to users were the major factors that cause theft and mutilation in the Library. This finding agrees with Reitz, 2004; Ogunyade, 2005; Salaam and Onifade, 2009; Ogbonyomi, 2011; Akor, 2013 and Aba, Beetseh and Ahom, (2014) that restriction in the use of some materials, number and duration of loans, insufficient number of copies of recommended textbooks, high cost of photocopying were the main factors that cause theft and mutilation in university libraries.

Table 4 considered types of surveillance suggested for Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi.

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents on Types of Surveillance Suggested for Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi. (N=300)

S/N	Item	Mean	SD	Decision*
1	Close Circuit Television	2.7759	1.70076	S
2	Electronic gates	2.5500	1.00542	S
3	Radio frequency identification	2.5300	.92662	S
4	Parameter alarm system	2.6067	.88765	S
5	Movement detector	2.7333	.83939	S
	Grand Mean	13.20	5.40	S

HS-Highly Suggested, S-Suggested; AS-Averagely Suggested, NS-Not Suggested

Table 4 showed suggested surveillance systems for Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library. Result revealed Electronic Gates ($\bar{X} = 3.34$), Close Circuit Television ($\bar{X} = 3.09$); Radio Frequency Identification ($\bar{X} = 3.05$), Movement Detector ($\bar{X} = 3.01$) and Parameter Alarm System ($\bar{X} = 2.97$). The Grand mean of ($\bar{X} = 13.20$) showed that the suggested surveillance systems were appropriate. These findings agreed with Ramana (2010) and Odaro (2011) that (Closed Circuit Television-CCTV), 3M library security systems (electronic gates), Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system, Perimeter Alarm System, Movement Detectors as some of the security devices that can be installed in university libraries to curb book theft and mutilation.

Table 5 displayed constraints of electronic surveillance system of book theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi.

Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents on Constraints of Electronic Surveillance System of Theft and Mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi. N=300

S/N	Item	Mean	SD	Decision*
1	High cost of electronic surveillance system	2.5500	1.00542	A
2	Lack of trained personnel to handle gadgets	2.5300	.92662	A
3	Poor power supply	2.6067	.88765	A
4	Inadequate funding of library	2.7333	.83939	A
	Grand Mean	10.42	3.70	A

SA- Strong Agreed, A-Agreed; D-Disagreed, SD-Strongly Disagreed

Results in table 5 revealed that inadequate funding of library ($\bar{X} = 2.73$), poor power supply ($\bar{X} = 2.60$); high cost of electronic surveillance system ($\bar{X} = 2.55$), lack of trained personnel to handle gadget ($\bar{X} = 2.53$) as constraints that affect the effectiveness of electronic surveillance system of theft and mutilation. The Grand mean of ($\bar{X} = 10.42$) showed that inadequate funding of library; poor power supply and high cost of installing electronic surveillance affect the effectiveness of electronic surveillance in Francis Sulemanu Idachaba Library. This finding is in line with Ogbodo (2011) that inadequate funding of the library, lack of security policy, inadequate infrastructure, lack of trained staff and power failure were some of the constraints that affect security of information sources.

Table 6 considered strategies for curbing theft and mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi.

Table 6: Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents on Strategies to Curb Theft and Mutilation in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi. (N=300)

S/N	Item	Mean	SD	Decision*
1	Electronic system should be installed in the library	2.5233	.99973	A
2	Manual checking of library users	2.8000	.87324	A
3	Electrical surveillance system will make users to be conscious of how to handle library materials	2.5233	.97603	A
4	Electronic surveillance will check theft and mutilation in the library	2.5033	.97287	A
5	Installation of electronic surveillance system will yield positive results	2.8467	.67677	A
6	Installation of cameras will discourage library users because they are not comfortable been watched	2.5267	.86320	A
	Grand Mean	15.72	5.36	A

SA- Strong Agreed, A-Agreed; D-Disagreed, SD-Strongly Disagreed

Emerging results from table 5 revealed the followings as appropriate strategies for addressing constraints facing theft and mutilation: Installation of electronic surveillance system will yield

positive results ($\bar{X} = 2.85$), manual checking of library users ($\bar{X} = 2.80$); installation of cameras in the library ($\bar{X} = 2.53$), electronic surveillance system should be installed in the library ($\bar{X} = 2.52$); electronic surveillance system will make users to be conscious of how to handle library materials ($\bar{X} = 2.52$), electronic surveillance will help to check theft and mutilation in the library ($\bar{X} = 2.50$). These strategies were appropriate for addressing constraints facing theft and mutilation ($\bar{X} = 15.72$). The most appropriate of these strategies was that installation of electronic surveillance system will yield positive results. Suggested solutions to the constraints for addressing theft and mutilation were manual checking of library users, installation of cameras and electronic surveillance system in the library. These findings confirmed Ogunyade, 2005; McGinty, 2008; Trapskin, 2008 and Odaro, 2011 that electronic surveillance system should be installed in university libraries to control, minimize or avoid library theft and unethical losses. The use of electronic surveillance is discovered to be one of the effective ways of curbing theft and mutilation. It also agrees with Mckean, 1985; McComb, 2004; Tinuade, 2007 and Rajendran & Rathinasabapathy, 2007 and Aba, Beetseh and Ahom, 2014 that electronic surveillance system are useful in detecting security pattern and ensuring effective security strategies in the protection of library materials.

Conclusion

Theft and mutilation of library materials is a serious problem which affects students' educational development and jeopardize the efficiency of library services to users by managers. Some problems like defacing have been solved in the recent times but not much has been able to be done concerning mutilation or theft as the perpetrators of these crimes have been able to beat the library managers to it or have someone at the check point that assists them in committing these crimes or even throw it through open windows with someone standing by to collect them. Even though much has been done concerning book theft and mutilation, there is still a gap as not much has been done on using electronic security system to curb/prevent this anti-social crime.

Although government and individuals may have spent a lot of money on other aspects of information resources, the aim will not be achieved if library resources are mutilated or stolen every day. Therefore, security measures should be put in place to ensure the security and safety of these materials.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of the study

1. There should be adequate provision of funds for funding of the library and its surveillance systems.
2. Library staff should be properly trained to handle gadgets.
3. Power supply should be improved and there should be a standby power generating plant to supplement power failure or outage.
4. The cost of photocopying should be subsidized for library users and more photocopying machine should be made available.
5. More of the copies of recommended textbooks should be purchased and made available for loan.
6. There should be adequate provision of library resources to library users.

REFERENCES

- Aba, J., Beetseh, K. and Ahom, D. (2014) Strategies for Combating theft and vandalism in Francis Suleimanu Idachaba library, University of Agriculture Makurdi. *Erudite Journal of Educational Research Reviews and Essay (EJERRE)*, Vol. 1(1):27-39
- Abareh, H. M. (2001), An Exploratory Survey of Book Loss, Theft and Damage in Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University (ATBU), Bauchi, Nigeria, *Library and Archival Security*, 17 (1) 33-42.
- Ajebomogun, F.O. (2004) User's assessment of library security: A Nigerian university casestudy. *Library Management*, 19(6), 378-383
- Akor, U.P. (2013). Security Management for Prevention of Book Thefts in University Libraries. A Case Study of Benue State University Library, Nigeria *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available: [http: // unllib.unl.edu/ LPP/](http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/)
- Bello, M. (1998). Library Security: Material Theft and Mutilation in Technological University Libraries in Nigeria. *Library Management* 19(6): 378-383
- Birhanu, T. (1996). Security management of collection in Ethiopian academic libraries. *African Journal Library, Archival. & Information. Science*. 6.2:124.
- Bosah. I. E.(2009). Effects of mutilation of library materials on academic library development: A case study of Delta state university, Abraka. *Gateway Library Journal* 12(1):79.
- Edewor, N. and Ojohwoh, R. 2010. Security challenges and control measures in three selected Nigerian university libraries. *Information Impact: Journal of Information and knowledge Management*. 1(2):21.

- Griffith, R. and Krol, A (2009) Insider Theft: Reviews and Recommendation from the Archive Professional Literature. *Library and Archival Security* 22(1) 5 18
- Holt, G.E. (2007) Theft by library staff: The Bottom Line. *Managing the Library* 20(2) 83 95
- Mansfield, D. (2007) Redeeming book theft at University Libraries. *SCONUL Focus* 42:50 52
- Maidabino, A. A. 2010. Collection security issues in Malaysian Academic Libraries: An exploratory survey. *Library Philosophy and Practice* .Retrieved Feb 17th, 2014, from <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/maidabino-ngah.htm>
- Maidabino, A. A. 2012. Theft and Mutilation of print collection in University Libraries: A Critical review of literature and proposed framework for action. *Annals of Library and information studies*.59: 242-243.
- McGinty, J. (2008) Enhancing building security: Design consideration *Library and Archival Security* 21(2)115 125
- Nancy, H.K. (1976). Theft Detection System: A Survey, Library, *Technology Report*, 12(6) 576 690.
- Odaro, O (2011) Electronic security systems in university libraries:A case study of three university libraries in south-west Nigeria. 1-2. *Chinese Librarianship: An International Electronic Journal*, 32.<http://www.iclc.us/cliej/cl32osayande.pdf> retrieved from <http://www.iclc.us/cliej/cl32osayande.pdf>
- Ogbodo, C. I. (2011). Security of Information Sources in Libraries of Government Owned Polytechnics in South East Nigeria. *Journal of research in education and society* 2(2):40-46
- Ogbonyomi, A.L. (2011). Libraries: A Case Study of Kano State College of Education. *Libraries Philosophy and Practice*.<http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/lpp.htm>
- Ogunyade, T. O. (2005). Theft and mutilation in an academic library: college of medicine, university of Lagos Experience, Nigeria. *Nigerian Quarterly Journal Hospital Medical*, 15(2):2-3, 13.
- Omoniyi, J. O. (2001) The security of computer and other electronic installations in Nigerian universities library. *Library Management*, 22(6/7): 273.
- Reitz, J. M (2004) Dictionary of Library and Information science. Connecticut libraries unlimited.
- Revill, D. (1979). Security in Library, Proceedings of the 65th Annual Conference of the Scottish Library Association. 38-44
- Richmond, M.L. (1976). Attitudes of Law Librarians to Theft and Mutilation Control Methods *Law Library Journal*, 68, 60.
- Salaam, M. O. (2004). The Treatment of Other Libraries' Books by Nigerian University Libraries. *Library & Archival Security* 19(1): 47-51

Sorman, S. A. and Shyla, A. (1997) Students attitude towards the theft and mutilation of library reading materials. *Library science with a slant to documentation and information studies*. 34(4):203.

Trapskin, B.A. (2008) A changing of the guard : Emerging trends in public library security, library and Archival Security 21(2) 69 76

Thanuskodi, S. (2009) The environment of higher education libraries in India. *Libraries Philosophy and Practice*. <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/lpp.htm>

Tinuade, Adewale O. (2007). Book Theft and its preservation. *Gateway Library Journal* 10(1):78-79.