Security Risks Management in Selected Academic Libraries in Osun State, Nigeria

by

Abiola Abioye, and Omolara F. Adeowu

Abstract

The survival of a library depends to a large extent on how secured its collections are. Security of collections constitutes a critical challenge facing academic libraries in Nigeria. It is against this background that this study investigated the security risks management in selected academic libraries in Osun State, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive survey design of the ex-post facto type. The population of the study comprised 145 library personnel and 14,317 registered library users in four selected academic libraries in Osun State while the sample size consisted of all the 145 library personnel and 2% of the registered users to make a total of 432 respondents. Questionnaire and interview with the Chief Librarians of the selected academic libraries were the instruments used for data collection. Data were analysed using frequency distribution and percentages run using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The study established that the most prevalent security risks in the libraries included stealing/theft of library materials, mutilation of library materials, defacing, misuse/mishandling of library materials, insect attack, fire outbreak and flood. It also established inadequate funding, shortage of staff/personnel, erratic power supply and lack of institutional security policy/disaster plan as some of the challenges confronting security management in the libraries. Based on the findings, recommendations were made towards improving security management in the libraries.

Introduction

Libraries are the bedrock of higher institutions of learning such as universities, polytechnics, colleges of education and colleges of agriculture. They support the institutions' mandate of teaching, research and community service. Academic libraries are the 'heart' of the learning community, empowering students and faculty to learn, do research and advance the frontiers of knowledge. The institutions advance the knowledge of the citizenry through their libraries with the help of the collections that are the bedrock for the services provided to the users. This explains why Gelfand (2005) quoted in Maidabino (2010) referred to the library as "the only centralized location where new and emerging information technologies can be combined with knowledge resources in a user-focused, service-rich environment that supports today's social and educational patterns of learning, teaching and research". However, one major challenge that academic libraries have been faced with is security problems, that is, how to secure their collections. Mullen and Gaumond (2009) pointed out that people prefer to stay where they are, if the place is safe and secure. Therefore, for academic libraries to achieve their aim of information dissemination there must be proper security management of library collections against theft, mutilation, deterioration and natural disaster which are threats to academic libraries. The security of staff and users must also be guaranteed. This can be achieved if a great interest is taken in effective academic libraries security management. It should be noted that libraries are 'systems' and security is a vital part of maintaining balance in the system. Library security is typically best understood as a system that reflects the strategies of librarians to prevent or ameliorate the negative consequences of a realized threat in the libraries. Therefore, library security management is a professional effort to deal practically with knotty problems of library safety and security.

Statement of the Problem

Over the years, many factors have been militating against security management in library settings. These range from environmental factors such as temperature, relative humidity, dust and light to natural disaster such as flood, fire, earthquake and tornado. Equally important are the acts of user delinquency such as theft, mutilation and bad attitudes towards library collections. In some libraries, the management put in place some security measures to safeguard the security of library collections. These measures seem to be inadequate, leaving a yearning gap in meeting the security requirements of the libraries. It is on this premise that this study investigated the security risk management in selected academic libraries in Osun State, Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. determine the security risks that are prevalent in the selected academic libraries in Osun State, Nigeria;
2. identify various security measures put in place in the libraries;
3. find out the views of the users concerning the state of the security of library collections in the libraries;
4. find out the views of the librarians concerning the state of security of the library collections, and

5. ascertain the impediments to security management in the selected academic libraries.

Literature Review

Academic libraries are the 'heart' of the learning community, providing facilities and conducive environment required by students and faculty to teach, learn, carry out research and advance the frontiers of knowledge (Simmonds, 2001). However, one major challenge that academic libraries have been faced with is security problems, that is, how to secure their collections. The serious issue that has bothered librarians from earliest times to the present is how to ensure the security of library materials, especially against theft and mutilation (Akinfolarin, 1992). Wallace (2008) observed that threats to collection security come in many forms, and range from intentional acts such as book theft, vandalism, or identity theft to dangers which originate from unintentional factors such as flood, fire and the natural deterioration of collections. Another aspect of library security management relates to preservation of library collections against environmental, chemical and biological agents that can cause deterioration of library collections. Akussah (2006) in a study carried out in Ghana established that the level of deterioration of library collections is frightening with 51.1% of documents surveyed in urgent need of treatment while the rest are at various level of deterioration.

Academic libraries are prone to various security threats, Salaam and Onifade (2010) observed that vandalism of library materials has been an age-long problem of libraries. Holt (2007) observed that libraries are faced with the problem of physical materials theft, data theft and money theft. Other problems include failure to return overdue information resources, theft of library equipment as well as theft and abuse of personal belongings of staff and users. 'The goal of library security is to provide a safe environment for objects, people and places which are held to be of value" (Wallace, 2008). Therefore there is the need to examine the library security management in academic libraries in order to provide quality services for users making use of the collections. Although the dilemma of social inclusion and stock security in today's libraries is not an easily achievable task since the causes of crime are diverse (Mansfield 2009), library crime in academic libraries is a global problem. Security of library books has been the subject of much investigation. However, the situation seems not to be getting better (Ajayi 2003). No wonder why Nielson (2002) described library security management to be 'simply too bad a state of affairs'.

Destructive habits of some users such as theft, mutilation and hiding of information materials pose a great problem to other users who are most often prevented from having access to library collections. Arising from these wholesome practices, the library staff also experience difficulties providing quality services while the library management runs into financial mess of replacing lost or damaged collections (Popoola 2003). The threat to intellectual property through theft, mutilation and other forms of abuse has posed tremendous challenge to the library profession worldwide (Akussah and Bentil 2010). Ajegbomogun (2004) stated that theft and mutilation of books and non-books is a common phenomenon in Nigerian university libraries and if not checked will create a serious threat to library' collections and their preservation.

With particular reference to electronic resources, Kumar and Haneefa (2005) observed that libraries are lagging behind in realizing the need to protect their electronic resources and services from misuse, damage, theft, sabotage, mistakes and many more. It is true that we can never completely protect our library network from the unauthorized users but the attack can be minimized up to a desired level (Sarmah, 2003). In the aspect of security issues, Ugah (2007) identified theft and mutilation, vandalism, damages and disasters, over borrowing or delinquent borrowers and purposeful displacing arrangement of materials as some of the main security issues. The mismanagement and abuse of documentary materials contribute greatly to physical degradation. These include mutilation, careless handling, excessive photocopying, mis-shelving and flicking document over (Akussah 2010). Nowadays, any computer or library network connected to the internet is at risk of probes and scans, account compromise, packet sniffing and malicious codes (Sarmah, 2003). As libraries move from paper to electronic medium, safely providing access to resources has become complicated. Disaster is another form of security issue threatening library and its collections, Aziagba and Edet (2008) observed that disasters are threat to library security and that they can be man-made in the case of fire outbreak or natural such as flood, landslide and earthquake. Another aspect of threat to library security is the threat to library building. According to Senyah and Lamptey (2011), the building housing the library suffers from life-threatening structural and physical defects such as leakages, cracks at joints, creaking floors, poor ventilation and lack of maintenance of electrical installations and equipment.

In as much as there are various problems facing academic libraries, there should be different ways of reducing the problems. Wallace (2008) argued that there should be the use of security theatre in the library to improve the library security. In using library security theatre the library will put in place various security measures to ensure that the library is properly secured and monitored. Security awareness should be formalized in organization policy and procedures and communicated to every employee who works with information resources (Saffady, 2005). Akussah and Bentil (2010) recommended that library should invest more in electronic resources, which will reduce to a large extent the incidence of users physically handling documentary materials. This will enhance multiple access to library materials with little damage. Weible (2003) observed that, for libraries' missing items to be identified there must be successful inventory process. Freddie (2003) advocated the use of electromagnetic security system in securing library collections because it is very cost effective. Apart from inventory taking, there are some other steps that can be taken for libraries collection to be monitored.

Library staff is part of the challenges facing library security management because they also engage in collection theft and since they are part of the system, it is easier for them to carry out the operation without being caught. Holt (2007), therefore, concluded that "theft of library collections by staff is a real problem that libraries should address and not ignore". He observed that every profession has its ''closed areas'' which are little studied and seldom discussed publicly. Omoniyi (2001) observed that not only the users but also staff are involved in collection theft and this may be due to ignorance of the offence. In this case, not only the users' orientation is essential but also staff awareness of their responsibilities towards libraries collections security. Onatola (1998) cited in Salaam and Onifade (2010) expressed the view that human beings as agents of destruction in libraries have been the most difficult to control. He recommended that library security personnel as well as reader's services staff and indeed all library staff should be exposed to short training course in library security at least once a year.

Janus (2001) advocated stiff legal penalties for collection theft in order to serve as deterrent to prospective offenders. She also advised on keeping update of inventories and suggested the inclusion of theft possibilities into disaster plan and publication of stolen materials by the concerned institution. Moris (1996) quoted in Senyah and Lamptey (2011) observed that of the entire precautionary measures library can take against such crimes as vandalism, theft and incendiaries, none is more basic than that of securing the building itself. Swartzburg, Bussey and Garretson (1991) opined that the physical environment of the library must provide for the safety and security of library premises, which hold the collections. The physical security measures should begin with the physical architecture of the building and controlling building entrances and exits.

Finance is another factor threatening library security management. Akinfolarin (1992), Afolabi (1993), Bello (1997), Agboola (2001), Ajegbomogun (2004) and Akussah (2010) agreed that financial constraints had deprived librarians of the opportunity to acquire adequate number of essential books in high demand thereby exposing the available ones to the risk of theft and mutilation. There should, therefore, be adequate budgetary provision for libraries to enable them meet their basic requirements in order to meet the expectations of their clientele.

Methodology
The study adopted a descriptive survey design of the ex-post facto type. The population of the study comprised 145 library personnel and 14,317 registered library users in four selected academic libraries in Osun State as shown in Table 1. The sample size consisted of all the145 library personnel and 2% of the registered users to make a total of 432 respondents as shown in Table 2. Questionnaire and interview with the Chief Librarians of the selected academic libraries were the instruments used for data collection. Data was analysed using frequency distribution and percentages run using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

Findings and Discussion
The findings of the study are presented and discussed under the following headings:
1) The prevalent security risks in the selected academic libraries,
2) Security measures put in place in the selected academic libraries,
3) The perception of users of the state of security in the selected academic libraries,
4) The perception of the librarians of the security measures put in place in the selected academic libraries,
5) Factors militating against security management in the selected academic libraries.

The Prevalent Security Risks in the Selected Academic Libraries
The result on the prevalent security risks in academic library is presented in Table 3.

Table 1:Population of the study

Name of Library	Staff	Registered Users
Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library, Ile-Ife	111	3126
Ede Polytechnic Library, Ede	11	2032
Lawrence Omole Library, Ilesa	13	6909
Dr Opakunle library, Ire Polytechnic, Ire	10	2250
Total	**145**	**14317**

Table 2: Sample Size

Name of Library	Staff Sample	Users Sample	Total
Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library, Ile-Ife	111	63	174
Ede Polytechnic Library, Ede	11	41	52
Lawrence Omole Library, Ilesa	13	138	151
Dr Opakunle Library, Ire Polytechnic, Ire;	10	45	55
Total	**145**	**287**	**432**

Table 3 Security Risks Prevalent in Academic Libraries

S/No	Security Risks	Users	Staff	Overall (%)
1.	Stealing/theft of library materials	175(68.1%)	90(88.2%)	265(73.8%)
2.	Delinquent behaviours (smoking, sex, fighting)	73(28.4%)	20(19.6%)	93(25.9%)
3.	Mutilation of library materials	148(57.6%)	82(80.4%)	230(64.1%)
4.	Defacing of library materials (writing in books)	160(62.3%)	70(68.8%)	230(64.1%)
5.	Vandalism	116(45.1%)	28(27.5%)	144(40.1%)
6.	Occurrence of fire outbreak	106(41.2%)	23(22.5%)	129(35.9%)
7.	Deterioration of library materials	156(60.7%)	73(71.6%)	229(63.8%)
8.	Threats to computer systems/networks	129(50.2%)	41(40.2%)	170(47.4%)
9.	Misuse/mishandling of library materials	150(58.4%)	64(62.7%)	214(59.6%)
10	Occurrence of flood	75(29.2%)	41(40.2%)	116(32.3%)
11	Computer vandalism	101(39.9%)	24(23.5%)	125(34.8%)
12	Library roof leakage	123(47.9%)	75(73.5%)	198(55.2%)
13	Rodents / insects attack of library connections	140(54.5%)	51(50.0%)	191(53.2%)
14	Non-return of borrowed items	166(64.6%)	68(66.7%)	234(65.2%)
15	Theft of personal properties	145(56.4%)	50(49.0%)	195(54.3%)
16	Poor cooperation from library security officers	157(61.1%)	13(12.7%)	170(47.4%)
17	Unsecured doors and windows	118(45.9%)	14(13.7%)	132(36.8%)

Table 3 revealed that stealing/theft of library materials (73%) was the most prevalent security risk in the libraries. This is closely followed by non-return of borrowed items (65%) and mutilation of library materials as well as defacing of library materials (64%). Other security risks prevalent were deterioration of library materials, misuse/mishandling, theft of personal properties, roof leakage, insect attack, threats to computer systems, vandalism, fire outbreak and flood. These findings were in line with Ewing (1994), Lorenzen (1996), Ajegbomogun (2004) and Holt (2007) who also identified similar risks in their studies.

Security Measures Put in Place in the Selected Academic Libraries

Table 4 presents the security measures available in the libraries studied.

Table 4 Security Measures in the Library

S/No	Security Measures	Users	Staff	Overall (%)
1.	Installation of close circuit television (CCTV)	99(38.5%)	31(30.4%)	130(36.2%)
2.	Installation of electronic security system	123(47.9%)	47(46.1%)	170(47.4%)
3.	Secret security page in books	120(46.7%)	32(31.4%)	152(42.3%)
4.	Checking in and out of the library users and personnel	219(85.2%)	87(85.3%)	306(85.2%)
5.	Enforcement of no food/no drink policy	170(66.1%)	73(76.1%)	243(67.7%)
6.	Sanctioning/punishment of offenders	175(68.1%)	67(65.7%)	242(67.4%)
7.	Payment of overdue fines for defaulters	154(59.9%)	74(72.5%)	228(63.5%)
8.	Creation of awareness to users and staff	188(73.2%)	75(73.5%)	263(73.3%)
9.	Use of security personnel at the main entrance	200(77.8%)	86(84.3%)	286(79.7%)
10.	Occasional check on library users in the reading/shelf areas	190(73.9%)	55(53.9%)	245(68.2%)
11.	Digitization of rare library materials	138(53.7%)	44(43.1%)	182(50.7%)
12.	Maintenance of closed access collection (CDs, theses, manuscripts, etc)	144(56.0%)	58(56.9%)	202(56.3%)
13.	Stamping of library materials with ownership stamps	193(75.1%)	75(73.5%)	268(74.7%)
14.	Continuous security officers patrol	148(57.6%)	42(41.2%)	190(52.9%)
15.	Registration of users' property on entry into the library	179(69.9%)	44(43.1%)	223(62.1%)
16.	Fire alarm/smoke detectors	144(56.0%)	38(37.3%)	182(50.7%)
17.	Fire extinguishers	183(71.2%)	84(82.4%)	267(74.4%)
18.	Availability of functional photocopiers	160(62.3%)	84(82.4%)	244(68.0%)
19.	Restriction of access to important databases through the use of users' ID or password	163(63.4%)	52(51.0%)	215(59.9%)
20.	Users' orientation	190(73.9%)	87(85.3%)	277(77.2%)
21.	Staff training	183(71.2%)	72(70.6%)	255(71.0%)
22.	24 hours security guard	183(71.2%)	69(67.6%)	252(70.2%)
23.	Widow burglary	208(80.9%)	84(82.4%)	292(81.3%)
24.	Cleaning of the environment	177(68.9%)	47(46.1%)	224(62.4%)
25.	Mechanical traps for rodents	107(41.6%)	33(32.4%)	140(39.0%)

As revealed in Table 4, most of the respondents (85.2%) indicated that checking in and out of the library users and personnel was the commonest measure in all the libraries. Likewise, 81.3% of the respondents identified window burglar proof as one of the security measures while 79.7% of the total respondents indicated the use of security personnel at the main entrance of the libraries. However, only few of the respondents (42.3%) indicated secret security page in books while 39% of the respondents indicated mechanical traps for rodents. Apart from those security measures that had from 50% and above which clearly indicated the availability of such measures in some of the libraries (if not all), other measures like mechanical traps for rodents, secret security page in books, particularly the electronic ones such as installation of close circuit television (CCTV) and other electronic security systems were not available in the libraries. The inability to use these methods may be due to the nature and size of many of the libraries as college libraries, except Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU) which may have the capability to afford the heavy cost of the electronic systems.

The Perception of Users of the State of Security in the Selected Academic Libraries
The result on the perception of users of the state of security in the libraries is presented in Table 5. Table 5 revealed the views of library users on security management in the selected academic libraries in Osun State. Majority of the respondents,(243or 94.5%) affirmed that the state of library security needed to be improved, while (13 or 5.1%) of them disagreed. Also,(212 or 82.5%) of the respondents agreed that users feel secured in the library, but 33(16.7%) respondents of them felt unsecured. Only 51(19.8%) of the respondents indicated that there was no form of security in the library at all. Also, about 108(42.0%) of the respondents indicated that safety of users and their property could not be guaranteed, while the majority of them (145 or 56.4%) disagreed. The above findings revealed that the library users in the libraries studied had positive perceptions of the security management in the

libraries. However, most of the users (94.5%) also felt that the state of security in the libraries needed to be improved.

Table 6 reflected the perception of library staff to library security.

Table 5 Users' Views on Library Security

S/No	Views	SA	A	D	SD
1.	There is no form of security in the library at all	14(5.4%)	37(14.4%)	114(44.4%)	87(33.9%)
2.	The library security system is very porous	16(6.2%)	62(24.1%)	113(44.0%)	54(21.0%)
3.	Users are always at risk using the library	21(8.2%)	32(12.5%)	115(44.7%)	81(31.5%)
4.	The library is not a safe place for users and their property	17(6.6%)	38(14.8%)	107(41.6%)	92(35.8%)
5.	Security system in the library is very effective	54(21.0%)	125(48.6%)	55(25.4%)	22(8.6%)
6.	Safety of users and their property cannot be guaranteed	26(10.1%)	82(31.9%)	109(42.4%)	36(14.0%)
7.	The library staff are always security conscious	47(18.3%)	147(57.2%)	46(17.9%)	14(5.4%)
8.	It is easy to sneak out a library material without being caught	31(12.1%)	53(20.6%)	86(33.5%)	84(32.7%)
9.	Users feel secured in the library	66(25.7%)	146(56.8%)	33(12.8%)	10(3.9%)
10.	The state of library security need to be improved	125(48.6%)	118(45.9%)	10(3.9%)	3(1.2%)

Table 6 Staff perception of library security

S/No	Views	SA	A	D	SD
1.	There is overall statement of the library security program purpose	11(10.8%)	74(72.5%)	11(10.8%)	6(5.9%)
2.	The library has security programme plan, with an analysis of current systems and action plans for improving them	10(9.8%)	75(73.5%)	9(8.8%)	7(6.9%)
3.	There is a schedule for reviewing the library security program	6(5.9%)	75(73.5%)	13(12.7%)	8(7.8%)
4.	The library lack up-to-date written security plans, effective data gathering, and complete inventory procedures	3(2.9%)	12(11.8%)	78(76.5%)	9(8.8%)
5.	The library has programmes for training library staff and informing staff and users about security issues	11(10.8%)	51(50.0%)	40(39.2%)	--
6.	There is written security procedures accessible to all staff, including an emergency manual.	4(3.9%)	30(29.4%)	57(55.9%)	11(10.8%)
7.	Effective system for reporting security-related incidents and keeping records of such incidents is available.	4(3.9%)	77(75.5%)	10(9.8%)	11(10.8%)
8.	There is least a partial inventory system for high-value items.	22(21.6%)	31(30.4%)	41(40.2%)	8(7.8%)
9.	There is good working relationship with security personnel in the parent institution.	29(28.4%)	68(66.7%)	4(3.9%)	--

Table 6 revealed that the majority of the respondents (97 or 95.1%) agreed that there was good working relationship with security personnel in the parent institution, while only 4(3.9%) of them disagreed. In the same vein, no fewer than 85(82.5%) of the respondents agreed that there was

overall statement of the library security programme purpose, and that the libraries had security programme plan, with an analysis of current systems and action plans for improving them. However, only 34(33.3%) of the respondents agreed that there was written security procedures

accessible to all staff, including an emergency manual while the majority 68(66.7%) disagreed. The results of the study indicated that the library staff had positive perception of the library security management in the selected academic libraries.

However, there was no written security procedure accessible to all staff, including an emergency manual in many of the libraries.

Table 7 Challenges to Library Security Management

S/No	Challenges	Frequency			
		Users		Staff	
		A	D	A	D
1.	Poor budgeting/inadequate funding of the library	197(76.6%)	50(19.4%)	86(84.3%)	16(15.6%)
2.	Inadequate staffing/personnel	167(65.0%)	82(31.9%)	54(53.0%)	48(47.1%)
3.	Sabotage of library security by members of staff	106(41.3%)	140(54.4%)	22(21.5%)	80(78.4%)
4.	Poor lighting in important areas of the library	139(54.1%)	110(42.8%)	49(48.0%)	50(49.0%)
5.	Epileptic/erratic power supply to implement electronic security	151(58.8%)	94(36.6%)	69(67.7%)	33(32.4%)
6.	Lack of institutional security policy/disaster plan	143(55.7%)	102(39.7%)	61(59.8%)	41(40.2%)
7.	Poor/non-implementation of security policy	132(51.3%)	112(43.6%)	44(43.1%)	58(56.8%)
8.	Common disaster occurrence – fire, flood, roof leakage	72(28.0%)	173(67.3%)	55(53.9%)	47(46.0%)
9.	Conspiracy between staff and users	87(33.8%)	159(61.9%)	24(23.5%)	78(76.5%)
10.	Non-reporting for duty on time	112(43.6%)	132(51.3%)	21(20.6%)	81(79.5%)
11.	Poor staff attitude to users, collection and security measures	143(55.7%)	101(39.3%)	36(35.3%)	66(64.7%)
12.	Problem of choosing the right technological solution	157(61.1%)	87(33.9%)	55(53.9%)	47(46.1%)
13.	The public do not consider library theft to be a punishable offence	129(50.1%)	114(44.3%)	32(31.4%)	70(68.7%)
14.	Inadequate and non-functional library security measures	117(45.5%)	126(49.0%)	26(25.5%)	76(74.5%)
15.	Users can easily remove or tampered with some electronic security systems thereby reducing their effectiveness	105(40.9%)	139(54.1%)	20(19.6%)	82(80.4%)

Table 7 describes the challenges confronting security management in the selected academic libraries. It was revealed that most of the library users 197(76.6%) cited the problem of poor budgeting/inadequate funding of the library, which was also agreed to by 86(84.3%) of the library staff. Likewise, while 167(65.0%) of the library users cited inadequate staffing/personnel, most of the library staff 69(67.7%) indicated epileptic/erratic power supply to implement electronic security which was also affirmed by 151(58.8%) of the user respondents. On the other hand, while only few of the user respondents (72 or 8.0%) indicated common disaster occurrence like fire, flood, roof leakage, more than half of the library staff (55 or 53.9%) agreed that the problem existed. The result implies that security

management in the selected academic libraries was facing a number of challenges. It should be noted that security problems like poor lighting in important areas of the library, poor/non-implementation of security policy, and poor staff attitude to users, collection and security measures were all identified by the library users alone. Whereas, problems like common disaster occurrence – fire, flood, roof leakage was only acknowledged by the library staff alone.

Conclusion
The issue of security in academic libraries is a delicate issue which requires a holistic approach. In order to protect the patrons, staff, collections, and facilities, all staff must share responsibility for

safety and security. The security of the library resources and facilities, as well as the safety of staff and users should be at the heart of library management at all times. As the institutional repository, the library needs to be effectively managed and secured in order to ensure the continuous existence. This is the only way by which the users' satisfaction can best be guaranteed. The rate of crimes and security breaches in libraries and information centers nowadays is rapidly growing such that if care is not taken, it will be very difficult to curtail and control. If the libraries are to truly justify the basis of their existence, that is, support the teaching learning and research activities of their institutions, they should, as a matter of urgency and necessity, provide a lasting solution to all the barriers that impede effective library security management.

Recommendations
The following recommendations were made based on the findings of this study.

1. Competent security personnel should be made available to man the entrances of the library. This is to help protect the valuable library heritage from being stolen and vandalized by delinquent library users and staff.
2. Where there are limited funds to provide for sophisticated security gadgets such as the close circuit television (CCTV) and other electronic security systems, alternative provisions such as frequent patrol of the reading areas, registration of personal property at entry points, etc. should be made to enhance the security system of the library.
3. As the library serves as the memory of the institutions and the nation, there is the need for government, both at the state and federal levels to come to the aid of libraries through special intervention. They can help in the provision and installation of electronic security systems in the libraries to further boost the security system.
4. Adequate funds should be made available to the library by the institution to provide for effective security system and facilities to safeguard the library resources, as well as the users' property.
5. The academic libraries need to develop a workable security policy and disaster management plan, which should be made available to staff and fully implemented for effective library security management.
6. The general security of the library should be seen by all the staff as a collective responsibility. The security of the library should not be left alone to an individual or the

management. This will make the staff to be security conscious at all times.
7. There is the need for regular cleaning and fumigation of the library and its surroundings to prevent insects, rats and rodents, as well as serpents from gaining access into the library to cause havoc to library information resources.
8. In order to tackle the problem of erratic and epileptic power supply which hampers the operation of electronic security system, libraries should make provisions for alternative source of power generation, which is not dependent on the national power supply.
9. It is very important that library staff develop positive attitude toward service delivery to the library clientele. The users should rather be seen as partners in progress and should always be accorded due respect. This will go a long way to build the users' trust in the library, and consequently improve the library security system.

References
Afolabi, M. (1993). Factors influencing theft and mutilation among library users and staff in Nigeria. *Journal of Leading Libraries and Information Centers* 1 (3/4): 2-8.

Agboola, A. T. (2001). Penetration of stock security in a Nigerian university library. *Lagos Librarian* 22 (1/2): 45-50.

Ajayi, N. A. (2003). Closed-access policy as a solution to library crime: perception and view of students. *Libri* 53: 221-225.

Ajegbomogun, F. O. (2004). Users' assessment of library security: a Nigerian university case study. *Library Management* 25 (8/9): 386-390.

Akinfolarin, W. A. (1992). Towards the improved security measures in Nigeria university libraries. *African Journal of Librarianship, Archival and Information Science* 2 (1): 51-56.

Akussah, H. (2006). The state of document deterioration in the National Archives of Ghana. *African Journal on Librarianship, Archival and Information Science* 16 (1): 1-8.

Akussah, H. and Winifred, B. (2010). Abuse of library materials in academic libraries: A study of the University of Cape Coast main library. *African Journal on Librarianship, Archival and Information Science* 20 (2): 103-112.

Atkins, S. S. and Weible, C. L. (2003). Needles in a haystack: Using interlibrary loan data to identify materials missing from a library's collection. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services* 27: 187- 202.

Aziagba, P. C. and Edet, G. T. (2008). Disaster – control planning for academic libraries in West Africa. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34 (3): 265-268.

Bello, M. A. (1997). Library security: Material theft and mutilation in technological university libraries in Nigeria. *Library Bulletin* 2 (1/2): 84-93.

Ewing, D. (1994). Library security in the UK: Are our libraries of today used or abused? *Library* management 15 (2): 18-26

Freddie, Y. (2003). Managing security and productivity challenges within libraries. 3M Asia Pacific Private Limited. Available: http://eprints.ukm.my/136/1/Managing_Security_And_Productivity_Within_Library.pdf

Holt, G. E (2007). Theft by library staff: The bottom line of managing library finances. 20 (2): 85-93.

Janus, K. M. (2001). Securing our history. *Library and Archival Security* 17 (1): 3-15.

Kumar M. and Haneefa, K. M. (2005). Security for libraries in the digital networked environment. *3rd International Caliber-2005*: 679-687.

Lorenzen, M. (1996). Security issues of academic libraries. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service*. Available: http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERIC

Maidabino, A. A. (2010). Collection security issues in Malaysian academic libraries: An exploratory survey. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available: http://un/lib.uni.edu/LPP/lpp 2010.htm

Mansfield, D. (2009). Reducing book theft at university libraries. *Journal of Library and Information Research* 33 (103): 10-15.

Moris, J. (1996). *Library disaster preparedness handbook*. Chicago: America Library Association.

Mullen, K. L. and Gaumond, G. (2009). Safety and security in academic libraries: The administrator's role. Available: http://teach.valdosta.edu/klmullen/documents/7800_safety-security_paper.pdf

Nielsen, E. (2002). Library security management: An introduction. *Liber Quarterly* 12: 293-295.

Omoniyi, J. O. (2001). The security of computer and other electronic installations in university libraries. *Library Management* 22 (6/7): 272-277.

Popoola, S. O. (2003). *Preservation and conservation of information resources.* Ibadan: Distance Learning Series

Saffady, W. (2005). Risk analysis and control: Vital to records protection. *Information Management Journal* 39 (5): 62-64.

Sarmah, M. (2003). User level security management in a library network. Available: http:///Dl/Caliber_2003/te/7.htm

Senyah, Y. and Lamptey, R.B. (2011). Personal security and safety in academic libraries: A case study of the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology Library, Kumasi, Ghana. *Library & Archival Security* 24 (2): 83-91.

Simmond, P. L. (2001). Usage of Academic libraries: The role of service quality, resources and user characteristics. Available: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/miml387lis449/ai77811348.htm

Swartzburg, G. S., Bussey, H. and Garretson, F. (1991). Libraries and archives: Design and renovation with a preservation perspective. In Safety, security. emergency planning, and insurance. London: Scarecrow Press: 147-169.

Ugah, D. (2007). Evaluating the use of university libraries in Nigeria: A case study of Michael Okpara University of Agriculture. Available: http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/ugah2.htm.

Ungarelli, D. L. (1973). The empty shelves. *The bookmark* 32:155

Wallace, S. W. (2008). The perimeter of security policy as the bridge between library security philosophy and library security practice. A Master's paper for MS in LS Degree. 1-44.

Weiss, D. (1981). Book theft and book mutilation in a large urban university library. *College and Research Libraries* 42: 341-346