

**INFORMATION NEEDS, ACCESSIBILITY AND UTILIZATION OF LIBRARY
INFORMATION RESOURCES AS FACILITATORS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF
LECTURERS IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE SCHOOLS IN NIGERIA**

G.O. Onifade

College Librarian,

Michael Otedola College of Primary Education, Noforija, Epe, Lagos, Nigeria

tundeonifade2013@gmail.com

&

S.O. Popoola

Senior Lecturer,

Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies,

University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

drpopoolaso@yahoo.com.uk

ABSTRACT

Despite various efforts at improving the quality and learning outcome in library schools at the university level in Nigeria, many students are still performing below expectation. This has been traced to low level of teaching effectiveness of lecturers. This paper, therefore, examined the contributions of information needs, accessibility and utilization of library information resources to teaching effectiveness of lecturers in library and information science schools in Nigeria. Total enumeration technique coupled with a questionnaire was used to collect data on a population size 265 lecturers in 24 universities in Nigerian, out of which 200 responded given a response rate of 76%. The study found that information needs, accessibility and utilization of library information resources had significant collinear relationship with teaching effectiveness of the respondents. In addition, information needs, accessibility and utilization of library information resources significantly facilitated teaching effectiveness of the respondents. More so, each of the independent variables: information needs, accessibility and utilization of library information resources has relative contribution and significantly facilitates teaching effectiveness of the respondents. The paper concluded that more focus needs to be on the practice of teaching at the university level. Consequently, it is recommended that the university authorities should consider information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs for teaching effectiveness of lecturers.

Key words: *Information needs, Accessibility and utilization of library, Information resources, Teaching effectiveness of lecturers, Library and information science schools, Nigeria*

Introduction

The teaching effectiveness or performance of lecturers in universities in general and with specific reference to Library and Information Science Schools (LIS) in Nigeria, is of interest to many groups, including the general public, university faculty, students, administrators, makers of public policy, and higher education scholars. Consequently, an avalanche of literature in teaching effectiveness of lecturers in these institutions has been generated over the years by researchers and scholars not only in Nigeria, but the world over. Teaching effectiveness is an instructor's degree of

success in facilitating student learning (Cochran, Coppard, Gabriel, Furze, Keefner, Monaghan, Rayniovich, Jensen, Schwey & Hayes 2005). Lecturers are one of the key elements in any institution and effective teaching is one of the key propellers for school improvement (Ko, Sammons & Bakkum, 2013). Just as students require support to ensure maximum achievement of educational objectives, lecturers who are in charge of delivery of instruction require an institutional support structure that enables and encourages them to teach with excellence and effectiveness.

Each institution has long publicly endorsed the notion that excellence in teaching and excellence in research go hand in hand hence steps toward developing more effective campus-wide assessment mechanisms for the evaluation of teaching have been taken in high institutions of learning. There are numerous tools used for collecting evidence of faculty performance quality. Braskamp and Ory (1994) cited the following assessment tools: evaluations by student and peers, as well as self-evaluation, of teaching; the evaluative conference, evaluative letters from colleagues and experts in the field; and portfolios that explicate professional accomplishment. Berk (2005) also identified twelve potential sources of evidence to measure teaching effectiveness namely student ratings, peer ratings, self-evaluation, videos, student interviews, alumni ratings, employer ratings, administrator ratings, teaching scholarship, teaching awards, learning outcome measures, and teaching portfolios.

The forms of teaching evaluation may vary by education system, and by levels within systems, there are three commonly articulated purposes for it (Robinson & Campbell, 2010): the first is that it serves a performativity ideology, whereby public-sector services, including schooling, are required to develop greater accountability to their stakeholders, including parents, students, tax payers, and policy-makers. A second purpose is to provide robust evidence upon which lecturers' promotion and career development can be equitably supported. Thirdly, teacher evaluation serves as an important element in assessing school effectiveness. This purpose envisages the teacher in the classroom as part of the wider school context. Teacher evaluation is thereby constructed as, potentially, a major mechanism for school improvement, assuming it is used formatively.

Information is germane to the teaching functions of the lecturers in library and information science schools in Nigeria. Lecturers operate in an academic environment where information is needed for teaching and research. Information needs of lecturers in LIS schools in Nigeria are as diverse as the academic tasks before them. Information needs could be described as the extent to which information is required by lecturers in relation to their jobs. Various kinds of library information resources (LIRs) are required to meet their teaching, research, conferences, workshops, seminars, general administration, grants, and projects needs among other. It is believed that the profession or the type of job performed dictates the nature of LIRs required by information user (Emasealu, 2014) which are in different formats: textbooks, journals, e-resources, newspapers and magazines, reports, and Internet facilities. These LIRs are expected to be carefully selected, procured, organized, preserved and disseminated to the lecturers and students.

Availability and timely access to library and information resources is indispensable to teaching and research. It is often believed that a library is as good as its patronage. The objective of the university library is to provide access to LIRs. As more information is developed using computer and network technologies, university libraries play an increasingly important role in ensuring access for lecturers and students to the Internet and other information resources. The state or a circumstance which permits a lecturer to reach and obtain with freedom LIRs for use is termed accessibility to library information resources. It is the ease of locating and retrieving a piece of information from the storage medium by lecturers in the university library. Easy access to LIRs enables the lecturers not only to locate or identify LIRs but also saves the time of lecturers and students. Therefore,

information sources are expected to be efficient and effective so that they can provide relevant, useful, and accurate information that can help lecturers to perform their academic responsibilities

The essence of seeking information is primarily related to its demand and utilization. Library information resources are the important services of the university library. Lecturers in LIS schools are expected to be in dire need of LIRs for their teaching functions. Utilization of LIRs refers to the practical and adequate use of resources and materials of information identified and acquired by the user for the purpose as solving a problem (Emesaelu, 2014). It is the effective consumption or correct application of information to improve the teaching effectiveness of lecturers. Unegbu (2007) argued that utilization of LIRs is goal oriented with the aim of solving a problem believing that identification determines the utilization of LIRs. Abiolu (2010), Ezeala and Yusuff (2011), Mubashrah, Riaz-ul-Haq and Shaziah (2013) submitted that the use patrons made of a library has been characterized as the ultimate test of its effectiveness". It is the users that make the library and its services come alive. The use to which the university library is put infuses life into its resources and services. Therefore, LIRs must not just be made available in the right quantity and at the right time, but also must be accurate and their sources credible, reliable and received within the closest proximity to users. Essentially, LIRs are expected to be available, and accessible without any barrier to obtain for use.

Review of Related Literature

Lecturers in LIS schools in Nigeria are compelled to seek and obtain information from the available sources and use it to address uncertainties that may adversely affect their teaching effectiveness and institutional success. Studies show interrelatedness of information needs and the job performed. The essence of obtaining information from a particular source is geared towards the satisfaction of a particular need. Oyedum (2009), Shivalingappa and Tadasad (2008) and Khan and Shafique (2011) all contended that the information needs of lecturers are job related, that is, for teaching, research and publication. Akinola (2009) found that university lecturers seek information for teaching and research works noting that the increase in information available on the Internet has greatly affected the information seeking pattern of lecturers. Echezona (2005) reported that biological science lecturers needed information for teaching and research. In the same vein, Okogwu and Nnam (2013) also investigated the information needs and seeking behaviour of social science lecturers of Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria and reported that lecturers sought information for educational purposes, which include doing research work, writing and presenting papers and updating knowledge.

The university library is expected to meet all the information needs of lecturers by providing library information resources both in print and electronic forms so as to satisfy their academic and administrative needs. The university library is also expected to market its products and services to increase the level of awareness of the lecturers of the availability of these products and possibly discover deficiencies in the provision of LIRs. Studies have confirmed that accessibility of LIRs is a prerequisite to utilization (Ugah, 2008, Odunlade, 2012). Odunlade (2012) submitted that where there is access to LIRs, utilization could be guaranteed stressing further that availability and accessibility of LIRs are inseparable factors in determining resource utilization. Adeogun (2006) argued that the value of information services in the present information dispensation was not possessing information but providing access to it and more importantly in developing the organizational and technological capabilities in the end-user to be able to identify access, sift and determine the validity of information. However, information obtained at times may not be used immediately or might be out rightly discarded when not needed eventually.

Seth and Parida (2006) opined that availability of LIRs and services does not automatically translate to information accessibility and use. They argued further that the problems of transmission, storage, and display of information have been combined with the problem of getting information to users quickly. Retrieval tools are expected not only to be provided in the library but efficient to assist lecturers to access LIRs with a view to saving their precious time. Therefore, efficient and effective provision of LIRs can have positive impact on academic achievement (Williams, Wavell & Coles 2001 cited in Mubashrah, Riaz & Shaziaah 2013). Arif and Meadows (1994) noted that once users of information became aware of an information source, there is every tendency for them to use it. This implies that information sources which users are not aware of might be underutilized. Umunadi (2009) noted that lecturers' utilization of relevant library information resources in teaching facilitates learning and enhances student achievement. The kind of information required depends on the job performed. Agba, Kigongo-Bukenya, and Nyumba (2004) found that academic staff at Makerere University in Uganda used library electronic information resources for teaching and research, while Nazan and Kurbanoglu (1998) reported that scholars in a Turkish university preferred the use of print materials such as encyclopedia, dictionaries and periodicals for teaching and research.

The emergence of Information Communication Technologies (ICT) has increased considerably the sources of information available to lecturers. Krubu, Okoh, Ebunuwele and Odion (2012) found that ICT is an indispensable tool in teaching, learning and research processes while students also attested to the fact that ICT has contributed immensely to their academic performance. Anas (2012) observed a trend among the students of Pondicherry University, India that most of them preferred electronic resources as compared to the conventional resources but at the same time, strongly believed that the conventional resources should also be maintained side by side.

There exist a significant relationship between provision of relevant LIRs and its effective utilization (Haruna & Oyelekan 2010, Anyaogu, 2014). Users' satisfaction is the concern of university libraries. Azubogu and Madu (2007) reported a high and satisfactory level of use of e-resources by the respondents studied. Adeoye and Popoola (2011) also reported that the available LIRs were highly utilized by the lecturers of the institution they studied, and more importantly, that utilization of LIRs positively correlates significantly with teaching effectiveness. It has been observed that students' performances in library schools in Nigeria are not encouraging as a result of low level of teaching among lecturers. This paper, therefore, examined the contributions of information needs, accessibility and utilization of library information resources to teaching effectiveness of lecturers in library and information science schools in Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are to:

- i. find out the major information needs of lecturers in LIS schools in Nigeria;
- ii. ascertain the most accessible library information resources to the library school teachers;
- iv. determine the major library information resources utilized by these school teachers;
- v. find out the level of teaching effectiveness of library school teachers in Nigeria;
- vi. determine whether there exists any correlation among information needs, accessibility, and utilization of library information resources and teaching effectiveness of lecturers in LIS schools in Nigeria; and
- vii. investigate the joint contribution of information needs, accessibility and utilization of library information resources on teaching effectiveness of lecturers in library and information science schools in Nigeria.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses guided the conduct of this study and they were tested at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance:

HO₁: There are no significant correlations among information needs, accessibility of library information resources, utilization of library information resources and teaching effectiveness of lecturer in LIS schools in Nigeria.

HO₂ : Information needs, accessibility and utilization of information resources will not significantly facilitate the teaching effectiveness of lecturers in LIS schools in Nigeria.

Methodology

The survey research design of correlational type was adopted. The study population comprised lecturers in 24 universities in Nigeria. Total enumeration technique was used to cover a population size of 265 teachers in universities in Nigeria. A set of questionnaire entitled: "Information Needs, Accessibility and Utilization of library information resources and Teaching Effectiveness of Teachers (INACUTE)" scale was used for data collection. The research instrument had five main sections. Section 'A' focused on demographic information of the respondents such as name of institution, highest educational qualification, academic status, subject background, and work experience (in years). Section 'B' dealt with information needs of the respondents, also measured on a 4-point scale by asking the respondents to score each source type as follows: always needed (AN)=4, sometimes needed (SN)=3, needed (N)=2 and never needed (NN)=1, with a co-efficient reliability of 0.82 using Guttman Split-half method. Section 'C' dealt with accessibility of library information resources to the respondents. It was measured on a 4-point scale with responses ranging from very easily accessible (VEA)=5 to not accessible (NT)=1. It had a coefficient of 0.93 using Cronbach-alpha method. Section 'D' dealt with utilization of library information resources by the respondents. It was measured on a 4-point scale by making the respondents to score each source type as follows: very highly utilized (VHU) =4, highly utilized (HU) =3, occasionally utilized (OU) =2 and never utilized (NU) =1.

It had a coefficient reliability of 0.92 using Cronbach-alpha method. Section 'F' dealt with teaching effectiveness of the respondents. It is a 22-item teaching effectiveness inventory developed by Popoola (2008). It was revalidated and a reliability coefficient of 0.82 was obtained using Cronbach-alpha method. It is a 5-point scale with response ranging from excellent=5 to poor=1. Six hired and trained postgraduate students drawn from the Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan, Nigeria administered the questionnaire on the 265 teachers from the 24 chosen universities out of which 200 responded and their questionnaire were found valid for analysis. The response rate achieved was 76%. The questionnaire administration and retrieval is reflected in Table 1. The data collection lasted for nine months as a result of the trade dispute between the Academic Staff Union of Nigerian University (ASUU) and the federal government, that is, May, 2013 - January, 2014

Table 1: Questionnaire Administration and Retrieval

Universities	Copies of questionnaire			Response Rate (%)
	Distributed	Returned	Usable	
MU	10	10	10	5.0
DELSU	10	10	10	5.0
AAU	16	12	12	6.0
ESUST	11	08	08	4.0
UNILORIN	11	05	05	2.5
ASU	08	05	05	2.5
BIU	06	05	05	2.5
FUTM	17	14	14	4.0
ISU	14	10	10	5.0
BUK	16	09	09	4.5
UNIUYO	04	03	03	1.0
UNIMAID	13	03	03	3.0
UNN	14	10	10	5.0
BU	11	07	07	3.5
UMYU	07	05	05	2.5
UI	15	10	10	5.0
ABU	15	10	10	6.0
BSU	12	11	11	5.5
KSU	05	05	05	2.5
AU	05	05	05	2.5
ATBU	05	14	14	2.5
UNIZIK	10	10	10	5.0
UNICAL	10	08	08	4.0
TASUED	07	06	06	3.0
N	265	200	200	76

Key

MU = Madonna University

DELSU = Delta State University

AAU = Ambrose Alli University

ESUST = Enugu State Univ. of Sc. & Tech.

UNILORIN = University of Ilorin

ASU = Abia State University

BIU = Benson Idahosa University

FUTM = Federal Univ. of Tech., Minna

ISU = Imo State University

BUK = Bayero University, Kano

UNIUYO = University of Uyo

UNIMAID = University of Maiduguri

UNN = University of Nigeria, Nsukka

UMYU = Umaru Musa Yar'Adua University

UI = University of Ibadan

ABU = Ahmadu Bello University

BSU = Benue State University

KSU = Kwara State University

AU = Adeleke University

ATBU = Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University

UNIZIK = Nnamdi Azikiwe University

UNICAL = University of Calabar

TASUED = Tai Solarin University of Education

BU = Babcock University

Findings

Demographic Profiles of the Lecturers (Respondents)

The gender distribution of the respondents shows that 132 (66.0%) were males while 38 (34.0%) were females. This implies that there are more male lecturers than female lecturers in the surveyed library schools in Nigeria. Perhaps this may be connected to low career interest among female graduates in teaching profession as compared to their male counterparts. Ugah (2007) reported that more men were found in most Nigerian federal universities than females. This gender differential is attributed to the culture and traditions in African countries and was corroborated by Aina (2012) who also opined that more men enrolled in Nigerian federal universities than females.

Majority of the respondents, that is, 165 (83%) were adults between the age-group 21-60. Their educational qualifications distribution showed that 82(41.0%) had master degree in Library and Information Science (LIS), 58 (29.0%) had PhD degree in LIS 35 (17.5%) had Bachelor degree in LIS, while 25 (12.5%) did not indicate their qualifications. This indicates that a good number of them (MLS and PhD combined) have the requisite qualifications to teach in library schools in Nigeria. Their working experience ranged between 6 and 26 years and above; while 60 (30%) of them have education as their subject background, with some others having a postgraduate diploma in education. This implies that a little above 30% of the respondents have teaching qualification.

Information Needs of the Lecturers

Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation scores of different items measuring the information needs of lecturers in LIS schools in Nigeria. The results showed that lecturers tend to exhibit high information needs; indicated by high mean scores for all 10 statements. Majority of the respondents indicated that they would always need information on: teaching and research (X = 3.78); other educational matters (X = 3.60); current affairs (X = 3.53); health/social welfare (X = 3.42); and general administration (X 3.32)

Table 2: Information Needs of Lecturers in LIS Schools in Nigeria

S/N	Information Needs	NN	N	SN	AN	Mean	Std.
1	Teaching and research	1(.5%)	15(7.5%)	10(5.0%)	174(87.0%)	3.78	.59
2	Other educational matters	4(2.0%)	20(10.0%)	27(13.5%)	149(74.5%)	3.60	.75
3	Current affairs	4(2.0%)	20(10.0%)	43(21.5%)	133(66.5%)	3.53	.76
4	Health/Social welfare	5(2.5%)	17(8.5%)	67(33.5%)	111(55.5%)	3.42	.75
5	General administration	6(3.0%)	32(16.0%)	55(27.5%)	107(53.5%)	3.32	.85
6	Governmental/Political issues	4(2.0%)	36(18.0%)	65(32.5%)	95(47.5%)	3.26	.82
7	Community service	2(1.0%)	28(14.0%)	95(47.5%)	75(37.5%)	3.22	.72
8	Business and economic affairs	4(2.0%)	30(15.0%)	91(45.5%)	75(37.5%)	3.18	.76
9	Technical/Scientific	5(2.5%)	37(18.5%)	97(48.5%)	61(30.5%)	3.07	.77
10	Environmental management	5(2.5%)	47(23.5%)	83(41.5%)	65(32.5%)	3.04	.81

*Always needed (AN) = 4, Sometimes needed (SN) = 3, Needed (N) = 2, and Not needed (NN) = 1

Most Accessible LIRs to the Lecturers

Table 3 presents accessibility to LIRs by the lecturers. Respondents had access to a variety of LIRs both print and electronic. The most accessible LIRs with mean scores of above 3.07 were books (X=3.55); encyclopedia (X=3.20); dictionaries (X=3.20); journals (X=3.08) and newspapers/magazines (X = 3.07). In addition, reports, almanacs and gazettes were the least accessible LIRs to the lecturers in the universities studied.

Table 3: Accessibility of Library Information Resources to Lecturers

S/N	Accessibility of LIRs	NA	A	EA	VEA	Mean	Std.
1	Books	-	22(11.0%)	45(22.5%)	133(66.5%)	3.55	.69
2	Encyclopedia	1(.5%)	40(20.0%)	77(38.5%)	82(41.0%)	3.20	.77
3	Dictionaries	1(.5%)	44(22.0%)	68(34.0%)	87(43.5%)	3.20	.80
4	Journals	8(4.0%)	52(26.0%)	56(28.0%)	84(42.0%)	3.08	.92
5	Newspapers\Magazines	6(3.0%)	49(24.5%)	70(35.0%)	75(37.5%)	3.07	.86
6	Computers	13(6.5%)	54(27.0%)	62(31.0%)	71(35.5%)	2.96	.94
7	Theses\Dissertations	8(4.0%)	67(33.5%)	66(33.0%)	59(29.5%)	2.88	.88
8	Internet facilities	14(7.0%)	60(30.0%)	69(34.5%)	57(28.5%)	2.85	.92
9	Handbooks	10(5.0%)	75(37.5%)	56(28.0%)	59(29.5%)	2.82	.92
10	Computer printouts	18(9.0%)	69(34.5%)	49(24.5%)	64(32.0%)	2.80	.99
11	Bibliographies	16(8.0%)	81(40.5%)	57(28.5%)	46(23.0%)	2.66	.92
12	CD-ROM facilities	30(15.0%)	66(33.0%)	49(24.5%)	55(27.5%)	2.64	1.04
13	Abstracts\Indexes	19(9.5%)	75(37.5%)	69(34.5%)	37(18.5%)	2.62	.89
14	Radio\Television	43(21.5%)	55(27.5%)	37(18.5%)	65(32.5%)	2.62	1.15
15	Conference proceedings	16(8.0%)	90(45.0%)	52(26.0%)	42(21.0%)	2.60	.91
16	Directories	21(10.5%)	78(39.0%)	65(32.5%)	36(18.0%)	2.58	.90
17	Atlases\Maps	22(11.0%)	82(41.0%)	56(28.0%)	40(20.0%)	2.57	.93
18	Manuals	24(12.0%)	78(39.0%)	61(30.5%)	37(18.5%)	2.55	.93
19	Biographies	19(9.5%)	92(46.0%)	58(29.0%)	31(15.5%)	2.50	.87
20	Reports	31(15.5%)	80(40.0%)	56(28.0%)	33(16.5%)	2.46	.94
21	Almanacs	24(12.0%)	97(48.5%)	50(25.0%)	29(14.5%)	2.42	.88
22	Gazettes	50(25.0%)	72(36.0%)	53(26.5%)	25(12.5%)	2.26	.97

*Very easily accessible (VEA)=4, Easily accessible (EA)=3, Accessible (A)=2, Not accessible (NA)=1

Major LIRs Utilized by the Lecturers

Table 4 shows the mean and standard deviation scores of utilization on LIRs by the lecturers. The major LIRs utilized by the respondents were books (X=3.57), Internet facilities (X=3.23), journals (X=3.18), newspapers/magazines (X=3.09), computers (X=3.04), and dictionaries (X=3.02). In addition, bibliographies, atlases/maps, reports, biographies, directories, manuals, almanacs and gazettes are LIRs that were occasionally utilized by the respondents.

Table 4: Utilisation of Library Information Resources by Lecturers

S/N	Utilization of LIRs	NU	OU	HU	VHU	Mean	Std.
1	Books	6(3.0%)	13(6.5%)	43(21.5%)	138(69.0%)	3.57	.75
2	Internet facilities	8(4.0%)	36(18.0%)	58(29.0%)	98(49.0%)	3.23	.88
3	Journals	6(3.0%)	35(17.5%)	76(38.0%)	83(41.5%)	3.18	.83
4	Newspapers\Magazines	9(4.5%)	34(17.0%)	86(43.0%)	71(35.5%)	3.09	.84
5	Computers	11(5.5%)	49(24.5%)	61(30.5%)	79(39.5%)	3.04	.93
6	Dictionaries	4(2.0%)	54(27.0%)	76(38.0%)	66(33.0%)	3.02	.83
7	Theses\Dissertations	10(5.0%)	54(27.0%)	78(39.0%)	58(29.0%)	2.92	.87
8	Encyclopedia	8(4.0%)	68(34.0%)	73(36.5%)	51(25.5%)	2.83	.86
9	CD-ROM facilities	19(9.5%)	57(28.5%)	67(33.5%)	57(28.5%)	2.81	.96
10	Computer printouts	33(16.5%)	49(24.5%)	49(24.5%)	69(34.5%)	2.77	1.10
11	Conference proceedings	13(6.5%)	73(36.5%)	74(37.0%)	40(20.0%)	2.71	.86
12	Radio\Television	36(18.0%)	54(27.0%)	52(26.0%)	58(29.0%)	2.66	1.08
13	Abstracts\Indexes	9(4.5%)	104(52.0%)	63(31.5%)	24(12.0%)	2.51	.76
14	Handbooks	15(7.5%)	103(51.5%)	54(27.0%)	28(14.0%)	2.48	.83
15	Bibliographies	15(7.5%)	117(58.5%)	49(24.5%)	19(9.5%)	2.36	.76
16	Atlases\Maps	15(7.5%)	131(65.5%)	39(19.5%)	15(7.5%)	2.27	.71
17	Reports	25(12.5%)	116(58.0%)	44(22.0%)	15(7.5%)	2.24	.77
18	Biographies	22(11.0%)	121(60.5%)	44(22.0%)	13(6.5%)	2.24	.73
19	Directories	17(8.5%)	132(66.0%)	44(22.0%)	7(3.5%)	2.20	.64
20	Manuals	17(8.5%)	137(68.5%)	34(17.0%)	12(6.0%)	2.20	.67
21	Almanacs	23(11.5%)	129(64.5%)	36(18.0%)	12(6.0%)	2.19	.71
22	Gazettes	43(21.5%)	102(51.0%)	34(17.0%)	21(10.5%)	2.16	.88

*Very heavily utilized (VHU)=4, Heavily Utilized (HU)=3, occasionally utilized (OU)=2, Not utilized (NU) = 1

Lecturers' Level of Teaching Effectiveness

Lecturers in library and information science schools in Nigeria tend to exhibit high level of teaching effectiveness (Table 5). This is premised on the high ratings given to items 1 - 11 (>3.40) which indicated that teaching effectiveness was based on crucial factors that can bring about success in teaching like expertise of the lecturer (X=3.65), lecturer's personal integrity and character (X=3.57), lecturer's use of the appropriate teaching method and strategy (X=3.55), clarity of the lecturer's explanation (X=3.54), Clarity of the curriculum in stating course objective, course outlines and parameters for grades (X=3.46), communication skills of the lecturer (X=3.43), human relations of the lecturer (X=3.43), regular use of continuous assessment as part of final score in the course examination by the lecturer (X=3.41), class management and control of the course lecturer (S=3.41), teacher's respect for students individual differences (X=3.41), and fairness of question and scoring procedure of the teacher (X=3.40). Furthermore, from the test norm of teaching effectiveness scale, the total maximum score of 110 is permissible. A score of 1-36 indicates low teaching effectiveness, 37-72 indicates moderate teaching effectiveness and 73-110 indicates high teaching effectiveness. Since the mean score of the respondents is (x=74.73, SD=19.30) and falls within the range of 73=110, one can therefore deduce that the teaching effectiveness of the respondents is high.

Table 5: Teaching Effectiveness of the Lecturers

S/N	Teaching Effectiveness	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Mean	Std.
1	Expertise of the course teacher	14 (7.0%)	13 (6.5%)	54 (27.0%)	67 (33.5%)	52 (26.0%)	3.65	1.14
2	Teachers personal integrity and character	20 (10.0%)	18 (9.0%)	44 (22.0%)	65 (32.5%)	53 (26.5%)	3.57	1.25
3	Teachers use of the appropriate teaching method and strategy	16 (8.0%)	18 (9.0%)	48 (24.0%)	77 (38.5%)	41 (20.5%)	3.55	1.15
4	Clarity of teachers explanation	17 (8.5%)	15 (7.5%)	53 (26.5%)	72 (36.0%)	43 (21.5%)	3.54	1.16
5	Clarity of the curriculum in stating course objective, course outlines and parameters for grades	22 (11.0%)	10 (5.0%)	55 (27.5%)	80 (40.0%)	33 (16.5%)	3.46	1.16
6	Communication skills of the teacher	19 (9.5%)	16 (8.0%)	63 (31.5%)	63 (31.5%)	39 (19.5%)	3.43	1.17
7	Human relations of the teacher	20 (10.0%)	24 (12.0%)	47 (23.5%)	68 (34.0%)	41 (20.5%)	3.43	1.23
8	Regular use of continuous assessment as part of final score in the course examination by the teacher	16 (8.0%)	13 (6.5%)	65 (32.5%)	85 (42.5%)	21 (10.5%)	3.41	1.03
9	Class management and control of the course teacher	14 (7.0%)	22 (11.0%)	60 (30.0%)	76 (38.0%)	28 (14.0%)	3.41	1.08
10	Teachers respect for students individual difference	23 (11.5%)	22 (11.0%)	48 (24.0%)	64 (32.0%)	43 (21.5%)	3.41	1.26
11	Fairness of question and scoring procedure of the teacher	16 (8.0%)	20 (10.0%)	63 (31.5%)	71 (35.5%)	30 (15.0%)	3.40	1.11
12	Teachers class attendance and punctuality	18 (9.0%)	21 (10.5%)	51 (25.5%)	85 (42.5%)	25 (12.5%)	3.39	1.12
13	Teachers stimulation of the students interest in this course	18 (9.0%)	16 (8.0%)	62 (31.0%)	79 (39.5%)	25 (12.5%)	3.38	1.09
14	Adequacy of the course materials	20 (10.0%)	15 (7.5%)	67 (33.5%)	72 (36.0%)	26 (13.0%)	3.35	1.11
15	Teachers ability in relating course materials to real life situation	24 (12.0%)	17 (8.5%)	56 (28.0%)	72 (36.0%)	31 (15.5%)	3.35	1.20
16	Clarity of evaluation	21	18	56	81	24	3.35	1.13

	criteria of the teacher	(10.5%)	(9.0%)	(28.0%)	(40.5%)	(12.0%)		
17	Time management of the course teacher	21 (10.5%)	21 (10.5%)	60 (30.0%)	64 (32.0%)	34 (17.0%)	3.35	1.19
18	Clarity of teachers presentation	21 (10.5%)	22 (11.0%)	60 (30.0%)	62 (31.0%)	35 (17.5%)	3.34	1.20
19	Relevant of the course materials to the course outlines	21 (10.5%)	16 (8.0%)	67 (33.5%)	69 (34.5%)	27 (13.5%)	3.33	1.13
20	Quick feedback to students on graded assignments, class tests and examination by the course teacher	27 (13.5%)	25 (12.5%)	46 (23.0%)	74 (37.0%)	28 (14.0%)	3.25	1.24
21	Teachers record of students class attendance	22 (11.0%)	21 (10.5%)	65 (32.5%)	69 (34.5%)	23 (11.5%)	3.25	1.14
22	Adequacy of the tutorial hours and methods	18 (9.0%)	26 (13.0%)	70 (35.0%)	64 (32.0%)	22 (11.0%)	3.23	1.10

Teaching Effectiveness, Information Needs, Accessibility and Utilization of LIRs of the Lecturers

The test of the first hypothesis shows that there are significant correlations between the information needs ($r = 0.485$, $P < 0.05$), accessibility of LIRs ($r = 0.407$, $P < 0.05$), utilization of LIRs ($r = 0.427$, $P < 0.05$) and teaching effectiveness of the respondents as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Summary of Test of Significant Correlations Among the Variables of Interest

Variable	N	X	SD	Teaching Effectiveness (r)	Sig p
Information Needs	200	33.51	4.184	0.485	0.009*
Accessibility of LIRs	200	60.69	12.357	0.407	0.002*
Utilization of LIRs	200	58.67	10.211	0.427	0.002*
Teaching Effectiveness	200	74.73	19.301	1.000	-

*LIRs = *Library information resources*

The results from the data analysis in Table 7 revealed that the three independent variables (information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs) had significantly facilitated the teaching effectiveness of the respondents ($F=3.294$, $P < 0.05$). The result also shows that information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs had significant multiple correlation (adjusted $R^2=0.7956$, $P < 0.05$) with the teaching effectiveness of the respondents and a multiple adjusted R^2 of 0.633. This means that 63.3% of the variance in teaching effectiveness of the respondents was accounted for by the independent variables, when taken together.

Table 7: Joint Contribution of Independent Variables (Information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs) in facilitating Teaching Effectiveness among the LIS Lecturers in Nigeria

	Adjusted R			Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
	0.7956			.633	18.9758
A N O V A					
Model	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig. P
Regression	3557.976	3	1185.992	3.294	.022
Residential	70575.899	196	360.081		
Total	74133.875	199			

Data analysis as shown in Table 8 revealed that each of the independent variables: information needs ($B = 0.860$, $p < .05$), accessibility of LIRs ($B = 0.175$, $p < .05$), and utilization of LIRs ($B = 0.244$, $p < .05$) significantly facilitated teaching effectiveness of the respondents. More so, information needs (Beta = 0.186) had the highest relative contribution of 18.6%, followed utilization of LIRs (Beta = 0.129) with relative contribution of 12.9% and accessibility of LIRs (Beta = 0.112) with relative contribution of 11.2% and to facilitating the teaching effectiveness of the respondents.

Table 8: Relative Contribution of Independent variables (Information needs, LIRs Accessibility and Utilization) on Teaching Effectiveness among Academic Staff in LIS in Nigeria

Model	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient		Standardized Regression Coefficient	T	Sig. P
	B	Std. Error	Beta Contribution		
(Constant)	42.213	12.229		3.452	.001*
Information Needs	.860	.335	.186	2.566	.011*
Accessibility	.175	.031	.112	5.645	.005*
Utilization	.244	.057	.129	4.281	.021*

* Sig. at $p < 0.05$

Discussion of the Findings

Lecturers in Library and information schools in Nigeria are unique users of information, with specific information requirements relevant to the job they perform that involve teaching, research, and community service among others. In the process of instructional delivery and conducting research, they acquire needed information from various sources. Lecturers' information needs cut across academic, administrative, political, economic, scientific and technological and these are based on the components of their academic environment. The study revealed that the major types of information needs for teaching effectiveness of the respondents were teaching and research, other educational matters, current affairs, health/social welfare, and general administration. Akinola (2009) and Oyedum (2009) affirmed that lecturers in universities in Nigeria prefer and acquire information on teaching, and research among others.

The study also found that most accessible LIRs are books, encyclopaedia, dictionaries, journals, and newspapers/magazines. This finding agrees with that of Odunlade (2012) who had earlier reported that accessibility of LIRs is a precondition to utilization. Adeogun (2006) is of the opinion that the value of information services in the present information dispensation is not possessing information but providing access to it and more importantly in developing the organizational and technological capabilities in the end-user to be able to identify access, sift and determine the validity of information. Therefore, retrieval devices that will assist the lecturers to access LIRs are expected to be effective so as to save their precious time. Library personnel are also expected to be on ground in anticipation of users' needing their attention.

Furthermore, the study found that the major LIRs utilized for effective teaching of the respondents were books, Internet facilities, journals, newspapers/magazines, computers, and dictionaries. The finding is in line with Nazan and Kurbanoglu (1998) who reported that scholars preferred the use of print materials such as encyclopaedia, dictionaries and periodicals for teaching and research. Anas (2012) also noted a trend among the respondents studied that most of them prefer electronic resources as compared to the conventional resources but at the same time, they strongly believe that the conventional resources should also be maintained side by side. This implies that both print and e-resources are still good materials for the university libraries. Subair (2015) reported that a positive significant relationship exists between students' study habit and their library usage. Therefore there is the need for user education so that the university library could be patronized by its academic community.

The results of the study also reveal that lecturers in library and information science schools in Nigeria tend to exhibit high level of teaching effectiveness. Ko, Sammons and Bakkum (2013) were of the opinion that lecturers are one of the key elements in any institution and effective teaching is one of the key propellers for school improvement. Just as students require support to ensure maximum achievement of educational objectives, lecturers who are delivering instruction require an institutional support structure that enables and encourages them to teach with excellence and effectiveness.

One of the major findings of this study is that there is a significant correlation among information needs, accessibility of LIRs, utilization of LIRs and teaching effectiveness of the respondents. Akinola (2009) and Oyedum (2009) asserted that information needs are job related. The job function of lecturers is teaching and that they need LIRs for teaching. This implies that there is a correlation between information needs and teaching effectiveness of lecturers. Odunlade (2012) reported that accessibility of LIRs is a prerequisite to utilization. However, the fact that a lecturer is aware of the existence of an information resource does not imply that the lecturer has access to it or utilizes it. However, availability of LIRs would always lead to accessibility. Emasealu (2014) also submitted that utilization of LIRs is determined by the duty performed and the kind of profession to which one belongs. Lecturers as academics utilize LIRs for teaching. This further lends credence to the fact that a significant correlation exists between utilization of LIRs and teaching effectiveness of the respondents.

Another major finding of this study is that the joint contributions of information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs are significant to the teaching effectiveness of the respondents. It has been established that each of the independent variables (information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs) correlates significantly well with teaching effectiveness of the respondents. The implication is that the independent variables (information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs) are significant predictors of teaching effectiveness of the respondents.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Public education is under ever increasing scrutiny, and will probably continue to be so well into the future. If schools are going to improve to the level where the needs of all students are met, then more focus needs to be on the practice of teaching. Therefore, every lesson presented by lecturers in institutions of higher learning is delivered within an academic environment. Information is a critical factor at every stage of lesson preparation. Lecturers in LIS schools render noble services to produce high quality graduates to face the modern challenges of information delivery, produce middle-level and high-level manpower needed to manage libraries, equip individuals with theoretical knowledge to teach in one or more areas in the field of library, archives and information science, and seasoned professionals to identify and conduct research into problem areas of the information profession.

Thus, lecturers in LIS schools in Nigeria need sufficient, current and timely LIRs for effective teaching, which are expected to be well organized and accessible for effective utilization. There exists a link between information needs and the jobs performed. Lecturers perform teaching functions and that they are always in need of LIRs for teaching, research and public service. The university libraries are expected to provide LIRs to meet the information needs of the lecturers. Accessibility of LIRs is also a prerequisite to their utilization. There is also a significant relationship between provision of relevant LIRs and effective utilization and that users' satisfaction is the concern of university libraries. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the university authorities should consider information needs, accessibility and utilization of LIRs for teaching effectiveness of lecturers. Furthermore, professional development should be encouraged among lecturers for effective teaching, while functional university libraries should be established to supply needed LIRs for effective teaching.

REFERENCES

- Abiolu, O. A. (2010). The effects of user education programmes on academic performance of non-fresh undergraduates in a Nigerian university. *Owena Journal of Library and Information Science*, 3 (2) 1-12.
- Adeogun, M. (2006). The challenges of modern tertiary education system: paradigm shifts for educators and information professionals in sub-Saharan Africa. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 16 (1): 45-54.
- Adeoye, S. & Popoola, S.O. (2011). Teaching effectiveness, availability, accessibility and use of library and information resources among teaching staff of schools of nursing in Osun and Oyo States, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved Oct. 26, 2012, from <http://unllib.unl.edu/LLP/adeoye-popoola.htm>.
- Aina, O.A (2012). *Two halves make a whole: Gender at the crossroads of Nigerian development agenda*. Inaugural lecture series 250th. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria, 67.
- Anas, K. (2012). Utilization of e-resources in Pondicherry University Library: a case study. *International Journal of Computer Engineering & Technology IJCET*, 3 (1): 29-37.
- Anyagou, U. (2014). *Legal information resources availability, accessibility, utilization and demographic characteristics as factor influencing law lecturers' research productivity in universities in Nigeria*. PhD Thesis. Post-field presentation. University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Arif, M. & Meadows, A. K. J. (1994). The provision of information to industry: A comparative study of Saudi Arabia and U.K. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 26 (1): 29-34.
- Azubogu, N. & Madu, C. (2007). Use of computer and Internet technology among the teaching staff of Imo State University, Owerri. *H-JOLIS: Heartland Journal Library and Information Science*, 1 (2): 38-49.

- Berk, A. (2005). Survey of strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1): 48-64.
- Braskamp, L. & Ory, J. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: enhancing individual and institutional performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cochran, T., Coppard, B., Gabriel, L., Furze, J., Keefner, K., Lenz, T., Monaghan, M, Rayniovich, W., Jensen, G., Schwery, L. & Hayes, M. (2005). *Evaluating and documenting teaching effectiveness: challenges and opportunities*. School of Pharmacy and Health Professions, The Creighton University Working Document. 2.
- Echezona, R. I. (2005). The use of information resources by lecturers in biological sciences in the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. *Global Review of Library and Information Science*, 1(1): 19-38.
- Emesaelu, H. E. (2014). *Information needs, accessibility, and utilization of library information resources as determinants of psychological well-being of prison inmates in Nigeria*. PhD, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Ezeala, L. O. & Yusuf, E. O. (2011). User satisfaction with library resources and services in Nigerian agriculture institutes. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available at <http://webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/ezeala-yusuf.pdf>. (Accessed 9 March, 2015).
- Haruna, I. & Oyelekan, .G O. (2010). Provision and utilization of information resources and services in Nigerian Defence Academy (NDA) Library, Kaduna. *The Information Technologist*, 7:1-9, Available at URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ict.v7i1.60426> (Accessed 10 February, 2015).
- Khan, S. A. & Shafique, F. (2011). Information needs and information-seeking behaviour: A survey of college faculty at Bahawalpur. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available at <http://unlib.unl.edu/llpkhan-safique.html>. (Accessed 12 March, 2015).
- Ko, J., Sammons, P. & Bakkum, L. (2013). *Effective teaching: a review of research and evidence*. The Hong Kong Institute of Education and University of Oxford. i.
- Krubu, D.E., Okoh, M.I., Ebunuwele, G.E., & Odion, F. (2012). Extent of use of information and communication technology (ICT) by undergraduates in Edo State. *Delta Library Journal*, 6 (1): 60-70.
- Macgregor, R. R. (2007). The essential practices of high quality teaching and learning: a review of literature prepared for The Center for Educational Effectiveness, Inc. Available at www.effectiveness.org.
- Mubashrah, J., Riaz-ul-Haq, T., & Shazia, J. (2013). Library resources: utilization by teachers and students. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 35 (2): 19-35.
- Odunlade, R. O. (2012). *Information resources utilization and teaching effectiveness of lecturers in federal polytechnics in Nigeria*. PhD thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Okogwu, F. I. & Nnam, M. U. (2013). Information needs and information seeking behaviour of social science lecturers of Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki. *Nigerian Libraries* 46 (1):1-13.
- Oyedum, G. U. (2009). Information seeking behaviour of faculty members of Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria. *Gateway Library Journal*, 12 (2): 38-51.
- Robinson, W. & Campbell, J. (2010). *Evaluation of teacher quality and practice*. In Encyclopedia of Education. Third edition. Oxford: Elsevier, vol.3: 674-679.
- Saleh, A. G. (2011). Educators' perspective on library education in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available at <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/saleh.html>
- Seth, M. K. & Parida, B. (2006). Information needs and use pattern of disadvantaged communities: A case study. *Library Philosophy and Practice* 9 (1). Available at <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin.seth.htm>



- Shivalingappa, A. & Tasasad, P. G. (2009). Use of Gram Panchayat Libraries in Gulbarga District: a study. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 46 (1): 149-161.
- Subair, M.O. (2015). Study habits and library usage among undergraduates in federal universities in south-west Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 7 (1): 1-9.
- Ugah, D. (2007). Evaluating the use of university libraries in Nigeria: A university. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available at <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/ugah.html>
- Unegbu, A.N. (2007). *The information user: Issues and themes*. 2nd ed. Okigwe: Whytem Publishers, Nigeria.