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Certain emergent issues have necessitated cooperation and resource sharing among libraries. Some of such squeezing phenomena are: increase in bibliographic access of literature through internet and off-line database on CDs; explosion in published output; static or decreasing library budget, along high cost of published output. There is need to motivate librarians for resource sharing to ensure optimum utilization of available financial, physical, electronically and manpower resources. Therefore, the study set out to identify measures for promoting resource sharing for effective access and utilization of information among university libraries in Anambra and Enugu States. It adopted a survey design. Federal and State universities were purposively chosen from the two States. The population comprised all librarians in those universities. The sample was made up of senior librarians and above. Research questions guided the study. Questionnaire was constructed to address the research questions. Percentages and means were used in analyzing the data obtained. Problems associated with resource sharing and ways of dealing with them were identified. Based on what was identified, recommendations were made

INTRODUCTION

Academic libraries all over the World are established to support their parent institutions in actualizing their objectives of teaching, learning and research in different formats. No library, not even the largest and most comprehensive can fulfill all its users' needs. One of the objects of resource sharing is to enable the cooperating libraries to save money and to make their budgets go further, and at the same time maintain or improve the level of output, increase in bibliography access of literature through internet and off-line database on CDs, and in many cases decreasing budgets along with high cost of published output have made it virtually impossible for libraries and documentation/information centres to fulfill information needs of their primary clientele. These have forced the libraries to explore strategies such as resources sharing with greater intensity in order to provide more of the technology growth that enables libraries to construct a powerful infrastructure for sharing. Resource sharing is therefore one of the methods for demonstrating wise management of resources, diversity of ideas and methods

In this study, networking, alliance, association, consortium, cooperation and resource sharing can be used interchangeably. Nwal (2008) stated that the resource sharing as part of consortium building has become a critical success factor in the effectiveness and sustainability of academic and research library services. He sees resource sharing as method whereby libraries with common interest pool their materials, physical and human resources together in order to meet their clientele needs much more than they could have done were they to depend on individual effort. Nwal (2008) also define library resource sharing as a cooperative association of libraries of different types and its purpose is to share human and information resources so that the collective strength of the institutions facilitate the resource and learning of the members constituents. The economics of access versus ownership theory which state that source of potential saving from consortium delivery comes from the lower cost of access via consortium delivery than from other sources of delivery or purchasing a journal subscription. This source of saving only occurs if consortium delivery is the lowest cost method of access. In theory, a consortium of libraries which offers member's joint collection development and priority access to interlibrary loan can provide saving to library members
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Resource sharing brings about effective and efficient service through programs in cooperative acquisition, cooperative cataloging, sharing of human resources, access to electronic database harmonization of ICT application in library management and electronic content licensing (Nwalo 2008). For resource sharing to survive, there must be a policy and written agreement on the participating libraries. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in its National Programme Document (1995) defines resource sharing/network as two or more libraries engaged in a common pattern of information exchange through communications for some functional purpose while Franklin and Fredrick (2004) explained that library resource sharing is broadly described as a group of libraries coming together with some agreement of understanding to help each other.

Franklin and Fredrick (2004) explained that library resource sharing is broadly described as a group of libraries coming together with some agreement of understanding to help each other.

Historically, resource sharing is not a new phenomenon worldwide only that it has not recorded so much success story. Okeagu and Okeagu (2008) itemized some library network going on elsewhere. For example, South Africa in 1992 established the first formal library consortium called Cape library cooperation (CALICA). Five academic library consortia were established and their objectives were to promote formal relationship between members to foster collaboration and networking. United Kingdom library and information plan (LIP) was launched with the philosophy that LIP services are a national heritage and requires conscious national effort to maintain them. In order to promote resource sharing, the United States in 2005 launched a concept called Rethinking Resources Sharing initiative (RRS) which seeks to inspire libraries to meet user expectations through innovative resource sharing services. Collaborative collection development and management are essential means for coping with shrinking acquisition budget and enhancing the library resources available to all participants. According to Nwalo (2008), Yale University Library has provided historical development of library consortia as follows: Consortium in United States have been around since the 1930s (North Carolina) 1960 and 1990s shared cataloguing through OCLC and RLE, online cataloguing OCLC Worldwide and Netscape. The Rethinking Resource Sharing Committee’s manifesto (cited by Chen, 2007) Stated that:

If libraries want to expand and promote information accessibility, and to continue to be valued resources, we believe that libraries must improve their information delivery system. Aligning resource sharing workflow, collection policies, and discovery-delivery systems by significantly reducing service barriers and cost, and offering user service options are critical pieces that promote information access. The origin of formal inter-library cooperation in Nigeria has been traced to the meeting of the working group on inter-library lending held in 1974 at the instance of National library of Nigeria (Issa and Oyeleke, 2000). Nwalo (2008) stated that Kaduna conference looked beyond inter-library lending and recommended cooperative acquisition. In 1980, Committee of University Librarians in Nigeria Universities (CULNU) initiated another cooperative acquisition which failed due to lack of seriousness and non-participation of most libraries.

In Nigeria, five libraries are participating in the scheme out of the hundred that joined at the inception. The scheme is being supported by MacArthur foundation. In 2004, CULNU formed the Nigerian University consortium (NULIC). The objectives include (1) to promote resource sharing among members' libraries available and also ensure that member institutions contribute meaningfully towards sustaining the cooperation. Nigerian Universities NETWORK (NUNET) is another initiative by the Nigerian Universities Commission to encourage Universities to network and share information for academic and administrative functions while Nigerian periodical index (NPI) of CULNU and (NADICEST) Documentation and library centre for Science and Technology aimed at providing access to current and retrospective information on Science and technology to facilitate resource sharing (Okeagu and Okeagu, 2008). Cooperation is not only desirable in the acquisition of materials but resource sharing is its holistic nature. All academic libraries in Nigeria be it State or Federal experience common problems of inadequate collection, limited budget, untrained personal. Cooperative efforts may not only rescue troubled libraries economically, but also revitalize them and make them stronger and more effective (Ikem and Nwalo, 2001). In any resource sharing endeavor, there is need to develop both human and technical systems that will lead to success. Resource sharing is not the only strategies for dealing with the current problems facing libraries, but it is a strategy that holds promise for most. Libraries benefit a lot from resource sharing but with a lot of problems such as over-reliance on the new technology, lack of funding, lack of formal agreement etc. All partners must receive an acceptable benefit from it rather than working for individual short terms gains. In this end, State and Federal University libraries in Nigeria can be involved in the sharing of human and literature resources between themselves.

This paper therefore, was set out to indentify measures for promoting resource sharing for effective access and utilization of information between State and Federal University libraries. Similarly, problems hindering resource sharing between Federal and State University libraries in Nigeria would be examined with suggestions...
on how such problems could be alleviated.

Statement Of Problem.

The study conducted by Okeagu and Okeagu (2008); Edem, (2010); Omekwu and Anyaogu (2006) and Nwalo(2008),have shown that the global information explosion, the cut in budgetary allocation, the rising costs and complexities of information resources as well as the imperative to provide the user community with optimal access to needed information make resources sharing initiative indispensable. The paradigm shift from owning specific physical information items in a local collection to providing access to many information resources regardless of their format and location is a worldwide trend which university libraries in Nigeria cannot afford to ignore. The problem of this study therefore, is to identify measures for promoting resource sharing for effective access and utilization of information between state and federal university libraries in Anambra and Enugu state of Nigeria.

Objectives of the study

The following objectives that guided this study are to find out

1. the status of resources sharing in university libraries in Anambra and Enugu state
2. possible areas of resource sharing between Federal and State University libraries in the two States
3. if there is any documented policy on resource sharing in university libraries in the two states
4. the problems hindering resource sharing in University libraries.
5. the strategies to enhance resource sharing in University Libraries.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the Mean response on status of resource sharing in Federal and State University Libraries.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the Mean response ratings of libraries on problems that hinder resource sharing in Federal and State University Libraries.

Literature review

The need for access to information to support academic activities has shown libraries that this need could not be supplied with their own holdings due to money, manpower, and space. As a consequence of the perception of this situation, libraries started organizing networks and consortia with the aim of resource sharing. Lawal et al (2008), emphasis on a new humanistic resources sharing idea which considers love, sympathy and mutual aid as more important elements in human development. They further advised that cooperative enterprise is probably more logical and easier among individual entities whose resources, problems and aspiration are somewhat similar. Nwalo (2001) in his discussion mentioned that “Area of resource sharing deserved by the libraries include exchange of personnel, Inter-library lending, and joint financing of mutually beneficial projects especially pertaining to accessibility to electronic resources. Reitz (2004) explained that resource sharing is the activity that results from an agreement, formal and informal among a group of librarians (usually a consortium or network) to share collections, data facilities, personnel etc for the benefit of the users and to reduce the expense of collection development.

Usman (2006) in explaining the formalized arrangement of resource sharing made by international Federation of library Association (IFLA) (2002) stated that this arrangement is a common feature of collaboration between two or more libraries especially when the geographic and political borders separate the participants. For sharing to be successful, there should be mutual objectives, joint decision making processes and continuous improvement for all participants. Adekunle (1978) states that resources sharing among libraries is imperative as no single library can acquire all it needs. Globally, no library can claim bibliographic completeness in its collection and human development, but when placed in perspective of entire collection, resource sharing seems an important option out. Consortium supports resource sharing and provides services to users through programs in cooperative acquisition, access to electronic resource, access to physical collection, enhances interlibrary loan, and document deliver (Nwalo, 2008). He also opined that advances in ICT have facilitated resources sharing through computer networks, explaining further, he notes that more and more information are being made available by publishers electronically because of advances in ICT. He further in his study identified vast distances separating the libraries, lack of funding, improper planning and also notes that once the problems are addressed there is hope that university libraries in Nigeria will be able to depend on each other for assistance.

Aina (2001) also observed that many of the university library cooperation failed due to adoption of wrong strategies. The plethora of problems facing academic and resource libraries in Nigeria have no doubt resulted in the ineffectiveness of the libraries as studied have shown
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METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a survey design, descriptive survey
and also t-test for the testing of the Hypothesis. The area
of the study is Nigeria. Federal and State universities in
Enugu and Anambra states were purposively chosen, two
in Enugu and two in Anambra states. The population
comprised all librarians in those universities. The sample
was made up of senior librarians and above which comes
to eighty five in number Research questions guided the
study. Questionnaire was constructed to address the
research questions Eighty five copies of questionnaire
were distributed but a total of seventy copies were
returned. Percentages and mean were used in analyzing
the data obtained.

The following findings were made:

The organization of libraries into resource sharing
consortia and network are alternative to address the
former problems (Geronimo and Aragon 2008).
According to Tanvir (2005) success in exploration of new
means of resource sharing can help overcome the
financial constraints faced by most of our libraries and
information centers. New concepts can be adopted which
will ultimately open new vistas of knowledge to our
scientists, resources, policy makers, and planner. Edem
(2010) in her
1. The status of resource sharing in University
libraries. The four libraries are engaged in all the nine
activities of resource sharing to a small or low extent
(table 1). However, inter-library lending and document
delivery was ranked highest.

However, inter-library lending and document delivery
was ranked highest. This was followed by shared access
to electronic database and information services, while
electronic content licensing was ranked lowest. Inter-
library lending and document supply (ILDS) is for the
end-user probably the most visible exponent of library co-
operation. Libraries share their collections with others in
order to fulfill the requests for documentations from their
end users. That there are elements of resource sharing in
all the libraries goes to support Lawal (2008) that no
individual or group can profitably remain an island unto
itself.

A low level of resource sharing in Nigerian Universities
is also being experienced outside the continent. Tanvir
(2005) has observed with regret that the concept of
resource sharing is generally missing among libraries in
Pakistan, where most of the libraries are working on the
policy of "self-sufficiency". He observed that two
academic and research libraries located at a distance of a
few minutes walking distance are spending substantial
amounts from their budget on the subscription of same
journals and procurement of same books, whereas they
can easily share their resources with each other.

Table 1: Mean Ratings on status of resource sharing in the University libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Resource Sharing Activity</th>
<th>UNN</th>
<th>NAU</th>
<th>ESUT</th>
<th>ASUTECH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inter-library lending and document delivery.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shared access to electronic database and information service.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training resources and expertise.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harmonization of ICT applications in library management.</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Joint negotiation with suppliers.</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Co-operative acquisition.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Co-operative cataloguing.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sharing of human resources.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Electronic content licensing.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNN, University of Nigeria, Nsukka; NAU, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka; ESUT, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu; ASUTECH, Anambra State University of Science and Technology Uli; LE, Little Extent

(Nwalo, 2001; Ezeala, 2008). Ikem and Nwalo (2001)
observed that there have always been some forms of
colaboration informally practiced in Nigeria through
interlibrary lending, reference services and photo
reproduction of materials. Information technology has
extended availability of information. Due to this reality,
libraries are rethinking old practices related to acquisition,
storage, organization, and dissemination of this growing
quantity of information and knowledge.

The study enumerated some obstacle to resource
sharing and access to obstacle to resource sharing and
access to information among university libraries in
Nigeria to include: lack of finance, lack of well developed
ICT infrastructure; lack of requisite skills in ICT; faculty
formation strategies; unstable power supply and low level
conversion of local content

The study adopted a survey design, descriptive survey
and also t-test for the testing of the Hypothesis. The area
of the study is Nigeria. Federal and State universities in
Enugu and Anambra states were purposively chosen, two
in Enugu and two in Anambra states. The population
comprised all librarians in those universities. The sample
was made up of senior librarians and above which comes
to eighty five in number Research questions guided the
study. Questionnaire was constructed to address the
research questions Eighty five copies of questionnaire
were distributed but a total of seventy copies were
returned. Percentages and mean were used in analyzing
the data obtained.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following findings were made:
Table 2: Mean rating on areas of resource sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Areas of Resource Sharing</th>
<th>UNN</th>
<th>NAU</th>
<th>ESUT</th>
<th>ASUTECH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inter-library lending and document delivery.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shared access to electronic database and</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training resources and expertise.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harmonization of ICT applications in library management.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sharing of human resources.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Co-operative acquisition</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Joint negotiation with suppliers.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Co-operative cataloguing.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Electronic content licensing.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UNN, University of Nigeria, Nsukka; NAU, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka; ESUT, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu; ASUTECH, Anambra State University of Science and Technology, Uli; LE, Little Extent |

Table 3: Availability of documented policy on resource sharing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Nigeria Nsukka</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu State Univ. of Science and Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra State Univ. of Science and Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, there is need to motivate librarians and information professionals for resource sharing and networking of libraries to ensure optimum utilization of available financial, physical and manpower resources.

In co-operative acquisition schemes, Borm and Sokolova (2004) warn that this is difficult to set up. It requires extensive consultation and deliberation. Moreover, an extra budget is a pre-requisite. Nowadays, former co-operative acquisition schemes have been replaced by new and more successful ones co-operative licensing schemes for electronic journals. The advantage of the electronic as opposed to paper is that all e-journals in this consortium can be made available on-line to all the partners, whereas on paper only. The locally available titles are directly accessible for user.

2. Possible Areas of Resource Sharing

All the items chosen for the study are identified as possible areas of resource sharing (table 2). This finding complies with CULNU’s Guidelines for University libraries which states that University libraries should be willing to share with all research libraries in the responsibility of supporting higher education and research in general, and each other in particular through various library cooperative efforts (Bozimo, 2003). However, it is seen that inter-library lending and document delivery has the highest mean response. This finding agrees with Ikem and Nwalo (2001)’s experiment where inter-library loans and document delivery was also the most favoured aspect of co-operation (89.9%).

It is interesting to note that several attempts are made in different places to share resources. In Pakistan, Pakistan Agricultural Research Council (PARC) since its inception in 1978 has followed a sustained policy of sharing of information, ideas, technologies and a strong program in human resource development to meet the current and future needs of the country in agricultural sector (Tanvir, 2005).

In the UK, within the academic, the development of the Joint Academic Network (JANET), linking all higher education institutions, pioneered joint working and research sharing (Okeagu and Okeagu, 2008). In South Africa, in 1992 the first formal library Consortium, Cape Library Cooperation (CALICO) was established. Five academic library consortia were then established and their work focused mainly on purchasing a common library system, resource sharing, joint purchasing of information resources and licensing agreements.

In Nigeria, the conference on cooperative acquisition held in kaduna in 1980 resulted in the National Union Catalogue (NUC) and National Union of Serials (NULOS) projects (Okeagu and Okeagu, 2008). Very few libraries are participating in this scheme.

In 2004, the committee of University Libraries of Nigerian Universities (CULNU) formed the Nigerian University Libraries Consortium (NULIC) to embrace all universities with the view to expanding it to include all

Therefore, there is need to motivate librarians and information professionals for resource sharing and networking of libraries to ensure optimum utilization of available financial, physical and manpower resources.
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It is interesting to note that several attempts are made in different places to share resources. In Pakistan, Pakistan Agricultural Research Council (PARC) since its inception in 1978 has followed a sustained policy of sharing of information, ideas, technologies and a strong program in human resource development to meet the current and future needs of the country in agricultural sector (Tanvir, 2005).

In the UK, within the academic, the development of the Joint Academic Network (JANET), linking all higher education institutions, pioneered joint working and research sharing (Okeagu and Okeagu, 2008). In South Africa, in 1992 the first formal library Consortium, Cape Library Cooperation (CALICO) was established. Five academic library consortia were then established and their work focused mainly on purchasing a common library system, resource sharing, joint purchasing of information resources and licensing agreements.

In Nigeria, the conference on cooperative acquisition held in kaduna in 1980 resulted in the National Union Catalogue (NUC) and National Union of Serials (NULOS) projects (Okeagu and Okeagu, 2008). Very few libraries are participating in this scheme.

In 2004, the committee of University Libraries of Nigerian Universities (CULNU) formed the Nigerian University Libraries Consortium (NULIC) to embrace all universities with the view to expanding it to include all
academic and research libraries in Nigeria. The establishment of the National Virtual Library project in 2001 by the federal ministry of education enhanced access to national and international library and information resources as well as sharing locally available resources with libraries all over the world using digital technology. In this scheme, Nigerian Universities are to contribute their research information which would be placed on line for sharing. Nigerian University Network (NUNET) is another initiative by National Universities Commission to encourage Universities to network and share information for their academic and administrative functions. Other resource sharing projects are the Nigerian Periodical Index (NPI) of the CULNU and the National Documentation and Library Centre for Science and Technology (NADICEST) aimed at providing access to current and retrospective information on science and technology to facilitate research.

3. Availability of documented policy on resource sharing in university libraries.

None of the university libraries has a documented policy on resource sharing.

This finding seems to agree with Ubogu (1992)’s lament that resource sharing in Nigeria appears to have failed and that library cooperation exists only informally, based on goodwill of the library to another. It lacks legal support provided by formal agreement.

4. Problems that hinder resource sharing.

All items used here constitute hindrances to resource sharing (table 4).

Lack of adequate fund has been ranked as the greatest problem. Ikem and Nwalo (2002) have also identified gross under funding as one of the challenges of resource sharing (table 4).

The next important challenge has been identified by Kavitha (2009). He said that periodical transfer of digital material from one hardware/ software configuration to another or from one generation of computer technology to a subsequent generation is quite a common trend and a big challenge to e-collection development. Obsolescence of equipments required to access digital information directly affects the longevity of digital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Problems that hinder resource sharing</th>
<th>UNN</th>
<th>NAU</th>
<th>ESUT</th>
<th>ASUTECH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of adequate funds</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Obsolescence of equipment in assessing digital information</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catalogue data not being in a standard machine readable form</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of documented policy on resource sharing</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inability of the libraries to adopt the right strategies</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maintenance of union catalogue</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inability and unwillingness to pay for library resource sharing</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vast distance separating the libraries</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Mean Ratings for problems that may hinder resource sharing between federal and state university libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Strategies to enhance resource sharing</th>
<th>UNN</th>
<th>NAU</th>
<th>ESUT</th>
<th>ASUTECH</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There should be proper planning</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There should be adequate funds to meet the library’s part of the bargain</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There should be capacity building through staff training</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There should be a documented policy on resource sharing</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There should be a strong central coordinating body for example NUC</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The libraries should be able to adopt right strategies for resource sharing</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Mean ratings for strategies to enhance resource sharing.
information. To ensure longer life of the digital information, a continuous development and upgradation of information storage and access techniques and technology is very necessary.

For inability of libraries to adopt the right strategies, Aina (2001) observed that over the years, many of the university cooperation have failed because of adoption of money strategies. This fact has also been observed by Nwalo (2006). For him, fostering co-operation among libraries in Nigeria failed because important steps were not taken while the libraries lacked faith in the proposals. Other concerned studies (Ikem and Nwalo, 2002; Jebaraji and Devodoss 2004) attributed failure of library co-operation to lack of proper planning. Good planning in any organisation is a positive step towards success.

Vast distance separating libraries has been identified as the least challenge. In as much as, Ikem and Nwalo (2002) had earlier on identified this factor as a challenge, when libraries digitize their materials, distance will no longer constitute a barrier. In e-environment, distance is not a barrier.

5. Strategies to enhance resource sharing
The six selected items are strategies to enhance resource sharing (table 6).

However, the three leading factors are that:
1. There should be proper planning.
2. There should be adequate fund.
3. There should be capacity building through staff training.

The findings of this study agree with Nwalo’s (2008) previous study. He had found that for resource sharing to be effective in libraries, there should be proper planning, there should be adequate funding, and capacity building through staff training and retraining especially on ICT use skills. Furthermore, he advocate the control of a strong coordinating body such as NUC, the National Library of Nigeria or a federal ministry concerned with information, education or science and technology. There must be periodic evaluation of consortuim by the co-ordinating body. This will permit corrective measure to be taken early enough to forestall a breakdown in the arrangement.

**TABLE 6**

The result on Table 6 used for testing the first hypothesis of the study reveal that there is no significant difference between the Mean response of libraries on status of resource sharing in Federal and State University Libraries. This is because the level of 0.152 set by the computer is higher than 0.05, the one set for the hypothesis in those items. The hypothesis is therefore accepted. Ownership of universities has not significantly affected status of resource sharing in their libraries.

The result on Table 7 used for testing the second hypothesis of the study also shows that there is no significant difference in the Mean response of libraries on problems hindering resource sharing in Federal and State University Libraries. Whether university is federal or state sponsored, their libraries face similar problems. Then it becomes imperative that co-operating with each other would be advantageous in getting their problems solved.

**CONCLUSION**

Resource sharing is a novel and wise path to meeting library’s endless information demands. There are many forms of resource sharing. Libraries are consciously/ unconsciously engaging in one form or the other. Like many useful initiatives, resource sharing is faced with hydra headed challenges. However, there are ways out. If libraries begin to appreciate the usefulness of resource sharing, to their services, they will beat the obstacles and forge ahead towards satisfying their clienteles. Some of these ways to beat the obstacles are: Proper planning, Adequate funding, Capacity building, and Having a policy.

In this electronic age, resource sharing seems to be
the fastest method and the most economical way of a library demonstrating its relevance in the environment.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. All academic libraries in Nigeria should computerize their services. This will enable the libraries to benefit from the rich resources available electronically.
2. Higher body such as NUC, federal ministry of education or National Library of Nigeria should step in and monitor library consortium (e.g. make a policy or resource sharing for libraries.)
3. Librarians need sensitizations like conferences/ workshops to spur them into accepting what information technology have ushered into the system.
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