

**To cite this article:** Unegbu, V, Ayoola, O, Oduwole, A, Aluko-Arowolo, T & Olusanya, F.O. (2023) Role Clarity as a Determinant of Job Satisfaction among Library Personnel in South-West Universities, Nigeria Information Impact: *Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 14:1, 126-143, DOI <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijikm.v14i1.8>

**To link to this article:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijikm.v14i1.8>

## Role Clarity as a Determinant of Job Satisfaction among Library Personnel in South-West Universities, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Vincent Unegbu

<sup>2</sup>Onasote Ayoola

<sup>2</sup>Adebambo Oduwole

<sup>2</sup>Titilayo Aluko-Arowolo

<sup>2</sup>Francis Olufemi Olusanya

<sup>1</sup>Department of Information Resources Management, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria

### Abstract

This research explored the relationship between role clarity and work satisfaction among university library staff in South-West Nigeria. Survey research methodology was used with a sample size of 669 library employees. The study's target population consisted of 440 library workers from 23 out of 46 institutions in South-West Nigeria that were chosen on the basis of their years of inception. In the research, total enumeration was used. For data gathering, a validated structured questionnaire was employed. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for role clarity and work satisfaction varied from 74 to 75, respectively. Only 356 out of 440 issued questionnaires were returned, representing an 81 percent return rate. The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential (simple and multiple regression) statistics. The results suggested that role clarity had a substantial impact on the work satisfaction of university library staff in South-West Nigeria.

**Key Words:** Job Satisfaction, Library Personnel, Role Clarity, South-West Nigeria

### Keywords

Job satisfaction, library personnel, role clarity, south-west, Nigeria

---

CONTACT Onasote Ayoola @ [olabisi\\_adeleke university](mailto:olabisi_adeleke@olabisiadeleke.edu.ng)

2023 The Authors Published with License by Information Impact



## Introduction

Job satisfaction is the emotional condition of employees in relation to their jobs, considering what they anticipated and what they really received. According to Onuoha, U.D., Ukangwa, C.C and Otuza, E.C (2020), job satisfaction is a crucial aspect of a working environment and has been linked to enhanced performance and more dedication to the company or library services. Idiegbeyanose, Aregbesola, Owolabi and Eyiolorunse (2019) defines job satisfaction as the degree to which workers' needs and expectations are met in comparison to the prevalent national and global standard. The issue of job satisfaction has always been a topic of discussion among library personnel, as several factors have been found to affect their satisfaction. In addition to satisfying individual needs, employment gives other advantages, such as a feeling of accomplishing something meaningful and an increase in social standing. A worker's successful reaction to his job is job satisfaction. This means that worker happiness is a result of the worker's experience at work in respect to his own values and requirements.

Sambo (2016) attribute job satisfaction to nature of work, supervision, recognition of achievement, ability to use initiative, working conditions, fringe benefits and life satisfaction of individuals. The scenario is not different from what Renaweera and Bodhinyaka (2018) describe as facet of job satisfaction which can be seen from the angle of nature of work, recognition of achievement, ability to use initiative, involvement in decision making, relationship with co-workers and supervisors, prompt payment of salary, remuneration, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, job security, working condition, promotion policy, administration and communication and sharing of information within the organization - verbal or in written form.

The combined effect of librarians' job satisfaction, knowledge sharing, and team orientation on productivity was significant ( $f = 9.64$ ;  $df = 3.96$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), as found in an empirical study by Awoyemi and Olaniyi (2017).

Ikonne and Onuoha (2015) found that, on average, librarians in federal and state university libraries in Southern Nigeria gave their perceptions of their job security a score of 3.09 (58.5%) on a 5-point scale. Next in line was the quality of my working relationship with my supervisor, which was given a mean score of 3.05 (62.2%). A mean score of 2.97 (59.9%) was given to my interactions with co workers, while a mean score of 2.87 (64%) was given to my interactions with information users, customers, and clients. Having employment difficulties had a mean score of 2.82 (59.4%), while being satisfied with my job tasks and schedule obtained a mean score of 2.86 (65.3%). The average score for job satisfaction was 2.72 (56.5%), with 2.76 (60.2% of people) reporting that they were satisfied with their level of freedom and responsibility on the job. The average score for the workplace communication atmosphere was 2.68 (54 percent), while the average score for my employment status and recognition at work was 2.66 (52 percent). The average score for regular promotion happiness was 2.55, representing

52.6% of respondents' satisfaction. The survey also found that participants, on average, gave possibilities for professional growth a score of 2.58 out of a possible 5. My managing techniques at work were rated an average of 2.64 (46.6% satisfaction) by my subordinates. The research also found that my wage satisfaction was 2.50 (40.1%), while my working conditions satisfaction averaged 2.41 (38.9%). The librarians' mean satisfaction rating for research opportunities was 2.37 (37.2%), while 41.5% of them were dissatisfied. An average of 31.3% of respondents was satisfied with my fringe rewards, while 47.2% were not.

Inuwa (2016) in his empirical study on the effect of job satisfaction and employee performance, 37.6% of the University's staff falls within the ages of 30-39. This may be because the administration is actively seeking to hire young workers who can contribute to the institution's long-term success by providing the kind of innovative, energetic, and dedicated service that will bring the institution closer to realizing its stated goals. Additionally, 35.6% of the workforce is comprised of people aged 40-49, indicating that these individuals have the necessary expertise and skills to provide high-quality service to the institution. This is followed by 15.2% of the workforce, aged 20-29, and then 11.62 %, aged 50+. Therefore, the university's non-academic personnel are comprised mostly of young people in the prime of their lives, suggesting that they are mentally and physically well-equipped to carry out the institution's mission. As the results show ( $r = 0.710$ ;  $t = 1.647$ ;  $sig = 0.005$ ), there is a positive, significant relationship between work satisfaction and performance. Comparable findings were found in empirical research conducted by Fanimihin and Popoola (2013) looked at the influence of educational qualification and career progression on job satisfaction of library personnel in the Nigeria's Federal Civil Services of Nigeria confirmed that there is a relationship between education career progression and job satisfaction of library personnel with significance of each independent variable in influencing library employees' happiness on the job. Progression in one's career was ( $r = .418$ ,  $P .05$ ), while inspiration to do one's job well was ( $r = .670$ ,  $P .05$ ), and one's leadership style was ( $r = .724$ ,  $P .05$ ). There are a number of important aspects, such as opportunities for advancement, intrinsic motivation at work, and a supportive management style, which may improve the morale of library staff in the federal government's ministries and extra-ministerial agencies. Library workers in the Federal Civil Service of Nigeria fall into two distinct categories, as shown by the findings of Fanimihin (2015) empirical research on the impact of authority and advancement on job satisfaction in the library sector. The cadres consist of the librarians and library staff. Both librarians and library officer work in libraries, however librarians have a bachelor's or master's degree in the field whereas library officers just have a diploma. The results of his study showed a statistically

significant relationship between library workers' educational attainment and their level of job happiness, with a mean job satisfaction score of 20.3216 (SD 4.5313) and a mean educational qualification score of 20.4554. (SD5.8550).

A person's "role" is the place they have in the larger community. This means that figuring out a person's function in a group requires looking at the interactions between people and the expectations placed on them. When library personnel understand their responsibilities and what is expected of them, they have feelings of role clarity, as stated by Samie, Riahi, and Tabibvi (2014). Thangavelu and Sudhahar (2017) stressed the need of providing workers with sufficient knowledge about their duties and responsibilities to do their jobs effectively, which they refer to as "role clarity." This means it's up to workers to figure out what they're supposed to do and what parts of the job really matter. To ensure that all workers contribute to the best of their ability, they feel that job clarity is the meaning by which priorities may be mapped and training requirements are known. Empirical research on the impact of factors and job clarity on the perceived service quality of front-line personnel (studies on the Clerks of the Kashavarzi Bank in the province of Chaharmahal-E-Bakhtiary) was conducted by Allameh, Harooni, Chaleshtari, and Asadi (2013). In all, 580 participants were surveyed, and 132 of them were utilized as research samples. Standardized effect co-efficient (path co-efficient) equals 0.29 between feedback and role clarity, confirming the existence of a relationship between the two; job autonomy equals 0.51, confirming the existence of a relationship between job autonomy and role clarity; participation in decision-making equals 0.38, confirming the existence of a relationship between job autonomy and role clarity; and management factors equals 0.45, confirming the existence of a relationship between job autonomy and role clarity. The finding provided more evidence for the link between work satisfaction and a well-defined function. Hassan (2013) conducted empirical research examining the significance of role clarification in workplace groups and its implications on perceived role clarity, job satisfaction, and employee turnover. The study sample consisted of 1,699 state government workers from 45 different offices around the state. Role clarification was found to have a significant negative impact on turnover rates in the workplace ( $= 0.49$ ,  $p .05$ ;  $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F = 2.74$ ), while role classification also contributed to higher levels of job satisfaction. Managers in low- and moderate-turnover offices were noticeably more involved in outlining employees' tasks than their counterparts in high-turnover workplaces. Moreover, compared to workplaces with a high turnover rate, those with a low turnover rate had much clearer definitions of individual responsibilities.

Caillier (2014) in his empirical study on do role clarity and job satisfaction mediate the relationship between telework and work effort revealed that telework was

inversely related to work effort. Also, role clarity and job satisfaction did not mediate the relationship between telework and work effort with role clarity mean value of 3.90, SD = 0.85 and job satisfaction is with mean value of 3.81, SD = 1.02. Role clarity was regressed on telework and it indicates that telework was positively related to role clarity  $p < .001$ ; work effort was regressed on role clarity and the findings indicate that role clarity was positively associated to work effort  $p < 0.001$ ; telework was associated with higher job satisfaction  $p < 0.000$ .

### Statement of the problem

Librarians' loyalty to their present employer is directly proportional to their level of job satisfaction. However, library staff are not happy in their jobs, as evidenced by a lack of enthusiasm for their work and a sloppy approach to providing library users with information. This could be due to a lack of clarity regarding each employee's specific responsibilities and how they interact with patrons. Moreover, a comprehensive literature search revealed a lack of evidence connecting role clarity with work satisfaction among library staff. This study was motivated by a desire to learn more about how a lack of clarity about one's function in the workplace affects the happiness of university library workers in South-West Nigeria.

### Research Questions

- 1 What is the level of job satisfaction of university library personnel in universities in South-West, Nigeria?
- 2 How do library personnel perceive their role clarification in university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?

### Methodology

Survey research design was employed for this study using self constructed questionnaire. The total population was 669 library personnel comprising professional librarians (academic librarians) para professional librarians (library officer) and supporting staff (library assistant cadre) Library from seven (7) federal universities, ten (10) state universities and thirty (30) private universities across South-West, Nigeria were chosen for the study. Multistage sampling techniques were adopted in determining the sample size for the study. 23 Universities in South-West, Nigeria, comprising of (3) federal universities based on their year of establishment ranges from 1948- 1962; (5) state universities ranges from 1982- 1999 while (15) private universities ranges from 1999 - 2007 were used for the study. In all, twenty-three (23) universities covering all the states in South-West, Nigeria were selected and total population of library personnel from (23) universities is (440). Research instrument used for this study was validated by two experts one of which was a senior lecturer in the department of Arts and Social sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye and the other one was a Professor from the Department of Information Resources

Management, Babcock University, Ilishan. Thereafter, reliability index was conducted using Cronbach's alpha method which gave a reliability co-efficient of 0.74 and 0.79 for Role Clarity and Job satisfaction respectively. Primary data collected were analyzed using simple percentages, mean and standard deviation as well as regression analysis at 0.05 level of significant.

### Demographic Information of Respondents

This demographic information of the respondents in respect to gender, age, marital status, and educational qualification are presented in Tables 1 .

**Table 1: Distribution of respondents by gender**

| Gender | Number of respondents | Percentage (%) |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Male   | 163                   | 45.8           |
| Female | 193                   | 54.2           |
| Total  | 356                   | 100            |

Table 1 shows the gender distribution of responders. The response rate showed that of the polled library staff, 163 (45.2%) were male and 193 (54.8%) were female. The research revealed that in the university libraries in South-West Nigeria, female library workers outnumbered their male counterparts. This is because women report higher levels of work satisfaction than men, who tend to explore for opportunities elsewhere.

**Table 2: Distribution of respondents by Age group**

| Age           | Number of respondents | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| 18-27 years   | 33                    | 9.3            |
| 28-37 years   | 97                    | 27.2           |
| 38-47 years   | 134                   | 37.6           |
| 48-57 years   | 85                    | 23.9           |
| Above 57 yeas | 7                     | 2.0            |
| Total         | 356                   | 100            |

Table 2 shows the number of respondents in each age group. It shows that 33 (or 9.3%) of the questioned library workers were between the ages of 18 and 27, while 97 (or 27.2%) were between the ages of 28 and 37, 134 (or 37.6%) were between the ages of 38 and 47, 85 (or 23.9%) were between the ages of 48 and 57, and 7 (or 2.0%) were above the age of 57. According to the data in the table, the average age of a university library worker in the South-West region of Nigeria is 38.47 years old, with the next largest age group being 28-37 years old. This indicates that the library staff members aged 28-37, and 38-47, were in good enough health to do their duties. In the university libraries in South-West Nigeria, you may find young people working.

**Table 3: Distribution of respondents by marital status**

| Marital Status | Number of respondents | Percentage (%) |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Married        | 292                   | 82.0           |
| Single         | 52                    | 14.6           |
| Divorced       | 7                     | 2.0            |
| Widow/Widower  | 3                     | 0.8            |
| Separated      | 2                     | 0.6            |
| Total          | 356                   | 100            |

Table 3 shows the marital status distribution of respondents. It shows that out of the whole sample, 292 (82.0%) were married and 52 (14.6%) were not. Only 2.0% were divorced; 0.8% were widowed; and 0.6% were legally separated. The investigation revealed that in the university libraries of South-West Nigeria, the vast majority of the library staff members were married. This means that married library workers are emotionally and mentally secure, and so open to taking on any position in the library.

**Table 4: Distribution of respondents by highest educational qualification**

| Education         | Number of respondents | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| SSCE/GCE          | 24                    | 6.7            |
| OND/NCE           | 51                    | 14.3           |
| HND               | 27                    | 7.6            |
| Bachelor's degree | 97                    | 27.2           |
| Master's degree   | 132                   | 37.1           |
| PhD               | 22                    | 6.2            |
| Others            | 3                     | 0.8            |
| Total             | 356                   | 100            |

Table 4 illustrates the distribution of respondents according to their level of education. It shows that among the library workers at a South-Western Nigerian institution, 132 (37.1%) had master's degrees, while 97 (27.2%) held bachelor's degrees. The chart shows that most university library staff in South-West Nigeria hold master's degrees (MLS or MLIS), hence these libraries are staffed by knowledgeable professionals capable of managing library operations.

### Research Questions 1

**What is the level of Job Satisfaction of university library personnel in South-West, Nigeria?**

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics Showing the level of Job Satisfaction of university library personnel in South-West, Nigeria.

| S/N | STATEMENTS   | VD          | D            | S              | VS             | Mean | STD  | Remarks   |
|-----|--|-------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------|------|-----------|
|     | <b>INTRINSIC JOB SATISFACTION</b>  |             |              |                |                |      |      |           |
| 1   | Working with peers often contributed to overall development of the library.                                  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 4<br>(1.1%)  | 200<br>(56.2%) | 152<br>(42.7%) | 3.42 | 0.52 | Satisfied |
| 2   | I have the chance to be 'somebody' in the community.   | 4<br>(1.1%) | 5<br>(1.4%)  | 216<br>(60.7%) | 131<br>(36.8%) | 3.33 | 0.56 | Satisfied |
| 3   | My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.  | 3<br>(0.8%) | 21<br>(5.9%) | 190<br>(53.4%) | 142<br>(39.9%) | 3.32 | 0.62 | Satisfied |
| 4   | My efforts are recognized by my supervisor and co-workers  | 0<br>(0.0%) | 17<br>(4.8%) | 209<br>(58.7%) | 130<br>(36.5%) | 3.32 | 0.56 | Satisfied |
| 5   | I am satisfied with the level of cooperation I receive from my co-workers and other employees in the library | 3<br>(0.8%) | 17<br>(4.8%) | 202<br>(56.7%) | 134<br>(37.6%) | 3.31 | 0.60 | Satisfied |
| 6.  | My performance of any duty or library routine, even when it is not in my section is encouraging.             | 2<br>(0.6%) | 8<br>(2.2%)  | 222<br>(62.4%) | 124<br>(34.8%) | 3.31 | 0.54 | Satisfied |
| 7   | My opinion on work issues is recognized  | 4<br>(1.1%) | 11<br>(3.1%) | 218<br>(61.2%) | 123<br>(34.6%) | 3.29 | 0.58 | Satisfied |
| 8   | I am satisfied with the achievement I am making in the library   | 2<br>(0.6%) | 23<br>(6.5%) | 202<br>(56.7%) | 129<br>(36.2%) | 3.29 | 0.61 | Satisfied |
| 9   | My opinion on work issues contribute to the library development.   | 4<br>(1.1%) | 18<br>(5.1%) | 203<br>(57.0%) | 131<br>(36.8%) | 3.29 | 0.61 | Satisfied |
| 10  | I am allowed to use initiative on my job.  | 3<br>(0.8%) | 17<br>(4.8%) | 215<br>(60.4%) | 121<br>(34.0%) | 3.28 | 0.59 | Satisfied |
| 11  | I have the chance to tell people what to do.   | 3<br>(0.8%) | 17<br>(4.8%) | 229<br>(64.3%) | 107<br>(30.1%) | 3.24 | 0.57 | Satisfied |
| 12  | I am satisfied with the opportunities given to   | 5<br>(1.4%) | 22<br>(6.2%) | 212<br>(59.6%) | 117<br>(32.9%) | 3.24 | 0.63 | Satisfied |

| S/N | STATEMENTS   | VD           | D             | S              | VS             | Mean | STD  | Remarks   |
|-----|--|--------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------|------|-----------|
|     | work independently.  |              |               | )              |                |      |      |           |
| 13  | The library work gives me opportunity to challenge lives.  | 5<br>(1.4%)  | 19<br>(5.3%)  | 217<br>(61.0%) | 115<br>(32.3%) | 3.24 | 0.61 | Satisfied |
| 14  | I have the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.  | 4<br>(1.1%)  | 15<br>(4.2%)  | 237<br>(66.6%) | 100<br>(28.1%) | 3.22 | 0.57 | Satisfied |
| 15  | I am well respected.   | 1<br>(0.3%)  | 17<br>(4.8%)  | 241<br>(67.7%) | 97<br>(27.2%)  | 3.22 | 0.53 | Satisfied |
| 16  | I like the way my co-workers get along with each other.  | 4<br>(1.1%)  | 27<br>(7.6%)  | 210<br>(59.0%) | 115<br>(32.3%) | 3.22 | 0.63 | Satisfied |
| 17  | Negative attitude exhibited by most library supervisors affect productivity.   | 15<br>(4.2%) | 47<br>(13.2%) | 145<br>(40.7%) | 149<br>(41.9%) | 3.20 | 0.82 | Satisfied |
| 18  | My contribution in the library management meeting often led to accreditation success of the library.                   | 6<br>(1.7%)  | 38<br>(10.7%) | 194<br>(54.5%) | 118<br>(33.1%) | 3.19 | 0.69 | Satisfied |
| 19  | My supervisor gives me opportunity to control and monitoring of staff under my supervision without seeking assistance. | 10<br>(2.8%) | 30<br>(8.4%)  | 208<br>(58.4%) | 108<br>(30.3%) | 3.16 | 0.69 | Satisfied |
| 20  | Praises and recommendations on my job by my supervisor is satisfying   | 9<br>(2.5%)  | 33<br>(9.3%)  | 212<br>(59.6%) | 102<br>(28.7%) | 3.14 | 0.68 | Satisfied |
| 21  | I participate in the decision-making process in my department.   | 7<br>(2.0%)  | 45<br>(12.6%) | 197<br>(55.3%) | 107<br>(30.1%) | 3.13 | 0.70 | Satisfied |
| 22  | I have the freedom to use my own judgment.   | 10<br>(2.8%) | 51<br>(14.3%) | 204<br>(57.3%) | 91<br>(25.6%)  | 3.06 | 0.71 | Satisfied |
| 23  | My supervisor encourages and seats with me to plan my career development.  | 11<br>(3.1%) | 55<br>(15.4%) | 201<br>(56.5%) | 89<br>(25.0%)  | 3.03 | 0.73 | Satisfied |
| 24  | Each day of work seems like it will never end.   | 7<br>(2.0%)  | 70<br>(19.7%) | 199<br>(55.9%) | 80<br>(22.5%)  | 2.98 | 0.71 | Satisfied |

| S/N | STATEMENTS  | VD            | D             | S              | VS             | Mean | STD         | Remarks                |
|-----|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------|-------------|------------------------|
|     |   |               | )             | )              |                |      |             |                        |
|     | <b>Average Mean</b>   |               |               |                |                |      | <b>3.23</b> |                        |
|     | <b>EXTRINSIC JOB SATISFACTION</b>   |               |               |                |                |      |             |                        |
| 25  | I have the ability to communicate with my boss.                                   | 3<br>(0.8%)   | 18<br>(5.1%)  | 200<br>(56.2%) | 135<br>(37.9%) | 3.31 | 0.61        | Satisfied              |
| 26  | I have the ability to clearly communicate with colleagues and clients in writing. | 8<br>(2.2%)   | 21<br>(5.9%)  | 197<br>(55.3%) | 130<br>(36.5%) | 3.26 | 0.67        | Satisfied <sup>i</sup> |
| 27  | I follow the channel of communication in my place of work.                        | 4<br>(1.1%)   | 31<br>(8.7%)  | 194<br>(54.5%) | 127<br>(35.7%) | 3.25 | 0.65        | Satisfied              |
| 28  | My promotion boosts the level of my job satisfaction.                             | 18<br>(5.1%)  | 41<br>(11.5%) | 196<br>(55.1%) | 101<br>(28.4%) | 3.07 | 0.77        | Satisfied              |
| 29  | I have the ability to make oral presentation.                                     | 11<br>(3.1%)  | 53<br>(14.9%) | 195<br>(54.8%) | 97<br>(27.2%)  | 3.06 | 0.74        | Satisfied              |
| 30. | My salary is regular and it is been paid as at when due.                          | 27<br>(7.6%)  | 55<br>(15.4%) | 150<br>(42.1%) | 124<br>(34.8%) | 3.04 | 0.89        | Satisfied              |
| 31  | My boss recommends me for promotion regularly.                                    | 26<br>(7.3%)  | 57<br>(16.0%) | 171<br>(48.0%) | 102<br>(28.7%) | 2.98 | 0.86        | Satisfied              |
| 32  | I feel satisfied with job security in my place of work.                           | 18<br>(5.1%)  | 81<br>(22.8%) | 170<br>(47.8%) | 87<br>(24.4%)  | 2.92 | 0.82        | Satisfied              |
| 33  | I have the resources that can enhance my job performance.                         | 19<br>(5.3%)  | 76<br>(21.3%) | 179<br>(50.3%) | 82<br>(23.0%)  | 2.91 | 0.81        | Satisfied              |
| 34  | I am satisfied with my pay considering my level of education                      | 30<br>(8.4%)  | 83<br>(23.3%) | 163<br>(45.8%) | 80<br>(22.5%)  | 2.83 | 0.87        | Satisfied              |
| 35  | My promotion is regular.  | 40<br>(11.2%) | 82<br>(23.0%) | 147<br>(41.3%) | 87<br>(24.5%)  | 2.81 | 1.03        | Satisfied              |
| 36  | I am satisfied with policies attached to promotion in my place of work.           | 29<br>(8.1%)  | 84<br>(23.6%) | 171<br>(48.0%) | 72<br>(20.2%)  | 2.80 | 0.85        | Satisfied              |

| S/N | STATEMENTS   | VD            | D              | S              | VS            | Mean | STD         | Remarks   |
|-----|--|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|------|-------------|-----------|
| 37  | I am satisfied with income allowances and other benefits attached to my job                            | 37<br>(10.4%) | 87<br>(24.4%)  | 150<br>(42.1%) | 82<br>(23.0%) | 2.78 | 0.92        | Satisfied |
| 38  | I am satisfied with the opportunities given to attend job related seminars, conferences and workshops. | 41<br>(11.5%) | 77<br>(21.6%)  | 162<br>(45.5%) | 76<br>(21.3%) | 2.77 | 0.92        | Satisfied |
| 39  | I am satisfied with present salary.  | 44<br>(12.4%) | 93<br>(26.1%)  | 145<br>(40.7%) | 74<br>(20.8%) | 2.69 | 0.94        | Satisfied |
| 40  | The university management provides adequate emolument packages for enhancement of job security.        | 33<br>(9.3%)  | 115<br>(32.3%) | 136<br>(38.2%) | 72<br>(20.2%) | 2.69 | 0.89        | Satisfied |
| 41  | I am satisfied with hazard prevention packages provided in my place of work.                           | 34<br>(9.6%)  | 109<br>(30.6%) | 148<br>(41.6%) | 65<br>(18.3%) | 2.69 | 0.88        | Satisfied |
| 42  | I am satisfied with hazard allowances paid to workers.   | 48<br>(13.5%) | 136<br>(38.2%) | 115<br>(32.3%) | 57<br>(16.0%) | 2.50 | 0.92        | Satisfied |
|     | <b>Average Mean</b>  |               |                |                |               |      | <b>2.90</b> |           |
|     | <b>Ground Mean</b>   |               |                |                |               |      | <b>3.09</b> |           |

Decision rule: (0-1.49 = Very Level), (1.50-2.49 = Low Level), (2.50-3.49 = High Level), (3.50-4.0 = Very High Level)

Table 5 displays descriptive information pertaining to the Job Satisfaction of university library employees in South-West Nigeria. There were two distinct types of job fulfillment identified. The intrinsic job satisfaction mean was 3.42 when employees felt their work with colleagues had a significant impact on the library as a whole, and it was 2.98 when employees felt their workdays would never end. There was a high degree of intrinsic work satisfaction, with a mean score of 3.23. In contrast, when it comes to extrinsic factors, the mean level of job satisfaction was highest with a mean value of 3.31 on the statements that says "I have the ability to communicate with my boss" and lowest with a mean value of 2.50 on the statements that says "I am satisfied with hazard allowances paid to workers". As the mean score was 2.90, it showed that respondents

had a high degree of extrinsic work satisfaction. Overall work satisfaction, including intrinsic and extrinsic factors, averaged 3.09 on a 4-point scale. From these data, we infer that library workers in SW Nigeria reported high levels of job satisfaction. Staff members in South-West Nigeria's libraries report a high level of work satisfaction, with a mean rating of 3.09 on a scale from 1 to 4.

## Research Question 2

### How do library personnel perceive their role clarification in university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 6 : Descriptive Statistics of perceived role clarification of library personnel in university libraries in South-West, Nigeria.

|    | Library personnel perceived role clarification  | SA             | A               | D            | SD          | Mean | STD         |  |
|----|---|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|------|-------------|--|
|    | <b>Adequate information on job responsibility</b>   |                |                 |              |             |      |             |  |
| 1. | I know exactly my tasks and responsibilities.   | 162<br>(45.5%) | 185<br>(52.0%)  | 6<br>(1.7%)  | 3<br>(0.8%) | 3.42 | 0.57        |  |
| 2. | My role as library personnel is described in library work schedule.                         | 143<br>(40.2%) | 195<br>(54.8%)  | 16<br>(4.5%) | 2<br>(0.6%) | 3.35 | 0.59        |  |
| 3. | I understand my role as library personnel.  | 168<br>(47.2%) | 18 2<br>(51.1%) | 4<br>(1.1%)  | 2<br>(0.6%) | 3.45 | 0.55        |  |
| 4. | The university librarian clearly understands my role as library personnel.                  | 155<br>(43.5%) | 189<br>(53.1%)  | 11<br>(3.1%) | 1<br>(0.3%) | 3.40 | 0.57        |  |
|    | <b>Average</b>  |                |                 |              |             |      | <b>Mean</b> |  |
|    | <b>3.40</b>   |                |                 |              |             |      |             |  |
|    | <b>Detail information on procedure for work</b>   |                |                 |              |             |      |             |  |
| 5. | I know how to perform each task to get my job done.   | 180<br>(50.6%) | 171<br>(48.0%)  | 4<br>(1.1%)  | 1<br>(0.3%) | 3.50 | 0.54        |  |
| 6. | I know how to obtain the resources necessary for my job (equipment, tools and information). | 168<br>(47.2%) | 176<br>(49.4%)  | 11<br>(3.1%) | 1<br>(0.3%) | 3.44 | 0.57        |  |
| 7. | I know how to use library tools for library operations.                                     | 168<br>(47.2%) | 183<br>(51.4%)  | 3(0.8%)      | 2<br>(0.6%) | 3.45 | 0.55        |  |
| 8  | I know how my performance on the job is going to be evaluated.                              | 136<br>(38.2%) | 190<br>(53.4%)  | 25<br>(7.0%) | 5<br>(1.4%) | 3.28 | 0.66        |  |
|    | <b>Average Mean = 3.42</b>  |                |                 |              |             |      |             |  |
|    | <b>Knowledge of work priorities</b>   |                |                 |              |             |      |             |  |

|     | <b>Library personnel perceived role clarification</b>                                   | <b>SA</b>      | <b>A</b>       | <b>D</b>     | <b>SD</b>   | <b>Mean</b> | <b>STD</b>  |  |
|-----|---|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| 9.  | I can prioritize my tasks and responsibilities.   | 146<br>(41.0%) | 198<br>(55.6%) | 10<br>(2.8%) | 2<br>(0.6%) | 3.37        | 0.57        |  |
| 10. | I know who my clients are.  | 174<br>(48.9%) | 171<br>(48.0%) | 10<br>(2.8%) | 1<br>(0.3%) | 3.46        | 0.57        |  |
| 11. | I have knowledge of what is necessary for my clients to be satisfied.                   | 160<br>(44.9%) | 186<br>(52.2%) | 10<br>(2.8%) | 0(0.0%)     | 3.42        | 0.55        |  |
| 12. | I know how and from whom I should ask for support if necessary.                         | 166<br>(46.6%) | 182<br>(51.1%) | 7<br>(2.0%)  | 1<br>(0.3%) | 3.44        | 0.55        |  |
|     | <b>Average</b><br><b>3.42</b>   |                |                |              |             |             | <b>Mean</b> |  |
|     | <b>Adequate feedback</b>  |                |                |              |             |             |             |  |
| 13. | I know what my superiors expect from me.  | 140<br>(39.3%) | 204<br>(57.3%) | 12<br>(3.4%) | 0<br>(0.0%) | 3.36        | 0.55        |  |
| 14. | I know when to report about my work to my superior.                                     | 147<br>(41.3%) | 199<br>(55.9%) | 8<br>(2.2%)  | 2<br>(0.6%) | 3.38        | 0.56        |  |
| 15. | I know the implications of not performing my tasks and responsibilities on other staff. | 152<br>(42.7%) | 198<br>(55.6%) | 4<br>(1.1%)  | 2<br>(0.6%) | 3.40        | 0.55        |  |
| 16. | The feedback from my client geared me to perform better.                                | 160<br>(44.9%) | 186<br>(52.2%) | 10<br>(2.8%) | 0<br>(0.0%) | 3.42        | 0.55        |  |
| 17. | The feedback from my superior enhances my performance.                                  | 161<br>(45.2%) | 177<br>(49.7%) | 13<br>(3.7%) | 5<br>(1.4%) | 3.39        | 0.63        |  |
|     | <b>Average</b><br><b>3.39</b>   |                |                |              |             |             | <b>Mean</b> |  |
|     | <b>Autonomy/ Control</b>  |                |                |              |             |             |             |  |
| 18. | I have control of monitoring the staff under my supervision without seeking assistance  | 122<br>(34.3%) | 205<br>(57.6%) | 26<br>(7.3%) | 3<br>(0.8%) | 3.25        | 0.62        |  |
| 19. | I understand how my roles and responsibilities affect the effectiveness of the library. | 137<br>(38.5%) | 204<br>(57.3%) | 14<br>(3.9%) | 1<br>(0.3%) | 3.34        | 0.57        |  |
| 20. | I feel certain about how much authority I have on the job.                              | 104<br>(29.2%) | 221<br>(62.1%) | 27<br>(7.6%) | 4<br>(1.1%) | 3.19        | 0.61        |  |
|     | <b>Average</b><br><b>3.26</b>   |                |                |              |             |             | <b>Mean</b> |  |
|     | <b>Grand</b><br><b>3.39</b>   |                |                |              |             |             | <b>Mean</b> |  |

Decision rule: (0-1.49 = Very Low), (1.50-2.49 = Low), (2.50-3.49 = High), (3.50-4.0 = Very High)

Table 6 presents descriptive data illustrating how library workers in university libraries in Nigeria's South-West regarded their job clarification. They had a very favorable impression of the level of detail provided about their responsibilities on the job, scoring a mean of 3.40. The average mean score is 3.42, indicating that the general impression of the work process is good and very high. Additionally, they had a favorable and high opinion of their understanding of job priorities, averaging 3.42 out of 5. Furthermore, library staff rated it highly (3.39 on average) in terms of sufficient feedback. A mean of 3.26 indicates a high level of perceived autonomy/control. Overall, staff in university libraries in South-West Nigeria gave themselves a mean score of 3.39 on a scale from 1 to 4 when asked how clear their roles were to them.

### Discussion of Findings

From the study, it was discovered that defining individual roles and responsibilities has a major influence on library personnel job satisfaction and reduces turnover rates in the library. The findings revealed that library personnel in university libraries in South-West, Nigeria are very clear about their roles and responsibilities with a grand mean of 3.39.; detailed information on procedure for work and knowledge of work priority have the same high mean of 3.42 and adequate information on job responsibility have a mean of 3.40 which indicated that the understanding of role clarity by the library personnel influenced their job satisfaction and commitment to work. Managers of library with low and moderate-turnover offices were noticeably more involved in outlining employees' tasks than their counterparts in high-turnover workplaces. For most library personnel, job description is the document against which they were recruited. Role clarity in library focuses on what must be done to implement change, reduce duplication of work, prepare library personnel for a performance culture, improve quality of work and reduce turnover rate.

In support of the conclusion that role clarity has a greater influence on the job satisfaction of university library personnel in the South-West of Nigeria, Thangavelu and Sudhahar (2017), supported that there was a significant correlation between role clarity, performance feedback and job satisfaction of library personnel which confirmed that the understanding of role clarity by library personnel is essential for the library to function better. To support further, Onuoha, Ogunjmi, and Owodunni (2016) who conducted a study on role clarity, self-concept and job satisfaction of library personnel confirmed a correlation between library employees' role clarity and their job satisfaction with an average mean score of 3.56 which is consistent with the results shown above. Library staff in South-Western Nigerian university libraries reported higher levels of work satisfaction when they had a clearer understanding of their roles.

Also, in supporting the above submission, Subharh and Kumar (2019) supported that role clarity leads to higher commitment and job satisfaction of library personnel while role conflict or ambiguity on the other hand leads to lower job commitment, more tension, anxiety and job dissatisfaction which may invariably leads to personnel turnover.

Also, Hassan (2013) supported that role clarification was found to be a significant predictor of perceived role clarity in the offices ( $\beta = 0.54$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $R = 0.22$ ,  $F = 4.45$ ), Role classification also had a positive effect on work satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.59$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $R = 0.35$ ,  $F = 6.90$ ), Role clarification was found to have a significant negative impact on turnover rates in the offices ( $\beta = 0- .49$ ,  $p < .05$ ;  $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F = 2.74$ ), Role clarity had a significant negative effect on turnover rates in the offices, as well ( $\beta = -.39$ ,  $p < .05$ ). It was evident that managers in offices with low and moderate rates of turnover were significantly more active in clarifying subordinates' roles and responsibilities than those in offices with a high rate of turnover. In addition, offices that experienced a low rate of turnover had significantly higher levels of role clarity than offices with a high rate of turnover.

In addition, the empirical study that supported the above finding was carried out by Frogeli, Rudman and Gustavson (2019) on the relationship between task mastery, role clarity, social acceptance and stress among library staff revealed that when the new staff experienced higher level of task mastery, role clarity, and social acceptance, they experience lower level of stress and enjoyed satisfaction (task mastery - 0.04,  $p = 0.001$ , role clarity- 0.34,  $p = 0.001$  and social acceptance - 0.33,  $p = 0.001$ ).

### Implications of the study

The study implies that job description is the document against which the library personnel were recruited. When a role and responsibility is clearly defined the library personnel are aware of what must be done to implement change, reduce duplication of work, prepare the library personnel for a performance culture and improve quality of work based on the fact that they are satisfied with their job. It was apparent that library personnel have a good understanding of their role especially when it comes to criteria for performance evaluation and librarian's authority on the job. Role clarity leads to higher commitment and job satisfaction of the librarians while role conflict and ambiguity on the other hand, leads to lower job satisfaction, lower job commitment, more tension, anxiety and librarians turnover.

It was evident that the task of ensuring role clarity is basically a responsibility of the library administrator who has important tasks of organizing library personnel, acquaint them with necessary information regarding their roles and responsibilities so that they can effectively perform their duties as expected. The library administrators in offices with low and moderate rates of turnover were significantly more active in clarifying subordinates roles and responsibilities (work schedule) which made them to be more committed and satisfied with their jobs while those in offices with a high rates of turnover means that there exist a role ambiguity caused by lack of required information concerning employees roles and responsibilities (Keremer and Aginis 2019). This research study indicates that various individuals and group characteristics of library personnel may tend to influence their commitment, dedication and job satisfaction.

### Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to determine whether and how defining job responsibilities improved the happiness of library workers at universities in the South-West region of Nigeria. The following are inferences made considering the study's results. To begin, there was a noteworthy outcome for the role clarity factors. The importance of knowing one's priorities at work, receiving constructive criticism, and feeling that one has some control over one's own time, as well as being given sufficient information about one's responsibilities, was emphasized. The research confirmed that the five antecedents / indicators of role clarity were employed at university libraries in South-West, Nigeria, and that these factors all had a positive impact on the work satisfaction of library staff in these institutions. The results of the research verified the link between work happiness and role clarity, while a lack of position clarity might lead to worse performance, lower information service delivery quality, and lower job satisfaction. The results of the research showed that a strong predictor of job satisfaction among library workers in South-West Nigeria was a clear understanding of their roles.

### Recommendations

The following suggestions are offered considering the findings:

1. There is a need to develop working relationships amongst coworkers to increase the degree of job satisfaction among library staff, since this would increase the level of job satisfaction even higher.
2. Recognizing the importance of job clarity to organizational growth, management should outline employee roles and responsibilities.
3. Given the potential for a single employee to take on multiple responsibilities at once in university libraries, management should strive to minimize role conflicts by outlining the expected outcomes for each position and providing regular feedback on staff performance.

4. In addition, University Librarians should encourage their staff to learn and develop on the job, hence increasing work satisfaction.

## References

- Allemeh, S. M., Harooni, A., Chaleshtari, M.S. & Asadi, A. (2013). Investigating the relationship between variables and role clarity effects on the perceived service quality of front line employees. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3 (5), 121- 138.
- Caillier, J. G. (2014). Do role clarity and job satisfaction mediate the relationship between Telework and work effort? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 37 (4), 193 – 201.
- Fanimehin and Popoola (2013). Effect of career progression, work motivation and leadership styles on job satisfaction of library personnel in the Federal Civil Service of Nigeria. *International Journal of Library Science*, 5(5,147-159)
- Fanimehin, A. O. (2015). Influence of power and career progression on job satisfaction of library personnel in the Federal Civil Services of Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice( e - journal)*. <http://digitalcommons.unil.edu.libphiloprac/13344/2017>.
- Frogeli, E., Rudman, A & Gustavsson, P. (2019). The relationship between task mastery, role clarity, social acceptance and stress: An intensive longitudinal study with a sample of newly registered nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Student*, 91 (3) 60-69.
- Hassan, S. (2013). The importance of role clarification in workgroups: Effects on perceived role clarity, work satisfaction, and turnover rates. *Public Administration Review*, 73 (5), 716-725
- Idiegbeyanse, J., Aregbesola, A., Owolabi, S. E. & Eyiolorunse, T. (2019). Relationship between motivation and job satisfaction of staff in private university libraries, Nigeria. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal* , 18 (1) 20-29
- Ikonne, C.N. & Onuoha, U. D. (2015). Factors influencing job satisfaction of librarians in Federal and State University libraries in Southern Nigeria. *O & A Library Journal* 2 (2), 1-9.
- Inuwa, M. (2016). Job satisfaction and Employee Performance: An Empirical Approach. *The Millenium University Journal* 1 (1),S 90-98.
- Keremer, T. & Aginis, Y. (2019). Innovation leadership: Best practice recommendations for promoting employee creativity, voice and knowledge sharing, *Business Horizons* 62,(65-74..
- Orgambidez, A. & Almeida, H (2020). Social support, role clarity and job satisfaction: A successful combination for Nurses. *International Nursing Review*, 67 (3), 380-386.

- Onuoha, U. D., Ogunjimi, T. & Owodunni, M. (2016). Role clarity, self - concept and job satisfaction of library personnel in selected university libraries in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*, 9 (2), 9 - 16.
- Qureshi, M. A. & Abhmid, K. (2017). Impact of Supervisor support on Job satisfaction: A moderating role of fairness perception. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7 (3), 236--242.
- Renaweera, A. & Bodhinayaka, D. (2018). Job satisfaction of Library Staff: A study based on University Libraries in Sri-Lanka, *International Journal of Human Resources Studies*, 8(3), 53.D01:10:5296/ijhrs.v8B.13190.
- Samie, F., Riahi, L. & Tabibi, S. J. (2014). The relationship between role clarity and efficiency of employees in management and resource development, Department of Ministry of Health and Medical Education in I. R. Iran. *International, Open Access, Peer review Research Journal* 12 (3) 81 - 90.
- Taghavi, A. (2015). A role clarity framework for gathering business activities: A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, Faculty of Graduate and Post-Doctoral studies. University of British Columbia, Vancouver. 1 - 85.
- Thangavelu, A. & Sudhahar, (2017). Role clarity and Job performance among the employees in small and medium industries. *Research on Humanities and Social Science*, 7 (17), 1-6.
- Yadar, M. & Kumar, A. (2013). An Indian outlook on role clarity, organizational citizenship Behaviour and Gender Relationship: Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA) Approach. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 6 (1), 63 - 75.
-