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A questionnaire survey of 202 librarians from 28 university libraries in Nigeria was conducted to determine the influence of various library departments on publication output among librarians in Nigerian universities over a period of 1985-1992. To assess publication output, a one way analysis of variance statistics (ANOVA) was used to compare librarians from seven major library departments. The results of empirical analysis indicated that the librarians who work in university librarian’s department produced the highest quantity of academic publications, followed by librarians who work in subject/college libraries and cataloguing departments. The librarians in research library departments produced the highest quantity of work-related publications, followed by librarians in subject/college libraries and acquisition departments.

INTRODUCTION

A typical Nigerian university library could be divided into seven main departments, namely, (a) Circulation, (b) Reference, (c) Acquisition, (d) Cataloguing, (e) Research, (f) University Librarian’s, and (g) Subject/College Library. Each of the above departments is made up of several sections. The activities of some sections or departments are visible to users of the library while those of others are not [1].

Between 1948-1989, some Nigerian universities had already classified their librarians as academic staff while a few did not. According to Decree No. 16 of 1990, the National Universities Commission (NUC), legislated that librarians in all Nigerian universities would have academic status. By this Decree, the National Universities Commission was empowered to play a supervisory role in both the Federal and State universities [2]. One of the clear implications of the new unambiguous academic status conferred on librarians that librarians in Nigerian universities have to publish or perish. This means that librarians working in Nigerian universities are expected to write and publish research papers, journal articles and books, like their teaching counterparts - university lecturers, before they are promoted or elevated. Publication output enhances their status or rank and salary position in the university environment. Several research studies have indicated the justification for librarians to publish [3,4,5,6,7].

It is an old saying that the library building represents 5%, the book collection 20%, while the staff represent 75% of what it takes to make a good library [8]. The various library departments or divisions have different needs, duties, expectations and challenges for librarians. The duties performed by librarians in various departments may have positive or negative influence on their job performance. This trend, though of great importance in developed countries, gains little or no recognition in developing countries like Nigeria. Consequently, over-staffing or under-staffing of some library departments or divisions to the detriment of others are experienced which may have positive or negative influence on job performance and may, subsequently, affect their publication productivity.

It seems that the influence of a library department could elicit assessment of publication output among librarians in universities. With the recent focus on specialization in academics or university environments, there has been increasing interest in examining a specific form of deviation, particularly departmental, in publication output [9]. Olsgaard and Olsgaard [10] observed that the stock in trade in librarianship were communication and transfer of knowledge, though little is known about the communication of ideas within the profession. The au-
thors conclude that librarianship is sadly behind the disciplines of economics, psychology and the sciences in determining the bibliometric nature of the professional literature.

Writing in support of librarians to write and publish, Raymond et al [11] had earlier argued that librarians working in university libraries, irrespective of their departments or divisions should see themselves as being involved in two information cycles - a publication cycle which involves the production of new knowledge, its formalization and its storage and use; and a demand cycle - providing information to library users or clients. By so doing, these scholars observed that by taking active part in the publication cycle, librarians could compete with their teaching counterparts in the university environment. University libraries are the nerve centres of higher educational institutions of learning, teaching and research. The primary duties of university librarians are not only to acquire and disseminate information to clients or users but also, to contribute in extending the frontiers of knowledge by publishing significant research, like their teaching counterparts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Not much work has been done on the influence of library departmentalization on publication productivity of librarians, especially, in developing countries such as, Nigeria. However, a few studies have been conducted in developed countries. Watson [12] noted that librarians who were library administrators (7 percent), branch and departmental librarians (43 percent), subject and technical specialists (29 percent) as against supervised librarians comprising reference and acquisition, cataloguers and branch library assistance (15 percent) produced the majority of publications when compared among librarians from the various other library departments in university libraries in the United States of America. Similarly, Kendrick [13] compared the publications output of academic business librarians with and without faculty rank in university librarians in the United States of America. His research findings showed that librarians with faculty rank published more per person than librarians without faculty rank though the difference was not much to indicate that the results came from two different groups. The results suggest that faculty rank and eligibility for tenure do not have the desired effect of increasing the scholarly activity of academic business librarians as it relates to publication productivity.

Nwafor [14] found from a sample of 39 librarians drawn from selected academic and public libraries located in Plateau and Anambra States of Nigeria that the publication output of librarians from reference, circulation and acquisition departments were very low when compared with librarians from other departments.

Rayman and Goudy [15] argued that "for all librarians in the various departments of university library, the task to publish will be a difficult exercise". Similarly, Mitchell and Swieszkowski [16] also held the same view about librarians in university libraries. In the absence of a local empirical study to counter Rayman and Goudy's assertion [15], this paper examines the influence of departmentalization on publication output among librarians in Nigerian universities, tested with the following hypotheses:

i) There is no significant difference in library departments of librarians' academic publication output in Nigerian universities.

ii) There is no significant difference in library departments of librarians' work related publication output in Nigerian universities.

For the purpose of clarity, publication output survey statistics were categorised into two dimensions — academic publication output, comprising of journal articles, books, accepted or published conference/workshop papers, and work related publication output, comprising of abstracts, indexes, bibliographies and in-house publications accepted or published by the librarian. Such academic and work related publication output were assumed to have had local, national and international book/serial numbers of ISBN or ISSN.

METHODOLOGY

A stratified random sampling method was used to select 202 librarians working in 28 out of the 35 universities in Nigeria. All the universities were categorised into five groups consisting of

(a) Federal universities;
(b) Universities of agriculture;
(c) State universities;
(d) State universities of technology; and
(e) Federal universities of technology.

Their names or status were used as a major criterion for belonging to a group and the asterisked ones (*) in the Appendix were randomly selected for the study. Furthermore, a simple random sampling method was used to select universities from each of the five groups for the study. The essence of these two sampling methods was to ensure equal probability of being selected. Finally, all the librarians found in the sampled universities were given questionnaires irrespective of sex, age, status and library department or division. However, only the librarians who had spent at least four years in a particular division were found worthy to be used for the study analysis.

202 librarians filled in and returned the questionnaires correctly, representing 72.66% response rate. 23 (11.38%) librarians refused to disclose their work division or department (Table 1).

Indeed, the question enabled the researchers to really determine the influence of departmentalization on publication productivity.

Table 1

Classification of librarians in library department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no.</th>
<th>Library department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cataloguing</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>University Librarians'</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Subject/College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 1, the highest number of librarians 46 (22.77%) were found in cataloguing, followed by circulation 31 (15.35%) and 30 (14.85%) librarians in acquisition department.

Respondents were requested to check on a six point scale to express their level of publication output within the past seven years from 1985-1992, thus: (1) None, (2) 1-3, (3) 4-7, (4) 8-11, (5) 12-15, (6) 16 and above.

Quantitative values were given to the responses in the questionnaire, as indicated above, and the means of responses were computed for each publication output dimension. For the seven library divisions or departments in Nigerian universities, the one way analysis of variance statistics (ANOVA) was used to compare the difference of the mean scores of the departments with regard to their publication output. Furthermore, the mean and standard deviation scores of the publication output di-
dimensions were computed and used in determining the study results. The calculated F-value ratio was used to really determine the library department which had the greatest influence on publication productivity. The two null hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA**

In testing hypothesis 1, a one way analysis of variance statistics (ANOVA) was used to compare librarians from the seven identified library departments regarding their academic publication output dimension in Nigerian universities (Table 2).

**Table 2**  
Analysis of variance: influence of library department on librarians' academic publication output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.no.</th>
<th>Library departments</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.5333</td>
<td>2.5152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.2273</td>
<td>1.3428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.8462</td>
<td>1.8696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cataloguing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.9000</td>
<td>2.0356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7619</td>
<td>2.2783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>University Librarian's</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.0909</td>
<td>2.9480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Subject/College</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.4615</td>
<td>2.0662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>( F )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>129.6375</td>
<td>21.6063</td>
<td>4.7322*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>712.2643</td>
<td>4.5658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td><strong>814.9018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*P > 0.05; df = 6,156; Critical F = 2.16

The analysis of variance shows that the calculated F-value of 4.7322 is greater than the critical F-value of 2.16 at 6,156 degree of freedom. This means that the librarians' library departments have significantly influenced the quantity of academic publications produced by the librarians (*P > 0.05; df = 6,156; F = 4.7322). Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in library departments on librarians' academic publication output in Nigerian universities is rejected.

Further, the librarians who work in university librarians' department produced the highest quantity of academic publications (mean = 8.0909), followed
by librarians who work in subject/college libraries (mean = 5.4615) and librarians in cataloguing department came third (mean = 4.9000). The lowest quantity of academic publications came from librarians working in reference department (mean = 4.2273).

In testing hypothesis 2, a one way analysis of variance statistics (ANOVA) was used to compare librarians from the seven identified library departments regarding their work related publication output dimension in Nigerian universities (Table 3).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.no.</th>
<th>Library departments</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4286</td>
<td>0.8516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2500</td>
<td>1.5811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5714</td>
<td>2.2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cataloguing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.0588</td>
<td>1.1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8889</td>
<td>1.8330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>University Librarian's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Subject/College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6667</td>
<td>1.6330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of variance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.2615</td>
<td>2.8769</td>
<td>1.3841*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>118.4729</td>
<td>2.0785</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>135.7344</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*df = 6,56; Critical F = 2.27

The result of one way analysis of variance shows that the calculated F-value of 1.3841 is less than the critical F-value of 2.27 at 6,56 degree of freedom. This means that the various library departments in the university libraries do not significantly influence work related publication output. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in library departments on librarians' work related publication output in Nigerian universities is accepted.

Also, that librarians in research library department produced the highest quantity of work related publications (mean = 5.8889) followed by librarians in subject/college library department (mean = 5.6667) and acquisition department librarians came third (mean = 5.5714). The lowest quantity of work related publications was produced by librarians in university librarian's department (mean = 4.3333).
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The study results have shown that some library departments or divisions have significantly influenced the quantity of academic publications produced by librarians. This corroborates with results of previous studies. For instance, Watson [12] and Nwafor [14] revealed that library administrators, branch and departmental librarians and subject/technical specialists published more articles than their counterparts in other departments of the library. This could be explained by the fact that these groups of librarians have more time and are already occupying top ranking positions. Consequently, they could devote more time for themselves for writing and publishing.

A significant trend observed in the study results is that librarians in university librarian’s department have the highest quantity of academic publications to their credit. This could be explained by the fact that this group of librarians (University/Deputy University Librarians), apart from having enough time, have resources, experience or maturity for writing for publishing.

On the contrary, librarians working in departments, like reference division who may have numerous readers to attend to may not have adequate time for research and publication activities. The same applies to librarians in circulation and acquisition departments. In fact, this assertion has been confirmed by Nwafor [14] who noted that some librarians in reference, circulation and acquisition departments had low quantity of publications and majority of them did not have any publications.

A significant aspect of the survey shows the influence of the library department where a librarian’s works influence his/her quantity of publications by giving adequate time and resource materials to write or compile something meaningful for publications like journal articles, abstracts, indexes and bibliographies.

CONCLUSION

The study results point out that some library departments such as, university librarians’, subject/college, cataloguing, research and acquisition significantly influenced the quantity of publications produced by librarians in Nigerian universities. It emphasizes the need for rotational transfer within the various departments among librarians in Nigerian universities and spending a minimum of four years in a particular department before transfer, to enhance publication productivity.

Joint, corporate and multiple authorship of research papers should be encouraged among librarians irrespective of library department, age, sex, status within and outside the library environment. Interdepartmental researches should be encouraged among librarians. Furthermore, interdisciplinary researches should equally be encouraged among librarians, archivists and information scientists and other related field specialists.
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APPENDIX

ALL THE NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES AND THE ONES SAMPLED (*) FOR THE STUDY

GROUP A: FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES (CONVENTIONAL)
1. *Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
2. *University of Abuja, Abuja
3. *Bayero University, Kano
4. *University of Benin, Benin-City
5. *University of Calabar, Calabar
6. *University of Ibadan, Ibadan
7. *University of Ilorin, Ilorin
8. *University of Jos, Jos
9. *University of Lagos, Lagos
10. *University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri
11. *Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife
12. *University of Port-Harcourt, Port-Harcourt
13. *Usman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto
14. *University of Nigeria, Nsukka
15. *University of Uyo, Uyo.

GROUP B: FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES OF AGRICULTURE
16. *University of Agriculture, Abeokuta
17. University of Agriculture, Makurdi
18. University of Agriculture, Umunike

GROUP C: FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY
19. *Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi
20. *Federal University of Technology, Akure
21. *Federal University of Technology, Owerri
22. *Federal University of Technology, Minna
23. *Federal University of Technology, Yola

GROUP D: STATE UNIVERSITIES
24. *Edo State University, Ekpoma
25. *Abia State University, Abakpawo
26. *Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos
27. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
28. *Ogun State University, Ago Iwoye
29. Ondo State University, Ado Ekiti
30. Delta State University, Abraka
31. Kano State University, Kano
32. Benue State University, Makurdi

GROUP E: STATE UNIVERSITIES OF TECHNOLOGY
33. Enugu State University of Technology, Enugu
34. *Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho
35. *Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port-Harcourt.