University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)   Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

December 2018

Users' Perception for Quality Service Delivery in Albert Ilesanmi Ilemobode Library, Federal University Of Technology Akure (FUTA)

Ishola Bolanle Clifford Mr
Department of Library and Information Science, Federal Polytechnic Ede, Osun State, sholacliff@gmail.com

Peter Oluwaseyi
Department of Library and Information Science, Federal Polytechnic Ede, Osun State

Egbewale Funmilola Afolake
Department of Library and Information Science, Federal Polytechnic Ede, Osun State

Emida Adenike Adesola
Department of Library and Information Science, Federal Polytechnic Ede, Osun State

Olanlokun Eunice Olayinka
Department of Library and Information Science, Federal Polytechnic Ede, Osun State

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

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

Users' Perception for Quality Service Delivery in Albert Ilesanmi Ilemobode Library, Federal University Of Technology Akure (FUTA)

Ishola Bolanle Clifford, CLN

Olofingbuaro Peter Oluwaseyi

Egbewale Funmilola Afolake

Emida Adenike Adesola

&

Olanlokun Eunice Olayinka

All the authors are of   the Department of Library and Information Science, Federal Polytechnic Ede, Osun State

Abstract

The study investigated Users' perception for quality service delivery in Albert Ilesanmi Ilemobode Library, Federal University of Technology Akure (FUTA). The descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study; the major instrument for generating data collection was the questionnaires. In carrying out the research, a case study research method was adopted while the researchers made use of random sampling techniques. The Sampling size for this research consists of 10% of registered post graduate students of Albert Ilesanmi Ilemobode Library; hence 200 respondents were selected for the study. However, only 192 respondents completed and returned the questionnaires. The data collected were analyzed using frequency tables, and percentages. The findings of the study showed that the library was used more frequently by students. The perceptions of the quality of library services were found to be satisfactory in the library. The library environment and information resources were considered adequate by Albert Ilesanmi Ilemobode Library users, the most valued aspects of the library were the library collections, and the friendliness and willingness of library staff to assist users. It was also found that users derived a number of benefits from using the library. In the view of above findings the research recommended that the academic library should have a specific guideline for measuring their value. The research work considers the nature of library value and made recommendations for improving library services.

Keywords: Academic libraries; User Satisfaction, Library Services, Service Quality, Value

.

Introduction

University education in Nigeria is facing a critical challenge in meeting new demands of the 21st century, with its ever increasing population growth, inadequate library facilities, resources and insufficient funding. Adequate library resources and services, at the appropriate level for degrees offered is required to support the intellectual, cultural, and technical development of students enrolled in Nigerian universities.(Ishola, 2015)

It is no longer news in library and information science environment that the user in a 'king' and all library processes revolve around users hence the mission statement of any library should be the provision of excellent services to its users. Users require different services and libraries are expected to provide a variety of services to them. Even within one type of library, users demand different services. The services demanded are not static; as users' needs are dynamic, requiring different services at different times. It is therefore the duty of libraries to ensure that they provide services that meet the requirement of their users at all times. Though, many factors such as information explosion, technological revolution ,changing user expectations, escalating library cost and increasing competition from other information providers and web based commercial service operators has raised a number of challenges in provision of excellent service delivery to the 21st century library users. (Aina, 2004 and Adekunmisi, 2017)

On the other hand those who invest in libraries and their institutions are concerned about the outcomes and impact of their investments, while the economic down turn has dove-tail into dwindling budgets making it difficult for university library managers to provide excellent service delivery to users. The information constrain notwithstanding, library users continue to seek quality service delivery from university library operators hence this study seek to investigate the users perception for quality service delivery in university libraries in reference to Federal University of Technology Library (FUTA)Akure.

Objectives of the study

To address the research problem, the objectives of the study were to:

    i.   Investigate evidence of use of the library services.

    ii.   Investigate the purpose for which staff and students use the library.

    iii.   Find out users' perceptions of the services quality offered by the library.

    iv.   Find out users' perceptions of value of the services offered by the library.

    v.   Find out if users are satisfied with the library services

Research Questions

In an attempt to achieve the aim of the study, the objectives were broken down into research questions. Each of the questions below was derived from the objectives which must be answered to resolve the problem of the research. The research questions guiding this study were:

1. How frequently do users patronize the library services?

2. For what purposes do users use the library?

3. What is the perception of service quality of the library?

4. Are users satisfied with the services of the library?

5. What is the perception of the value of the library?

Literature Review

Chang (2016) asserts that Quality has a pragmatic interpretation as the non-inferiority or superiority of something; it is also defined as fitness for purpose. Quality is a perceptual, conditional, and somewhat subjective attribute and may be understood differently by different people. Consumers may focus on the specification quality of a product/service, or how it compares to competitors in the marketplace. Suzsanna (2014) defines quality as the grade of goodness, excellence; that which makes a thing what it is. The concept of quality was mainly applied to products in the manufacturing sector. Quality as viewed by Andrew (2017) is an elusive concept . Definitions range from the vague (e.g. 'the totality of characteristics of an entity that bear on its ability to satisfy stated and implied need'(1)) to the Martini advert ("doing the

right thing, at the right time, in the right way, for the right person - and having the best possible results"(2)). In defining the concept we either let it escape butterfly-like from our grasp or transfix it upon a pin. In either case we lose sight of what really constitutes quality Auka (2012) hold the view that quality derives from the assessment of what customers expected before using a product or service and their experience of what was delivered. Therefore, in the case of the academic library, if the service provided meets users information needs or expectations it can be considered that there is quality service. That is, when the information provided meets users' needs and expectations and it is used by them, it might have a positive impact on users.

According to Sahu (2007), within the library and information science field, service quality refers to the difference between users' expectations and actual service delivery. Experts present various requirements for achieving service quality in academic libraries. Hernon, Nitecki and Altman (1999) described service quality in academic libraries as comprising three main issues: the information resources, the environment in which service is delivered and service provided by staff. Rajan (2001). States that a library needs to fulfill user expectations. The application of quality management in libraries is to establish a culture of continuous improvement of quality of products and services. Its implementation in libraries improves the image of the library staff and helps in public relations and marketing. Similarly, Pindlowa (2002) mentioned that the quality of an academic library is related to services it provides to users, the space it offers for users and staff services.

According to Kitana and Saydam (2014), if a library is able to make available precise information at the time it is needed by users and in a desired form, then, it is providing quality service. Quality library services mean satisfying the requests of the individual user, fully and quickly. However, the basic principles that underpin quality management are based on the continuing improvement of services, adopting a customer focused approach, and responding to the needs and activities of all other stakeholders (Kulkarni andDeshpande2012). Verzosa (2011) indicated that library service quality demands: Continuous improvement of services against the users' expectation, acknowledging the interdependence of content, technology, facilities and (human) service and responding to user perceptions.

Research Methodology

The population of the study consisted of 2000 Post graduates students of Federal University of Technology Akure of Federal University of Technology Akure. A simple random sampling technique was used to select two hundred (200) post-graduate students out of 2000 post graduate students of Federal University of technology. The main instruments used to collect field data were structured questionnaires. The questionnaires were designed by taking into account the objectives of the study. It helped the respondents to offer relevant information needed for the study. The justification for the use for the questionnaires was that it helped the respondents to answer the questions at their convenient time. It reduced respondents' bias since the same questionnaires were answered by the respondents and variation of questions was eliminated. The data collected for this study through the instrument (questionnaire) was analyzed and interpreted using simple percentage. In analyzing the data, descriptive statistical method and simple percentage of data analysis was employed.

Table 1: Population and Sample

Federal University of Technology Akure	Total population of the library users	Sample of the Study	Percentage of the Population Sampled
Post graduate students	2000	200	10%
Total	2000	200	100%

Source: University library

Table 2:   Rate of Questionnaires Returned

Item	Figures	Percentage
Number of questionnaire administered	200	100%
Number of questionnaire retrieved	192	96%

A total of two hundred (200) copies of questionnaire were distributed and one hundred and eighty (192) copies were retrieved representing 96% return rate

Table 3: Level of Patronage of the library

S/N	How frequently do users patronize the library services?		frequency	percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
1.	Everyday	Yes	120	62.5	62.5	62.5
		No	72	37.5	37.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
2.	Once in a week	Yes	67	34.9	34.9	34.9
		No	125	65.1	65.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	
3.	Twice or more in a week	Yes	149	77.6	77.6	77.6
		No	43	22.4	22.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	
4.	Once in a month	Yes	22	11.5	11.5	11.5
		No	170	88.5	88.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
5.	Twice or more a month	Yes	32	16.7	16.7	16.7
		No	160	83.3	83.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
6.	Once or twice a semester	Yes	17	8.9	8.9	8.9
		No	175	91.1	91.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	
7.	Never use	Yes	5	2.6	2.6	2.6
		No	187	97.4	97.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	

Source: field survey 2017.

The above table shows the level of patronages of respondents to library services. One hundred and twenty (120) respondents which corresponds 62.5% agree that they usually visit the library every day while seventy two respondents which corresponds 37.5% disagree. For users opinion on the frequency of users patronage on never use, five (5) respondents which corresponds 2.6% said yes while one hundred and eighty seven respondents (187) which corresponds 97.4% replied no.

Table 4: Purpose of using the Library

S/N	For what purpose do you use the library?		Frequency	percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
1.	To borrow and read library materials	Yes	130	67.7	67.7	67.7
		No	62	32.3	32.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
2.	To work on my assignment/project	Yes	170	88.5	88.5	88.5
		No	22	11.5	11.5	100
		Total	100	100	100	
3.	To prepare for examination	Yes	185	96.3	96.3	96.3
		No	7	3.7	3.7	100
		Total	100	100	100	
4.	To read my personal notes	Yes	110	57.3	57.3	57.3
		No	82	42.7	42.7	100
		Total	192	100	100	
5.	To read for leisure	Yes	85	44.3	44.3	44.3
		No	107	55.7	55.7	100
		Total	192	100	100	
6.	Use Internet facility	Yes	54	28.1	28.1	28.1
		No	138	71.9	71.9	100
		Total	192	100	100	
7.	See reference librarian	Yes	90	46.9	46.9	46.9
		No	102	53.1	53.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	
8.	Use academic library database	Yes	50	26.0	26.0	26.0
		No	142	74.0	74.0	100
		Total	192	100	100	
9.	If other please specify	Yes	5	2.6	2.6	2.6
		No	187	97.4	97.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	

The above table shows the views of respondents on purpose of using the library. One hundred and thirty (130) respondents which corresponds 67.7% agree that they usually borrow and read library materials while sixty two (62) respondents which corresponds 32.3% disagree.. While on whether the purpose of using the library is to work on their assignment/project, one hundred and seventy respondents (170) which corresponds 88.5% agree while twenty two(22) respondents which corresponds 11.5% disagree.

 For users opinion whether they use library purposely to prepare for examination, one hundred and eighty five (185) respondents which corresponds 96.3% said yes, while seven (7) respondents which corresponds 3.7% said no. For respondents view on whether their purpose of using library is to read their personal notes one hundred and ten respondents which corresponds 57.3% agree while eighty two (82) respondents which corresponds 42.7% disagree.

Table 5:   Perception of Service Quality of the Library.

S/N	How do you rate the quality of the following services provided by the library?		frequency	percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
1.	Reference service	Excellent	90	46.9	46.9	46.9
		Good	55	28.7	28.7	75.6
		Average	35	18.2	18.2	93.8
		Poor	12	6.3	6.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
2.	E-resources	Excellent	60	31.3	31.3	31.3
		Good	82	42.7	42.7	74.0
		Average	40	20.8	20.8	94.8
		Poor	10	5.2	5.2	100
		Total	192	100	100	
3.	Photocopying/printing/scanning services	Excellent	70	36.5	36.5	36.5
		Good	65	33.9	33.9	70.4
		Average	45	23.4	23.4	93.8

		Poor	12	6.2	6.2	100
		Total	192	100	100	
4.	Publishing services	Excellent	32	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Good	40	20.8	20.8	37.5
		Average	65	33.9	33.9	71.4
		Poor	55	28.6	28.6	100
		Total	192	100	100	
5.	Newspapers services	Excellent	65	33.9	33.9	33.9
		Good	70	36.5	36.5	70.4
		Average	35	18.2	18.2	88.6
		Poor	22	11.5	11.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
6.	Internet/Computer	Excellent	55	28.6	28.6	28.6
		Good	75	39.1	39.1	67.7
		Average	40	20.8	20.8	88.5
		Poor	22	11.5	11.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
7.	Access to electronic Newspapers services	Excellent	50	26.0	26.0	26.0
		Good	60	31.3	31.3	57.3
		Average	70	36.5	36.5	93.8
		Poor	12	6.3	6.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
8.	Bibliographic Services	Excellent	67	34.8	34.8	34.8
		Good	112	58.3	58.3	93.1
		Average	9	4.6	4.6	97.7
		Poor	4	2.3	2.3	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
9.	Binding Services	Excellent	90	46.8	46.8	46.8

		Good	75	39.0	39.0	85.8
		Average	12	6.4	6.4	94.0
		Poor	15	7.8	7.8	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
10.	Renting facility services	Excellent	70	36.4	36.4	36.4
		Good	65	33.8	33.8	70.2
		Average	28	14.5	14.5	84.7
		Poor	29	15.2	15.2	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
11.	Access to social media services	Excellent	103	53.6	53.6	53.6
		Good	77	40.1	40.1	93.7
		Average	8	4.2	4.2	97.8
		Poor	4	2.0	2.0	100
		Total	192	100	100	
12.	E-mail services	Excellent	98	51.0	51.0	51.0
		Good	54	28.1	28.1	79.1
		Average	30	15.6	15.6	94.7
		Poor	10	5.3	5.3	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
13.	Access to electronic databases services (relevant to your research need)	Excellent	113	58.8	58.8	58.8
		Good	60	31.2	31.2	90.0
		Average	11	5.7	5.7	95.7
		Poor	8	4.3	4.3	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
14.	C D ROM services	Excellent	85	44.2	44.2	44.2
		Good	60	31.2	31.2	75.4
		Average	32	16.8	16.8	92.2
		Poor	15	7.8	7.8	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
15.	Reprographic	Excellent	114	59.3	59.3	59.3

	services	Good	51	26.5	26.5	85.8
		Average	15	7.8	7.8	93.6
		Poor	12	6.4	6.4	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
16.	Abstract and Indexing services	Excellent	78	40.6	40.6	40.6
		Good	59	30.7	30.7	71.3
		Average	36	18.9	18.9	90.2
		Poor	19	9.8	9.8	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
17.	Television services	Excellent	56	29.1	29.1	29.1
		Good	63	32.8	32.8	61.9
		Average	23	11.9	11.9	73.9
		Poor	50	26.2	26.2	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
18.	Research materials (journals, topics, project and business articles publish)	Excellent	114	59.3	59.3	59.3
		Good	52	27.1	27.1	86.4
		Average	18	9.3	9.3	95.7
		Poor	8	4.3	4.3	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
19.	Selection and dissemination services	Excellent	100	52.1	52.1	52.1
		Good	56	26.2	26.2	78.3
		Average	28	14.8	14.8	92.8
		Poor	8	4.2	4.2	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	
20.	Current Awareness Services	Excellent	96	50	50	50.0
		Good	25	13.02	13.02	63.0
		Average	36	18.7	18.7	81.7
		Poor	35	18.4	18.4	100.0
		Total	192	100	100	

Source: field survey 2017.

The above table explains the Perception of service quality provided by the library according to the respondent's point of view. While rating the quality of service provided by the library in reference service, ninety (90) respondents which corresponds 46.9% agree that reference service provision in the library is excellent, fifty five (55) respondents which corresponds 28.7% said the reference service is good, thirty five (35) respondents said the service is average, while twelve (12) respondents which corresponds 6.3% said the service is poor.

While rating the E-resources service, sixty (60) respondents which corresponds 31.3% said the service is excellent. Eighty two (82) respondents which corresponds 42.7% said the service is good. Forty respondents which corresponds 20.8% said the service is average. While ten (10) respondents which corresponds 5.2% said the E- resources service is poor. For photocopying/printing/scanning services, seventy (70) respondents which corresponds 36.5% said the service is excellent, sixty five (65) respondents which corresponds 33.9% said the service is good. Forty five respondents which corresponds 23.4% said the service is average while twelve (12) respondents which corresponds 6.2% said the service is poor.

.

Table 6: Users Satisfaction with the Services of the Library

S/N	Please indicate your satisfaction with the following library services		frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
1.	Reference service	Excellent	85	44.3	44.3	44.3
		Good	65	33.8	33.8	78.1
		Average	22	11.5	11.5	89.6
		Poor	20	10.4	10.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	
2.	E-resources	Excellent	90	46.8	46.8	46.8
		Good	80	41.7	41.7	88.5
		Average	12	6.3	6.3	94.8
		Poor	10	5.20	5.20	100
		Total	192	100	100	
3.	Photocopying/printing/scanning	Excellent	75	39.1	39.1	39.1

	services	Good	60	31.3	31.3	70.4
		Average	40	20.8	20.8	91.2
		Poor	17	8.8	8.8	100
		Total	192	100	100	
4.	Publishing services	Excellent	30	15.6	15.6	15.6
		Good	47	24.5	24.5	40.1
		Average	60	31.3	31.3	71.4
		Poor	55	28.6	28.6	100
		Total	192	100	100	
5.	Newspapers services	Excellent	70	36.5	36.5	36.5
		Good	65	33.8	33.8	70.3
		Average	37	19.3	19.3	89.6
		Poor	20	10.4	10.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	
6.	Internet/Computer	Excellent	72	37.5	37.5	37.5
		Good	75	39.1	39.1	76.6
		Average	20	10.4	10.4	87
		Poor	25	13	13	100
		Total	192	100	100	
7.	Access to electronic Newspapers services	Excellent	52	27	27	27
		Good	70	36.5	36.5	63.5
		Average	60	31.3	31.3	94.8
		Poor	10	5.20	5.20	100
		Total	192	100	100	
8.	Bibliographic Services	Excellent	55	28.6	28.6	28.6
		Good	70	36.5	36.5	65.1
		Average	30	15.6	15.6	80.7
		Poor	37	19.3	19.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
9.	Binding Services	Excellent	50	26	26	26
		Good	50	26	26	52
		Average	42	22	22	74
		Poor	50	26	26	100

		Total	192	100	100	
10.	Renting facility services	Excellent	70	36.5	36.5	36.5
		Good	65	33.9	33.9	70.4
		Average	28	14.5	14.5	84.9
		Poor	29	15.1	15.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	
11.	Access to social media services	Excellent	80	41.7	41.7	41.7
		Good	75	39.1	39.1	80.8
		Average	20	10.4	10.4	91.2
		Poor	17	8.8	8.8	100
		Total	192	100	100	
12.	E-mail services	Excellent	65	33.9	33.9	33.9
		Good	75	39.1	39.1	73
		Average	22	11.4	11.4	84.4
		Poor	30	15.6	15.6	100
		Total	192	100	100	
13.	Access to electronic databases services (relevant to your research need)	Excellent	40	20.8	20.8	20.8
		Good	60	31.2	31.2	52
		Average	35	18.2	18.2	70.2
		Poor	57	29.8	29.8	100
		Total	192	100	100	
14.	C D ROM services	Excellent	30	15.6	15.6	15.6
		Good	55	28.6	28.6	44.2
		Average	50	26	26	70.2
		Poor	57	29.8	29.8	100
		Total	192	100	100	
15.	Reprographic services	Excellent	45	23.4	23.4	23.4
		Good	47	24.5	24.5	47.9
		Average	52	27.1	27.1	75
		Poor	48	25	25	100
		Total	192	100	100	
16.	Abstract and Indexing services	Excellent	43	22.3	22.3	22.3
		Good	60	31.3	31.3	53.6
		Average	24	12.5	12.5	66.1
		Poor	65	33.9	33.9	100
		Total	192	100	100	
17.	Television services	Excellent	32	16.7	16.7	16.7
		Good	40	20.8	20.8	37.5

		Average	40	20.8	20.8	58.3
		Poor	80	41.7	41.7	100
		Total	192	100	100	
18.	Research materials (journals, topics, project and business articles publish)	Excellent	90	46.9	46.9	46.9
		Good	72	37.5	37.5	84.4
		Average	20	10.4	10.4	94.8
		Poor	10	5.20	5.20	100
		Total	192	100	100	
19.	Selection and dissemination services	Excellent	30	15.6	15.6	15.6
		Good	22	11.5	11.5	27.1
		Average	55	28.6	28.6	55.7
		Poor	85	44.3	44.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
20.	Current Awareness Services	Excellent	57	29.7	29.7	29.7
		Good	31	16.1	16.1	45.8
		Average	27	14.1	14.1	59.9
		Poor	77	40.1	40.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	

Source: field survey 2017.

The above table examine the level of User's satisfaction with the following library services . eighty five(85) respondents which corresponds 44.3% agree that reference service provision in the library is excellent, sixty five (65) respondents which corresponds 33.8% said the reference service is good, twenty two (22) respondents which corresponds 11.5% said the service is average, while twenty (20) respondents which corresponds 10.4% said the service is poor. For respondents opinion about the level of satisfaction provided by the library in E-resources service, ninety (80) respondents which corresponds 41.7% said the service is excellent. Eighty (80) respondents which corresponds 41.7% said the service is good. Twelve (12) respondents which corresponds 6.3% said the service is average. While ten (10) respondents which corresponds 5.2% said the E- resources service is poor.

For Access To Electronic Databases Services (relevant to your research need) , forty (40) respondents which corresponds 20.8% said the level of satisfaction of service is excellent , sixty (60) respondents which corresponds 31.2% said the service is good, thirty five(35) respondents

which corresponds 18.2% said the service is average ,while fifty seven (57) respondents which corresponds 29.8% said the service is poor.. While examine the level of satisfaction provided by the library in Reprographic Service , forty five (45) respondents which corresponds 23.4% said the service is excellent , forty seven (47) respondents which corresponds 24.5% said the service is good , fifty two (52) respondents which corresponds 27.1% said the service is average, while forty eight (48) respondents which corresponds 25% said the service is poor.

.

Table :7   Perception Of Value Of The Libraries By The Users

S/N	Perception of value as most valued by you		frequency	percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
1.	Do you value the activities in Reference services	Yes	120	62.5	62.5	62.5
		No	72	37.5	37.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
2.	Do you value the activities in lending services	Yes	67	34.9	34.9	34.9
		No	125	65.1	65.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	
3.	Do you value the activities in E-resources	Yes	149	77.6	77.6	77.6
		No	43	22.4	22.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	
4.	Do you value the activities in photocopying/printing/scanning/binding/laminating	Yes	22	11.5	11.5	11.5
		No	170	88.5	88.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
5.	Do you value the activities in Newspapers service	Yes	32	16.7	16.7	16.7
		No	160	83.3	83.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
6.	Do you value the activities in internet/computer	Yes	17	8.9	8.9	8.9
		No	175	91.1	91.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	

7.	Access to electronic News papers services	Yes	5	2.6	2.6	2.6
		No	187	97.4	97.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	
8.	Do you value the activities in Bibliographical services	Yes	92	47.92	47.92	47.92
		No	100	52.08	52.08	100s
		Total	192	100	100	
9.	Do you value the activities in binding services	Yes	80	41.7	41.7	41.7
		No	112	58.3	58.3	100
		Total	192	100	100	
10	Do you value the activities in documentation services	Yes	97	50.5	50.5	50.5
		No	95	49.5	49.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
11.	Do you value the activities in Access to Social Media services	Yes	122	63.5	63.5	63.5
		No	70	36.5	36.5	100
		Total	192	100		
12.	Do you value the activities in E-mail services	Yes	117	60.94	60.94	60.94
		No	75	39.06	39.06	100
		Total	192	100	100	
13.	Do you value the activities in Access to electronic data bases services (relevant to your research need)	Yes	150	78.1	78.1	78.1
		No	42	21.9	21.9	100
		Total	192	100	100	
14.	Do you value the activities in CD ROM services	Yes	65	33.9	33.9	33.9
		No	127	66.1	66.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	
15.	Do you value the activities in Reprographic services	Yes	72	37.5	37.5	37.5
		No	120	62.5	62.5	100
		Total	192	100	100	
16.	Do you value the activities in Abstract and Indexing services	Yes	85	44.3	44.3	44.3
		No	107	55.7	55.7	100
		Total	192	100	100	

17.	Do you value the activities in Television services	Yes	30	15.6	15.6	15.6
		No	162	84.4	84.4	84.4
		Total	192	100	100	
18.	Do you value the activities in research materials, (journals, topics, project and business articles publish)	Yes	147	76.6	76.6	76.6
		No	45	23.4	23.4	100
		Total	192	100	100	
19.	Do you value the activities in Selection and dissemination services	Yes	96	50	50	50
		No	96	50	50	100
		Total	192	100	100	
20.	Do you value the activities in Current Awareness services	Yes	90	46.9	46.9	46.9
		NO	102	53.1	53.1	100
		Total	192	100	100	

Source: field survey 2017.

The above table examines the Perception of value as most valued by the users. One hundred and twenty (120) respondents which corresponds 62.5% highly value the activities in the reference services while seventy two respondents (72) which corresponds 37.5% didn't . For the services rendered in lending services department, sixty seven respondents (67)which corresponds 34.9% value the activities in the lending service while one hundred and twenty five(125) respondents which corresponds 65.1% didn't . For the activities in selection and dissemination services, ninety six (96) respondents 50% value the services while the remaining ninety six (96) respondents which corresponds 50% didn't value the activities. However, while examine the activities in current awareness services, ninety (90) respondents which corresponds 46.9% value the activities while one hundred and two (102) respondents which corresponds 53.1% didn't value the activities in current awareness services.

Discussion of Findings

The findings in the selected institution revealed details about the Users perception for service quality in university library. Findings on the frequency of user's patronage to the library services revealed that the majority of the users patronize the use of internet 172 (58.3%) value the quality of internet facilities provided by the library. The findings supports Sharma (2001) which stated Quality library services mean satisfying the query of each and every user in all unit of the library to its users. From the reference service point of view, 90 (46.9%) agree that reference service provision in the library is excellent, The findings support Saleem (2014) which suggested that service quality provides a superior indicator of user satisfaction and indicated that service quality can influence satisfaction.

However, the findings about the perception of value of the library by the users revealed the perception of the users about their services One hundred and twenty (120) respondents which corresponds 62.5% highly value the activities in the library .The finding supports Steve (2010) which stated that users value internet services provided through the quality and accessibility of their resource.

Conclusion

The findings give an informative account that service quality is considered acceptable by users and most of the respondents used the library regularly which implies that the library is valuable to them. All services were well patronized except CD ROM and bibliographic instruction

The study also found that the library do not at present have any standard means of measuring their value. The library had previously been assessed in terms of the use of the collection and how satisfied their users are. Thus, the study concluded that service quality can be achieved in the Academic library if the institution can increase their information resources by adding very current books, journals and e-resources.

Recommendations.

Based on the findings from the study and the conclusion reached, the researcher would want to recommend as follows.

i. It is recommended that the institution should always publicize their services through the use of university websites, library guides and social media tools like Twitter and Facebook for optimum use so that users may derive value from their library.

ii. The institution should create different learning zones that suit the needs of different categories of users

iii. The management of federal university of technology library should regularly purchase relevant books and electronic databases to maintain a rich collection that supports the core function of the Academic Institution

iv. The Academic library should increase their information resources by adding very current books, journals and e-resources.

v. Though most of the respondents indicated the library have been valuable to them, it is still important for library staff to get closer to users, improve on all aspect of services for users to perceive the library as valuable.

vi. There should be systematic means of measuring their value by regularly gathering data that indicates the success of the library in relation to achieving the university goals.

References

Aina, L. O. (2004). *Library and Information Science Text for Africa*. Ibadan: Third World Information Services.

Auka, D. O. (2012). Service quality, satisfaction, perceived value and loyalty among customers in commercial banking in Nakuru Municipality, Kenya. *African Journal 166 of Marketing Management*. 4(5): 185-203. DOI: 10.5897/AJMM12.033. [2013, May 16].

Babbie, E. (2014). *The basics of social research*. 6th ed. Sydney: Wadsworth.

Garvin, D. (1983). Quality on the line. *Harvard Business Review*. 61, 65-73. Available: https://hbr.org/1983/09/quality-on-the-line [2015, November 13]. Ghana Institute of Journalism, 2013. *Annual Report*. Accra.

Hernon, P., Nitecki, D. & Altman, E. (1999). Service quality and customer satisfaction; an
assessment and future directions. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 25(1): 9-17.

.

  Ishola, B. C.(2014)   **Funding Problems in Nigerian University Libraries, Fee –
based Library Service to the Rescue: Focus on Pricing Policy**. Library Philosophy and
Practice. University of Nebraska – Lincoln Digital Commons@   University of
Nebraska – Lincoln.USA.

Kitana, A. & Saydam, S. (2014). Testing the service quality provided by the University of
Girne American Library. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*.
5(8): 55-61. Available: http://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_5_No_8_1_July_2014/7.pdf
[2015, April 12].

Kulkarni, M. & Deshpande, N. J. (2012). Empowering library users, establishing channel
of communication for service quality expectations of trainers from Government
Administrative Training Institute (ATI) libraries in India. *Proceedings of the World
Library and Information Congress 2012, 78th IFLA General Conference and
Assembly*.11-17 August 2012. Helsinki, Finland.

Pindlowa, W. (2002). High-quality information services to users as the fundamental
necessity for building a modern information society in the European Union. In:
*EBIB Electronic Information Bulletin for Librarians.*182

Sahu, A. K. (2007). Measuring service quality in an academic library: an Indian case study.
Library Review. 56(3): 234-243. DOI: 10.1108/00242530710736019 [2014, August
6].

Saleem, H. & Raja, N. S. (2014*).* The impact of service quality on customer satisfaction,

customer loyalty and brand image: evidence from hotel industry of Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*. 19(5):

Verzosa, A. F. (2011). Delivering service quality and satisfying library customers in a changing environment. The Lecture-Forum 26 April. Sta. Mesa, Manila.