

Upgrading of Security Measures to Reduce Book Theft and Damage in College Libraries

Mamatha N

Librarian

Library and Information Centre,
Government First Grade College
Kuvempunagar, Mysore
mungaru17@gmail.com
Cell no. 8762139158

Dr. Khaiser Nikam

Professor

Department of Library and Information Science
University of Mysore
Manasagangotri, Mysore
e-mail:khaiser.nikam6@gmail.com

***Abstract** - Libraries need to create an environment where primary resource materials are respected, handled carefully, and returned intact to the collection so that they might be studied again in the future. Forty seven University of Mysore degree colleges coming under UGC 12(B) 2 (F) constituted the sample for the study. In order to elicit appropriate responses from the 455 post graduate student users of the library selected for the study interview schedule was used along with the observation method. The student's perceptions of difficulties faced to use the library collection and the gender wise perceptions for improvement of security measures are considered for study. Frequency, tables, percentages, chi-square and t- test is the main statistical tools used for data analysis. Findings reveals that 34.7% students visits library daily; 78.9 % students opined that important books are not issued and both male and female students endorse many improvement of security, implementation of security policy ranks first way of improvement of security measures and last being implementation of CC camera.*

***Key Words:** Security Measures, College libraries*

1. INTRODUCTION

A college is considered as an academic institution of higher learning and offer bachelor degree and few colleges are offering the Post-graduation courses in Arts, Science and Commerce disciplines. Department of Collegiate Education has been striving to make quality higher education affordable and accessible to all sections of students. Collection security is a strategically designed process to protect library collections against unauthorized removal or lost and ensures their availability to users. This involves protecting resources and library premises against abuse, disaster and intruder (Ajegbomogun, 2004; Chaney & MacDougal, 1994).

Collection security management in libraries involved the formulation of collection security policies and implementation of procedures and processes to mitigate risk prevent vulnerabilities and ensure access.

2. BACK GROUND STUDIES

Collection security refers to a process designed to protect library collections against unauthorized removal, loss or protecting resources against disasters as well as thieves or intruders. For this purpose a proper planning is essential. Libraries need to create an environment where primary resource materials are respected, handled carefully, and returned intact to the collection so that they might be studied again in the future.

Lowry and Goetsch (2001) highlighted the importance of creating shared culture of mutual responsibility for security and safety at Maryland libraries. This involves making clear to users and staff about the safety and security policies and guidelines in libraries especially those regarding food consumption in libraries, theft, mutilation, and disruptive behavior.

Brown and Patkus (2007) proposed a security plan that comprises these components: a written security policy, the appointment of a security manager; carrying out a security survey to assess current and projected needs; identifying preventive measures, ensuring a secure premise for both during and after working hours; installing security system; ensuring collection security through regular inventory, proper storage area, marking collections to establish ownership and instituting a tracking system of lost and over borrowed items; managing, educating and training users and staffs.

The Association of College and Research Libraries and RBMS Security Committee (2006) published a guideline for the security of rare books, manuscripts and special collections since these collections were found to be frequent target of theft and mutilation. The guidelines proposed the establishment of proper governance by hiring library security officers who plan and administer security programs, prepare and spearhead written policies. The emphasis on securing heritage items was highlighted by Brown, Morley, and Salter (2006) who proposed guidelines for planning stack and storage management of collections for Australian Libraries to minimize loss and damage.

3. OBJECTIVES

- To find out the frequency of use of library by the students
- To know the difficulties faced to use library books by the students
- To find the student's perceptions for improvement of security measures
- To find out the students gender wise perceptions for improvement of security measures towards theft and mutilation of books.

4. METHODOLOGY

The investigator decided to use a combination of methods of research. In order to elicit appropriate responses from the student users of the library selected for the study interview schedule designed was administered to both urban and rural college library users was used along with the observation method. The researcher covered only post graduate students of colleges, as they are well aware of the functions of the library and literature use in a college library. offering post graduate programmes.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

5.1 Gender Wise break up of Student Users

The gender wise break up of student users is shown in table 5.1. It may be seen from the table that majority of the respondents numbering 342 representing 75.2 percent are female and the remaining 113 respondents are with 24.8 percent are male.

Table 5.1
Gender Wise Break up of Student Users

S/N	Gender	No. of Responses	Percentage
1	Male	113	24.8
2	Female	342	75.2
Total		455	100.0

5.2 Frequency of Visit to the Library by the Student Users

The frequency of visit to the library by the student users is given in table 5.2. The table reveals that 158 (34.7 percent) respondents visit the library daily; about 108 (23.7 percent) visit once in a week; followed by those who visit the library once in two days is 100 (22 percent); similarly 58 respondents representing 12.7 percent visit the library twice a week; another 15 (3.3 percent) of them visit very rarely; whereas, 11 (2.4 percent) respondents visits the library once a month; only 5 (1.1 percent) of them visit the library once a fortnight.

Table 5.2
Frequency of Visit to the Library by the Student Users

S/N	Frequency of visit	No. of Responses	Percentage
1	Daily	158	34.7
2	Once a Week	108	23.7
3	Once in Two Days	100	22.0
4	Twice a Week	58	12.7
5	Once a Month	11	2.4
6	Rarely	15	3.3
7	Once a Fortnight	05	1.1
Total		455	100

5.3 Difficulties Faced to Use Library Books

Respondents were asked to indicate the difficulties faced to use library books and their opinions are presented in the table 5.3. It may be observed from the table 5.3 that, respondents numbering 157 representing (34.5 percent) say 'agree', for 'Important books are kept in the reference collection', followed by 'strongly agree' scoring 124 (27.3 percent); whereas 85 (18.7 percent) respondents say 'neither agree nor disagree'; so also, 48 (10.5 percent) of the respondents have opted 'disagree'; only 41 (9 percent) have chosen 'strongly disagree'. Thus significant differences ($\chi^2=108.022$; $p=000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses with regard to – 'Important books are kept in the reference collection', where the mean value is 3.60 and SD being 1.24.

In case of 'Difficulty in finding the library books', the respondents choice is 'agree' scoring 153 representing 33.6 percent; followed by 104 (22.9 percent) of them say 'strongly agree'; so also, 75 (16.5 percent) respondents say 'neither agree nor disagree'; whereas, 74 (16.3 percent) of them say 'strongly disagree'; only 49 (10.8 percent) of respondents chosen 'disagree'. Thus, there are significant differences ($\chi^2=69.473$; $p=000$) with regard to 'Difficulty in finding the library books'; where the mean score is 3.36 and SD being 1.37.

For 'Lack of sufficient copies' as a drawback, the respondents numbering 122 representing 26.9 percent say 'agree'; followed by the choice 'neither agree nor disagree' score 105 (23.1 percent); the choice 'strongly agree' score 103 (22.7 percent); whereas, 63 respondents (13.9 percent) opt for the choice 'strongly disagree'; so also, 61 (13.4 percent) of them say 'disagree'. Thus, significant differences ($\chi^2=32.872$; $p=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for the drawback - 'Lack of sufficient copies', where, the mean value is 3.31 and SD being 1.33.

In case of 'Inconvenient library working hours', the respondents choice is 'strongly agree' scoring 106 representing 23.3 percent; the choice 'agree' score 97 (21.3 percent) responses; the choice 'strongly disagree' score 90 (19.8 percent); whereas 83 respondents representing 18.2 percent have opted the choice 'neither agree not disagree'; only 79 of them representing 17.4 percent have opted 'disagree'. Thus, there are significant differences ($\chi^2=5.165$; $P=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for the difficulty 'Inconvenient library working hours', where the mean value is 3.01 and SD being 1.38.

Another difficulty is 'Missing pages in important and expensive books'. For this difficulty, the respondents choice is 'agree' scoring 122 representing 26.8 percent; followed by, the choice 'strongly agree' scoring 121 representing 26.6 percent; whereas, the choice 'disagree' amounts to 81 (17.8 percent); the choice 'strongly disagree' scores 77 (16.9 percent); only 54 (11.9 percent) have opted the choice 'neither agree nor disagree'. Thus, there are significant differences ($\chi^2=38.747$; $p=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for the difficulty in using the library books - 'Missing pages is important and expensive books', where, the mean value is 2.99 and SD being 1.27.

One more difficulty in using the library books is 'No proper arrangement/ improper shelving', the respondents numbering 109 representing 24 percent have opted the choice 'disagree'; followed by 102 (22.4 percent) who say 'strongly disagree'; the choice 'agrees' scoring 98 (21.5 percent) responses; nearly 89 (19.6 percent) respondents say 'neither agrees nor disagrees'; only 57 (12.5 percent) has opted for the choice 'strongly agree'. Thus, significant differences ($\chi^2=18.176$; $p=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for difficulty in using the library books - 'No proper arrangement/improper shelving', where, mean value is 2.83 and SD being 1.31.

Yet another reason of difficulties in using the library book is 'library staff is not helpful'. The respondents say 'strongly disagree' scoring 121 representing 26.6 percent; the choice 'neither agree nor disagree' has a score of 94 (20.7 percent); followed by 'disagree' scoring 89 (19.6 percent); whereas, for the choice 'agree' respondents scoring 84 (18.5 percent); so also, 67 (14.7 percent) of them say 'strongly agree'. Thus, significant differences ($\chi^2=16.901$; $p=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for the difficulties - 'Library staff is not helpful', where the mean value is 2.75 and SD is 1.41.

Yet another difficulty is using the library books is 'Bad condition of books due to photo copying and rough use'. The respondents scoring 121 representing 26.6 percent say 'strongly disagree'; as many as, 98 of them representing 21.5 percent say 'disagree'; so also, for the choice 'neither agree nor disagree' amount to 93 (20.4 percent); whereas, 87 respondents (19.1 percent) opt the choice 'agree'; only 56 (12.3 percent) of them say 'strongly agree'. Thus, significant differences ($\chi^2=24.110$; $p=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for the difficulty in using the library books - 'Bad condition of books due to photo copying and rough use', where, the mean value is 2.69 and SD is 1.37.

In case of 'Attacked by pests and terminates' the respondents choice is 'disagree' scoring 126 representing 27.7 percent; the choice 'strongly disagree' score 114 (25.1 percent); the choice 'neither agree nor disagree' scores 97 (21.3 percent); only 79 (17.4 percent) of them say 'agree' and 39 (8.6 percent) of them say 'strongly agree'. Thus, significant differences ($\chi^2=50.967$; $p=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for the difficulties face to use library books - 'Attacked by pests and terminates', where the mean value is 2.63 and SD is 1.26.

Another difficulty faced to use library books is 'Exposed to Sunlight', for which the respondents choice is 'strongly disagree' scoring 181 (39.8 percent); the choice 'disagree' amounts to 91 representing (20 percent); followed by the choice 'neither agree nor disagree' scores 74 (16.3 percent); whereas, the choice of respondents for 'agree' scores 71 (15.6 percent); only 38 of them representing 8.4 percent opt the choice 'strongly agree'. Thus, there are significant differences ($\chi^2=127.451$; $p=.000$) with regard to the difficulties faced to use library books - 'Exposed to Sunlight' are observed between the frequencies of responses has a mean value of 2.36 and SD being 1.36.

Finally, another difficulty face to use library books is 'Exposed to rain water'. The respondents choice for this difficulty is 'strongly disagree' scoring 186 representing 40.9 percent; followed

by ‘disagree’ scoring 92 (20.2 percent); whereas 78 (17.1 percent) of the respondents say ‘neither agree nor disagree’; so also, the choices ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ score 60 (13.2 percent) and 39 (8.6 percent) respectively. Thus, significant differences ($\chi^2=141.319$; $p=.000$) are observed between the frequencies of responses for the difficulties faced to use library books - ‘Exposed to rain water’, where, the mean value is 2.31 and SD is 1.35.

Table 5.3
Difficulties Faced to Use Library Books

S/N	Difficulties faced	Responses in percentage (N=455)					Mean	SD	χ^2	P value
		1	2	3	4	5				
1	Important Books are Kept in the Reference Collection	41 (9.0)	48 (10.5)	85 (18.7)	157 (34.5)	124 (27.3)	3.18	1.27	108.02	.000
2	Difficulty in Finding the Library Books	74 (16.3)	49 (10.8)	75 (16.5)	153 (33.6)	104 (22.9)	3.17	1.23	69.47	.000
3	Missing Pages in Important and Expensive Books	77 (16.9)	81 (17.8)	54 (11.9)	122 (26)	121 (2)	3.16	1.31	38.75	.000
4	Inconvenient Library Working Hours	90 (19.8)	79 (17.4)	83 (18.2)	97 (21.3)	106 (23.3)	3.01	1.30	5.17	.271
5	Lack of Sufficient Copies	63 (13.9)	61 (13.4)	105 (23.1)	122 (26.9)	103 (22.7)	2.98	1.28	32.87	.000
6	No Proper Arrangement/ Improper Shelving	102 (22.4)	109 (24.0)	89 (19.6)	98 (21.5)	57 (12.5)	2.96	1.27	18.18	.001
7	Library Staff is Not Helpful	121 (26.6)	89 (19.6)	94 (20.7)	84 (18.)	67 (14.7)	2.94	1.25	16.90	.002
8	Bad Condition of Books due to Constant Photo Copying and Rough Use	121 (26.6)	98 (21.5)	93 (24)	87 (19.1)	56 (12.3)	2.91	1.27	24.11	.000
9	Attacked by Pests and Terminates	114 (25.1)	126 (27.7)	97 (21.3)	79 (17.4)	39 (8.6)	2.91	1.40	50.97	.000
10	Exposed to Sunlight	181 (39.8)	91 (20.0)	74 (16.3)	71 (15.6)	38 (8.4)	2.78	1.34	127.45	.000
11	Exposed to Rain Water	186 (40.9)	92 (20.2)	78 (17.1)	60 (13.2)	39 (8.6)	2.56	1.46	141.32	.000

Key: 1 – Strongly disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Neither agree nor disagree; 4 – Agree; 5 – Strongly agree; SD = Standard deviation; N=Number of Respondents; Numbers in parentheses indicate percentages; χ^2 = chi-square; P = Probability; $P \leq .050$ – Significant; $P > .050$ – Not Significant.

5.4 Improvement of Security Measures verses Gender

Respondents were asked to indicate the difficulties faced to use library books and their opinions are presented in the table 5.4. For the statement ‘develop and implement a security policy’, 40.2 percent of the respondents indicated ‘always’, followed by 38.7 percent of them indicated ‘most of the time’, 13.4 percent of them indicated ‘sometimes’, 4.0 percent of them opined ‘seldom’ and remaining 3.7 percent of them indicated ‘never’. Chi-square test revealed a significant

difference ($\chi^2=301.03$; $p=.000$), between groups of frequencies of responses for develop and implement a security policy is significantly high. Further, the mean score obtained by males (4.12) is comparatively more than the score obtained by females (4.06), a non- significant gender difference was observed between male and female respondents for the security measures 'Develop and implement a security policy' ($t=0.568$; $p=.057$).

In the case of conduct library orientation/ educate users, 40.7 percent of the respondents indicated 'most of the time', followed by 32.7 percent of them indicated 'always', 16.7 percent of them indicated 'sometimes', 6.2 percent of them opined 'seldom' and remaining 3.7 percent of them indicated 'never'. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference ($\chi^2=240.33$; $p=.000$), between groups of frequencies of responses for conduct library orientation/ educate users is significantly high. Further, the mean score obtained by males (3.95) is comparatively more than the score obtained by females (3.92), a non- significant gender difference was observed between male and female respondents for the security measures 'Conduct Library orientation /education users' ($t=.256$; $p=.798$).

For the statement improving security check, 37.1 percent of respondents indicated 'most of the time', followed by 30.8 percent of them indicated 'always', 18.9 percent of them indicated 'sometimes', 8.8 percent of them opined 'seldom' and remaining 4.4 percent of them indicated 'never'. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference ($\chi^2=177.50$; $p=.000$), between groups of frequencies of responses for Improving security check is significantly high. Further, the mean score obtained by males (3.78) is comparatively lesser than the score obtained by females (3.82), a non- significant gender difference was observed between male and female respondents for 'Improving security check' ($t=-.359$; $p=.072$).

For strengthening vigilance, 40.4 percent of the respondents indicated 'most of the time', followed by 26.8 percent of them indicated 'always', 19.0 percent of them indicated 'sometimes', 11.2 percent of them opined 'seldom' and remaining 2.0 percent of them indicated 'never'. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference ($\chi^2=197.12$; $p=.000$), between groups of frequencies of responses for strengthening vigilance is significantly high. Further, the mean score obtained by males (3.83) is comparatively more than the score obtained by females (3.77), a non- significant gender difference was observed between male and female respondents for this security measures ($t=.513$; $p=.608$).

On the whole 38.2 percent of the respondents indicated 'most of the time' for verify pages of book when returned, followed by 34.3 percent of them indicated 'always', 13.4 percent of them indicated 'sometimes', 8.1 percent of them opined 'seldom' and remaining 5.9 percent of them indicated 'never'. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference ($\chi^2=209.08$; $p=.000$), between groups of frequencies of responses for verify pages of book when returned is significantly high. Further, the mean score obtained by males (3.87) is comparatively more than the score obtained by females (3.87), a non- significant gender difference was observed between male and female respondents for this security measures ($t=-.009$; $p=.993$).

In the case of introduce CCTV, 43.7 percent of the respondents indicated 'always' for, followed by 22.9 percent of them indicated 'most of the time', 13.6 percent of them indicated 'never', 13.2

percent of them indicated ‘sometimes’, and remaining 6.6 percent of them opined ‘seldom’. Chi-square test revealed a significant difference ($\chi^2=190.73$; $p=.000$), between groups of frequencies of responses for introduce CCTV is significantly high. Further, the mean score obtained by males (3.71) is comparatively lesser than the score obtained by females (3.78), a non-significant gender difference was observed between male and female respondents for the security measures ‘Introduce CCTV’ ($t=.492$; $p=.623$).

It was observed that perception on improvement of security measures to library collection by the users, which is revealed by the overall mean values obtained for the security measures needs to improve. Thus, “Users vary significantly in their perception on improvement of security measures for theft and mutilation of books library collection in college libraries” (Table 8.7). The mean values of perceptions of male respondents are high compared to female respondents for the improvement of security measures, results of t- test shows that there exists non-significant difference in perceptions with respect to gender. Thus, “Gender do not has significant influence on perception of damage to the library collection in college libraries”.

Table 5.4
Improvement of Security Measures verses Gender (Student users)

S/N	Security Measures	Responses					χ^2	p value	Mean values			t value	p value
		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always			overall	male	Female		
1	Develop and Implement a Security Policy	17 (3.7)	18 (4.0)	61 (13.4)	176 (38.7)	183 (40.2)	301.03	.000	4.08	4.12	4.06	.568	.057
2	Conduct Library Orientation /Education to Users	17 (3.7)	28 (6.2)	76 (16.7)	185 (40.7)	149 (32.7)	240.33	.000	3.92	3.95	3.92	.256	.798
3	Improving Security Check	20 (4.4)	40 (8.8)	86 (18.9)	169 (37.1)	140 (30.8)	177.50	.000	3.81	3.78	3.82	-.359	.072
4	Strengthening Vigilance	9 (2.0)	51 (11.2)	89 (19.)	184 (40.4)	122 (26.8)	197.12	.000	3.79	3.83	3.77	.513	.608
5	Verify Pages of Book when Returned	7 (5.9)	37 (8.1)	61 (13.4)	174 (38.2)	156 (34.3)	209.08	.000	3.87	3.87	3.87	-.009	.993
6	Introduce CCTV	62 (13.6)	30 (6.6)	60 (13.2)	104 (22.9)	199 (43.7)	190.73	.000	3.76	3.71	3.78	-.492	.623

Note: for responses values in the parenthesis indicate percent values; χ^2 = chi-square; P = Probability; $P \leq .050$ - Significant; $P > .050$ - Not

6.0 Recommendations

Security policy is the necessity for any library, Student user’s opinion on the difficulties can be considered a necessary policy can be implemented in college libraries to promote easy access and use of the library collection; Security personal can be placed at the entrance position in the college library to follow strict library rules and regulations among the library users; sufficient copies of the books in demand can be made available; Overnight issue of books and journals can be introduced; College libraries can follow routine cleaning of book shelves by using insecticides and rat poison so as to reduce the activities of insects, termites and rats.

The roof of library buildings can be checked now and then in order to repair leaking spots so that water seepage will be stopped; the fire extinguishers has to be checked at regular intervals, while all the library staff can be shown to locate them and demonstrate how to use them;; Electronic

devices can be installed in the college libraries to aid security job; more closed circuit television (CCTV) system can be installed; College libraries can also acquire more smoke detectors, fire alarms and fire tracers to prevent fire disasters; RFID technology can be used.

7. Conclusion

As knowledge expands, the need to organize it and to provide adequate security becomes more demanding. Library collection is maintained on everyday basis to protect them from the ecological factors by keeping tidy on daily basis and regular shelf reading and guiding the users will reduce the risk factors by human agent. The information bearing materials of the library can be secured using traditional and electronic measures from the users' point of view. Promoting safety and security procedures in the Libraries and improvement of interpersonal skills to reduce the risk associated with theft and damage in the library system. Finally, guidelines regarding the safety and security of library collection can be formulated.

Bibliography

1. Adewale, T. O. (2007). Book theft and its prevention in Nigerian academic libraries. *Gateway Library Journal*, 10(1), 74-75.
2. Ajegbomogun, F. O. (2004). Users' assessment of library security: a Nigerian university case study. *Library Management*, 25 (8/9), 386-390.
3. Brown, K. E. & Patkus, B. L. (2007). *Collection security: Planning and prevention for libraries and archives*. Northeast Document Conservation Centre.
4. Brown, J., Morley, T & Salter, L. (2006). Council of Australian State Libraries (CASL) working group on stack management. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 30 (1-2), 85-101
5. Chaney, M. & MacDougall, A. F. (1994). *Security and crime in libraries*. Gower Publishing.
6. Lowry, C.B. & Goetsch, L. (2001). Creating a culture of security in the university of Maryland libraries. *Portal: Libraries and Academy*, 1(4), 455-464.
7. Maidabino, A. & Zainab, A. N. (2011). Collection security management at university libraries: assessment of its implementation status. *Malaysian journal of library & information science*, 16(1), 15-33.
8. McComb, M. & Dean, E. (2004). *Library security*. San Francisco, RLS Inc.
9. Rude, R & Hauptman, R. (1993). Theft, dissemination and trespass: Some observations on security. *Library and Archival Security*, 12(1), 18-21.
10. Soete, G. J. (1999). Management of library security. *Journal of Library Administration*, 25 (1), 1-3.
11. Thomas, M. A. (2000). Redefining library space: Managing the co-existence of books, computers, and readers. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 26 (6), 408-415.

