

Impact of Mentoring on Research Productivity of Young Librarians in Selected Academic Libraries

OLUTOYIN OLUKEMI OSO¹

T.Y. Danjuma Library
Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria
Email: oo.oso@acu.edu.ng

SOLOMON ADEOLU OLANIYI²

T.Y. Danjuma Library
Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria
Email: sa.olaniyi@acu.edu.ng

Abstract

The research productivity of young librarians in academic libraries is very germane to their academic status, promotion and contribution to knowledge among others. Nevertheless, earlier surveys have indicated that the research productivity of some young academics seems to be low. This might be ascribed to mentoring. Thus, the survey investigated the connection between mentoring and research productivity of young librarians in some selected academic libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. The descriptive research pattern and the census technique were used. Also, 23 out of the 25 young librarians in six universities in the selected academic libraries took part in the study. Findings indicated that out of the four major factors promoting research productivity, research funding/grant ($\bar{x} = 3.78$) and mentoring ($\bar{x} = 3.61$) were the most prominent. Result also showed the presence of statistical significant relationship between mentoring and research productivity of Young Librarians ($r=0.488$, $n=23$, $p(0.018)<0.05$). Therefore, in a bid to ease the research productivity of young librarians, mentoring programmes should be put in place.

Keywords: Mentoring, Research Productivity, Young Librarians, Academic Libraries

Introduction

It is noteworthy to point out that; libraries, irrespective of their types across the globe, are recognised as fountains where information as water is disseminated to quench the information thirst of users. Then, going by the description of a type, according to Okogwu (2022), Academic libraries consist of three elements: staff, information resources, and patrons. They are located in academic institutions. Academic libraries support academic institutions, faculty, and students among other complementing roles. Which include teaching, learning and research activities. However, to ensure that teaching, learning and research are provided with adequate support, academic libraries are occupied by staff. Okafor (2020) stated that; there are different cadres of staff in the library for instance; Support staff who are not professionals, Library officers, Assistant Librarian, Librarians, Deputy Director, Director.

Nonetheless, at the core of every given academic library are the librarians steering the ship of their different libraries. Therefore, Reitz (2004) defined a Librarian as a person with professional training who oversees the upkeep of a library and its holdings, which includes material selection, processing, and organisation as well as information delivery, instruction, and loan services tailored to the needs of the library's patrons. The librarian cadre, however, comprises; Assistant Librarian, Librarian II, Librarian I, Senior Librarian and Principal Librarian. Chukwu, Emezie, Nwaohiri, and Chima-James (2018) stated that; a professional nomenclature has a significant mental impact. As such,

Librarian II and Assistant Librarian might be classified as Young Librarians. Therefore, being young in this milieu does not mean age and maturity but inadequacy in experience and skills as required of Librarians in charge of academic library activities. However, in view of the fact that the Librarian cadre belongs to the academics and while it is a must for academic libraries to be entirely involved in research activities, then, it means that; research-wise, Young Librarians need to be productive. Pal and Sarkar (2020) stated that; scientific performance, scholarly contribution, publication output, and other related concepts are habitually considered as identical to 'research productivity.

According to Oyeyemi, Ejakpovi, Oyeyemi and Adeniji (2019), Research productivity is a reliable indicator of academic success in academia, and peers frequently evaluate an academic's standing based on their research output. Furthermore, Ohio State University (2018) averred that; research contributions may be used as a gauge of research productivity in the form of value and number and the criterion utilised for this reason usually include; citation number, the number of publications, journal collection and impact factor/cite score. The value is characterised by the components of impact factor/cite score, amount of citations, and the value of the journal collection. However, the amount of publications signifies quantity.

The human driving factors of research productivity comprise: research skilfulness and proficiency, personal-efficacy, universal innovativeness, personal factors, self-purpose, mentoring, and dynamics of

professional life (Talukdar, 2015, Ghabban, Selamat, Ibrahim, Krejcar, Maresova and Herrera-Viedma (2019). Conversely, Nygaard (2017) stated that; organisational support, situational factors, departmental practice, tenure and promotions and research-integrated practice are the organizational driving factors of research productivity. Therefore, as clearly stated as one of the major human driving factors, research productivity could be a function of mentoring which young librarians must not jettison.

Pertin (2011) defines mentoring as the professional interactions in which a more experienced person (the mentee) receives assistance from a qualified individual (the mentor) in order to build challenging knowledge and skills that can foster both professional and personal growth. Regardless of a person's line of work, mentoring is a potent system that supports the growth and enhancement of a person's personal and professional skills (Ongek, 2016). The primary objective of mentoring is to assist staff members in promptly grasping the specifics of their work in order to support the professional, career, and personal development that is essential for a high level of commitment to their work (Ojeaga and Okolocha, 2019).

Furthermore, Ubogu (2019) confirmed that mentorship is a crucial part of the job for librarians in order to maintain and improve their professional practice and stay up to date with emerging trends in the field. Academic librarians benefit from mentoring because it prepares aspiring librarians for the more difficult work that lies ahead. Using this chance, mentors

gradually transfer control to younger librarians. Through mentoring, an educated person could coordinate with others to help them reach maturity. Each librarian plays a vital part in achieving the goals and objectives of the group organization. Every librarian, from the chief librarian to the least, has a distinct function to do. The professional competence and performance of each individual determines the degree to which the group aim is accomplished. Additionally, Ekechukwu and Horsfall (2015) noted that mentoring relationships may be regarded from a variety of angles, and that in addition to the young librarian's potential benefits, the experienced librarian's professional development must also be taken into account. However, the research productivity of young librarians is expected to be as progressive as academics, but it seems to be low. This claim may be supported by Iqbal (2011) who investigated factors responsible for low research productivity at the higher education level. The finding revealed that; mean score (4.16) respondents agreed to low research productivity. To this end, the survey is interested in the effect of mentoring on research productivity. Owing to all the salient issues discussed so far, this study is hinged on investigating the impact of mentoring the research productivity of young librarians in selected academic libraries.

Statement of the problem

There is no nay say in the fact that; mentoring is capable of providing a supportive form of development. Unlike coaching, where the focus is on success

at work, personal matters can be discussed more productively, and goals for mentoring programmes can be both organizational and personal. They can also be more casual, with sessions happening whenever the person being mentored needs advice or assistance. Longer-term, more comprehensive approach to the mentees, assistance and direction to help them get ready for new positions are what mentoring could offer.

However, observations and previous studies have shown that the research productivity of young librarians seems to be low.

Therefore, it is against this backdrop that this study is bent on examining the impact of mentoring on the research productivity of young librarians in some selected academic libraries.

Research questions

- i. What are the factors promoting research productivity among young librarians in academic libraries?
- ii. What are the types of mentoring programmes available to young librarians in academic libraries?
- iii. What are the perceptions of young librarians about mentoring?
- iv. What are the challenges confronting the research productivity of young librarians in academic libraries?

Research hypothesis

This null hypothesis will be tested in this study at 0.05 level of significance.

Ho: There is no significant relationship

between mentoring and research productivity of young librarians in academic libraries.

Literature Review

Mentoring is the process by which a person (mentor) gives advice, assistance, care and guidance to another person (mentee) in order to promote the professional development and learning of the mentee (Aladejana, Aladejana and Ehindero, 2006). In other words, a mentor is a trustworthy, reliable, experienced and well-exposed person who genuinely cares and has an interest in the training and development of less knowledgeable persons. A mentor is an individual who develops a one-to-one relationship with a learner and whom the learner recognises as a person who encourages personal development to take place. In this instance, the learners are mentees and the mentor is a senior colleague in a tertiary institution. As a result, mentors must be capable of initiating learning as well as processing strong interpersonal skills and understanding of the principles of adult education (Carter & Francis, 2000).

In a similar vein, Wadesango (2014) asserted that the mentorship process typically involves frequent gatherings and casual conversation. There is no bureaucracy and minimal paperwork; instead of the centre having to keep an eye on the system, the mentor and mentees are responsible for holding frequent meetings. Because conducting research may be an extremely solitary endeavour, this calls for devotion and commitment to the process on the part of mentors as well as mentees. Therefore, the primary

duty of research mentors is to support, encourage, and demonstrate an interest in their mentees' research objectives and endeavours.

It is very simple for recent graduates to devote most of their time—if not all of it—to teaching-related tasks, which frequently entail meeting deadlines and providing timely feedback. Depending on their composition, goals, and purpose, mentoring relationships can take on a variety of shapes. According to Nwabueze and Anike (2016), the structure, purpose, and substance of a mentoring relationship can determine its many characteristics. Formal mentoring and traditional or informal mentoring are the two types of mentoring practices that are offered for librarians' professional growth. A one-on-one, in-person mentoring relationship when the mentor or mentee makes the decision is known as conventional or informal mentoring (Sodipe and Madukoma, 2013).

In addition, Ritchie and Genoni (2008) noted that informal mentoring takes place outside the purview of formal mentoring initiatives. In this case, natural selection plays the sole role in the matching process. They also point out that, while being an unstructured curriculum, it offers a structured framework. Additionally, it gives each participant the freedom to choose the parameters of their interactions and the things they will do. It is unstructured and aims to establish a rapport between the mentee and the mentor, someone they know personally or through social media. Relationships based on informal mentoring naturally arise from rapport and respect. This

usually happens when a more seasoned co-worker shows a keen interest in the professional development of a less seasoned colleague (Abbot 2009, Adeniji and Adeniji 2010).

According to Abbott (2009), informal mentoring is a continuous process that involves librarians as possible mentors and mentees. Its success is partially dependent on the initiative and desire of the mentees to ask seasoned colleagues for help, as well as the availability and willingness of seasoned librarians to do the same. Because traditional librarianship is primarily an apprenticeship program, it is commonly performed in most libraries by staff members at all levels (Nwabueze and Ozioko, 2012). The goal of formal mentoring is to harness the benefits of informal mentoring relationships. Formal mentorship happens when an organization or professional group fosters the relationship, claims Asadu (2010). Administrators, who have limited firsthand experience of mentors and mentees, methodically link mentees with mentors according to predetermined criteria.

Ritchie and Genoni (2008) noted that formal mentoring is predicated on a program that is structured and has a set environment. It provides participants with the protocols and rules to follow when managing their connections. According to Spencer (2010) and Schlee (2011), for a formal mentoring program to be successful, both the mentor and the mentee must be aware of their roles in the procedure. The mentee should set out to acquire new abilities and knowledge that he can use in his profession. In order to

advance professionally, he asks for direction and counsel, accepts accountability for his choices and deeds, and upholds confidentiality. Also, he completes assignments and projects by the set deadlines and acts on objective, professional recommendations. The mentor supports the mentee's professional development by giving advice, information, and supportive criticism. Also, he assesses the mentee's goals and actions, offers support and encouragement, and, when needed, points out any shortcomings in the agreed-upon performance while maintaining confidentiality. Peer, group, and internet mentoring are just a few of the different forms that formal mentoring can take. No wonder Oso and Olorunsola (2015) affirmed that peer group support and institutional support are the major factors for research.

According to Mundia and Iravo (2014), mentorship plays a part in the development of human resources. These advantages could increase efficiency in academic libraries. Every library needs mentorship to be successful. With mentoring, people at all stages of their careers can share information vertically. The learning curve can be instantly lowered, and it can also energize the workforce. According to Sambunjak, Straus, and Marusic (2009), developing authentic relationships is at the core of mentoring. This is because a solid relationship is the means through which mentors assist others in learning and growing at a good rate. Clarity is attained in a mentor-mentee relationship, and high expectations regarding the position, needs, and things the two people shared result in agreement on shared values and norms that they both commit to

sustaining their relationship for a better and prosperous career. Terrion and Leonard (2007) listed the qualities of effective mentors as follows: Supportiveness, an interdependent approach to mentoring, excellent communication skills, reliability, empathy, compatibility with the mentee's personality, enthusiasm, and adaptability. The most effective research support has been identified as collaborative work on research through mentoring; when young faculty members collaborated with experienced researchers on some research, the conference paper was excellent.

In a similar vein, Howland (2018) offers the library, its librarians, and users numerous advantages. Therefore, he said, "In practically every profession, including librarianship, mentoring on the job duties is the key to perfecting retention, promotion, and long-term success. Research has demonstrated that the creation of mentoring relationships is one of the most important variables in promoting these outcomes. The likelihood of obtaining an intelligent outcome is higher when the work done by academic library librarians is closely supervised by a supervisor to the subordinates. However, mentoring responsibilities are a very delicate area to behave in a librarian's day-to-day activities in an academic library. Furthermore, Atanda (2012) reaffirmed that the marketability or utilization of academics' research output is greatly influenced by the quality and integrity of their work. As a result, if this is lacking, the academics' efforts are compromised. Atanda (2012) emphasized further that

university-based research could only fulfill its intended purpose if it adhered to ethical standards. One can argue that if the general public does not trust the processes that led to their creation, research findings end up on the book shelves of university libraries.

Idoko, Ugwuanyi, and Osadebe (2016) agreed that in order for new librarians to gradually acquire the depth of knowledge necessary, professional training and learning must be built upon the already-existing basis. Both new and seasoned professionals have the chance to learn and hone the skills required for success in the broad and quickly changing library and information profession by mentoring a new or prospective professional. It is important to note that academic staff promotion is based on output in the field of research. Many young librarians may find it challenging or problematic to write publishable articles, according to Oso and Olorunsola (2015). The writers believe that with the right guidance from knowledgeable librarians and managers, they will learn how to transform their routine jobs into publishable material. According to a related study conducted by Jaiyeoba and Atanda (2009), academic staff in the Lecturer I to Professorial cadre had high productivity scores, while Assistant Lecturers and Lecturers II had scores of 75% and 58.9%, respectively. According to a study by Atanda (2018), the results showed that senior faculty were largely willing to mentor junior faculty. Mentoring also had an impact on junior faculty career growth and research productivity. However, administrative workload for junior and senior faculties and the hierarchy of authority were found to be

barriers to effective mentoring.

In a study on publication productivity, Hart (1999) discovered that most Penn State University librarians spent an average of 19.8 hours per month conducting research and that 80% of them recognized the value of publications for their professional advancement. Over the 15 to 20 years under study, this led to an increase in the quantity of research and publishing production among Penn State University librarians. In a different study, Okafor (2011) found that although the mean research output of faculty members in the Southern Nigerian universities he studied does not differ statistically significantly, when local journal articles are included, it does. According to research by Tracy, Jagsi, Starr, and Tarbell (2004), structured mentorship programs have a favorable effect on junior faculty growth across a variety of professions. It implies that junior faculty have access to the professional skills necessary to thrive in academia due to their proximity to senior faculty. This conclusion was supported by Allen and O'Brien (2006), Ronald, Brian, and Fredrick (2009), and Nwankwo, Ike, and Anozie (2017) who discovered that the mentoring process produced beneficial results for the mentees. According to Ronald, Brian, and Fredrick (2009), effective mentoring must take the mentee's developmental requirements into account. They also emphasized that mentoring practices for junior faculty members should include evaluating and providing feedback for research that is in its early stages of development, supporting these individuals in their professional endeavours, directing

them toward regular participation in professional organizations and conferences, guiding them toward sources of research funding (both internal and external), and providing information and advice for upcoming scholarly activities. Over a five-year period, Watson (1997) conducted surveys at ten (10) significant American universities about the publishing needs of academic librarians. According to his data, during that period 292 librarians wrote 1,106 articles, averaging 4.2 per librarian. The University of Ibadan was found to be the most prolific university in Nigeria according to Ani and Onyancha's (2011) study on research productivity at Nigerian universities utilising the Web Science database. The most productive disciplines were biology and applied microbiology. Kennedy and Brancolini (2012) investigated the research endeavours of Librarians after completing their Master of Library Science degree. Their findings revealed that; 62% of the respondents had carried out research, but about 77% of these respondents had circulated the findings of their research as articles in publications, conference papers etc.

Ugwuanyi (2011) lists the following as possible obstacles to fruitful mentoring relationships in libraries: (a) Inappropriate mentor selection: mentors are selected without considering the mentee's aptitude, interests, or career goals. In this instance, the program's efficacy will be questioned, (b) Establishing behavioral objectives: Broad aims, which make up goals, must be further divided into more manageable, quantifiable, and particular targets. It becomes challenging to evaluate or quantify the

degree to which the overarching goals have been accomplished in the absence of specific targets. Additionally, Adeniji and Adeniji (2010) stated that an academic culture should include an unrestrained passion for research, frequent internal seminars, a healthy sense of competition among academic staff members, and a genuine willingness to exchange ideas and knowledge. In the absence of these prerequisites, mentoring cannot flourish.

Insensitivity, poor academic groundwork, poor communication, complexity in forming peer associations, and inadequate professional role models can all contribute to a mentor/mentee relationship that doesn't work (Wilson, Andrew and Lesners 2006; David-West & Nmwcha, 2019). If neither the mentor nor the mentee is committed, issues will inevitably arise (Billings and Kowalski) (2008). If the connection is severely unbalanced or one-sided, it will not last. By keeping their attention on the aim mentee's accomplishment, both parties are required to engage in and contribute to its success. Ugwuanyi (2010) proposed a few strategies for overcoming mentoring obstacles, such as: (i) Mentors should be prepared and quick to provide their mentee with information, assistance, feedback, ideas, and connections. They should not hold onto information. (ii) Mentees should always offer well-thought-out and articulate conversation subjects to their mentors for each meeting. This speeds up understanding and facilitates conversation. It also makes it possible for the mentors to relate to the mentees and achieve the mentoring objectives.

Methodology

Descriptive survey research design was used for this study. The young Librarians at Precious Cornerstone University, Lead City University, Ajayi Crowther University, University of Ibadan, Ladoke Akintola University and Dominican University, Nigeria constituted the population of the study. According to the data collected from the institution, there were 25 Young Librarians in the six (6) libraries of the aforementioned universities. The sampling technique used for the study is the total enumeration technique, owing

to the manageable size of the population. A self-developed questionnaire constructed based on the review of the relevant literature was the data collection instrument. It was validated by experts in the field before being administered to the respondents. However, only 23 responses from the respondents to the questionnaire were used for data analysis. Data was analysed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and presented in the form of descriptive statistics of frequency counts, percentages and correlation analysis.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of respondents by institution

Institution	Frequency	Percentage
Precious Cornerstone Univ.	1	4.3
Lead City University	7	30.4
Ajayi Crowther University	6	26.1
University of Ibadan	2	8.7
Ladoke Akintola Univ.	4	17.4
Dominican University	3	13.0
Total	23	100.0

Table 1 showed that 1(4.3%) Young Librarian was from Precious Cornerstone University, 7(30.4%) were from Lead City University, 6(26.1%) were from Ajayi Crowther University, 2(8.7%) were from the University of Ibadan, 4(17.4%) were from Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, and 3(13.0%) were from Dominican University respectively. The result revealed that; Lead City University

has the highest number of Young Librarians, followed by Ajayi Crowther University, while Precious Cornerstone University has the least.

Results and discussion

Research question one: What are the factors promoting research productivity among Young Librarians in academic libraries?

Table: 2 Factors promoting research productivity among Young Librarians

s/n	Statements	SD	D	A	SA	\bar{x}	S.D.
1	Mentoring	-	-	9 39.1%	14 60.9%	3.61	0.499
2	Reward system	-	-	16 69.6%	7 30.4%	3.30	0.470
3	Research funding/grant	-	-	5 21.7%	18 78.3%	3.78	0.422
4	Electronic information resources	-	-	9 39.1%	14 60.9%	3.61	0.499
5	Research competence	-	-	9 39.1%	14 60.9%	3.61	0.499
6	Research-oriented culture	-	1 4.3%	9 39.1%	13 56.5%	3.52	0.593
7	Self-efficacy	1 4.3%	-	10 43.5%	12 52.2%	3.43	0.728
8	Institutional support	-	-	12 52.2%	11 47.8%	3.48	0.511
9	Self-determination	-	1 4.3%	9 39.1%	13 56.5%	3.52	0.593
10	Tenure and promotion	-	%	11 47.8%	12 52.2%	3.52	0.511
Weighted Mean =3.54							

Table 2 delineates an evaluation of various factors contributing to research productivity among Young Librarians in academic libraries. Mentoring garnered agreement from 60.9% of Young Librarians, emphasizing its positive impact on research productivity. Similarly, research funding/grant received substantial support with (78.3%) agreement, indicating its perceived significance. Electronic information resources, research competence, and a research-oriented culture also exhibited positive responses, each with agreement percentages ranging from (60.9%) to (56.5%). Conversely, self-efficacy and tenure and promotion displayed more diverse opinions, with (52.2%) and (47.8%) agreement, respectively. The overall weighted

mean, calculated across all factors, stands at 3.54, implying a generally positive outlook on the influence of these factors on research productivity. The weighted mean serves as a composite measure, reflecting the overall sentiment towards the factors considered. Hence, “Research funding/grant” (\bar{x} =3.78), “Mentoring” (\bar{x} =3.61), “Electronic information resources” (\bar{x} =3.61), and “Research competence” (\bar{x} =3.61) are the major factors promoting research productivity among Young Librarians in the academic libraries in the study.

Research question two: What are the types of mentoring programmes available to Young Librarians in academic libraries?

Table 3: Mentoring programmes available to Young Librarians

s/n	Statements	NA	A	RA	VRA	\bar{x}	S.D.
1	Webinars/Seminars, conference	1 4.3%	3 13.0%	6 26.1%	13 56.5%	3.35	0.885
2	Staff development	1 4.3%	4 17.4%	8 34.8%	10 43.5%	3.17	0.887
3	Workshop	2 8.7%	5 21.7%	10 43.5%	6 26.1%	2.87	0.920
4	Group/individual mentoring	-	8 34.8%	10 43.5%	5 21.7%	2.87	0.757
5	Orientation	1 4.3%	4 17.4%	13 56.5%	5 21.7%	2.96	0.767
Weighted Mean =3.04							

Key; NA= Not Available, A= Available RA= Readily Available, VRA = Very Readily Available

Table 3 outlines the evaluation of mentoring programs available to Young Librarians. The first mentoring programme, Webinars/Seminars, Conferences, was the most available mentoring programme to Young Librarians receiving the highest VRA percentage at (56.5%), indicating that a significant proportion of Young Librarians found these programmes very readily available and adequate. The weighted mean of 3.35 suggests a generally positive evaluation of this mentoring approach. Staff development, with a weighted mean of 3.17, also received favourable ratings. However, Workshop and Group/individual mentoring exhibited slightly lower levels of agreement. The Workshop program had a lower VRA percentage (26.1%) and a weighted mean of 2.87, implying that some young

librarians did not find it very readily available. Similarly, Group/individual mentoring had a VRA percentage of (21.7%), indicating a lesser degree of perceived availability. The overall weighted mean across all mentoring programs is 3.04, reflecting a generally positive perception of mentoring programs for young librarians. However, the varied responses to individual programme underscore the importance of tailoring mentoring initiatives to meet the diverse needs and preferences of young librarians.

Hence, the types of mentoring programmes available to young librarians in academic libraries include Webinars/Seminars, conference, and staff development respectively.

Research question three: What is the perception of mentoring among young librarians in academic libraries?

Table 4: Perceived impact of mentoring

s/n	Perceived impact of mentoring	VLE	LE	HE	VHE	\bar{x}	S.D.
1	I perceived that research productivity is linked to my participation in conferences	-	1 4.3%	15 65.2%	7 30.4%	3.26	0.541
2	I feel that being in a group mentoring programme assist my writing of articles	-	%	16 69.6%	7 30.4%	3.30	0.470
3	I am aware that technical tips usually discussed at seminars has helped writing of books	-	2 8.7%	15 65.2%	6 26.1%	3.17	0.576
4	I feel that my research productivity is the aftermath of staff development	1 4.3%	-	14 60.9%	8 34.8%	3.26	0.689
5	I sense that being in an individual mentoring programme helps my contribution to knowledge	-	-	14 60.9%	9 39.1%	3.39	0.499
6	I am aware that research productivity is a product of regular training I have received	-	-	13 56.5%	10 43.5%	3.43	0.507
7	I sense that my usual attendance at workshops influence my research productivity	-	1 4.3%	13 56.5%	9 39.1%	3.35	0.573
Weighted Mean =3.31							

Key; VLE= Very low extent, LE= Low extent, HE= High extent, VHE= Very high

Table 4 outlines the perceived impact of mentoring on research productivity among young librarians. The results indicated that young librarians largely acknowledged the positive influence of mentoring on their research productivity. Notably, the highest agreement percentages are observed in statements such as the belief that participation in conferences is linked to research productivity (65.2%), and that being in a group mentoring program assists in article writing (69.6%). These findings suggest recognition among young librarians of the value of collaborative and developmental aspects of mentoring in enhancing specific research-related skills. However, it is important to note that there are variations in responses across different statements. For instance,

while some young librarians perceived the impact of staff development on research productivity (60.9%), others attributed it to individual mentoring programmes (60.9%). This indicates a diversity of opinions regarding the specific mechanisms through which mentoring contributes to research outcomes.

The weighted mean of 3.31 suggests an overall positive perception of the impact of mentoring on research productivity. The calculated weighted mean serves as a summary measure, indicating the central tendency of the responses. In this case, the score suggests a moderately high level of perceived impact.

Research question four: What are the challenges confronting the research productivity of Young Librarians in academic libraries?

Table 5: Challenges confronting research productivity

s/n	Challenges	SD	D	A	SA	\bar{x}	S.D.
1	Inadequate research skills	1 4.3%	4 17.4%	12 52.2%	6 26.1%	3.00	0.798
2	Inaccessibility of research grants	-	-	10 43.5%	13 56.5%	3.57	0.507
3	Insufficient infrastructural facilities	-	2 8.7%	13 56.5%	8 34.8%	3.26	0.619
4	Economic constriction	-	1 4.3%	12 52.2%	10 43.5%	3.39	0.583
5	Administrative work burden	-	3 13.0%	11 47.8%	9 39.1%	3.26	0.689
6	Family constraint/challenges	-	3 13.0%	12 52.2%	8 34.8%	3.22	0.671
7	Poor information literacy skills	-	5 21.7%	11 47.8%	7 30.4%	3.09	0.733
8	Lack of mentoring	1 4.3%	3 13.0%	10 43.5%	9 39.1%	3.17	0.834
9	Lack of motivation from employee's institution	-	5 21.7%	10 43.5%	8 34.8%	3.13	0.757
10	Lack of access to adequate information sources	2 8.7%	5 21.7%	9 39.1%	7 30.4%	2.91	0.949
Weighted Mean =3.20							

Table 5 outlines a critical analysis of challenges influencing research productivity among Young Librarians. In terms of agreement percentages, challenges such as inadequate research skills, inaccessibility of research grants, and economic constriction appear to be significant concerns, with agreement percentages ranging from (52.2%) to (56.5%). These challenges can hinder the research process by limiting the researcher's capabilities, financial resources, and access to essential support. Insufficient infrastructural facilities and administrative work burden also garnered notable agreement percentages at (56.5%) and (47.8%), respectively. These challenges highlight the crucial role of adequate infrastructure and a manageable administrative workload in fostering a conducive research environment. Notably, poor information literacy skills

and lack of access to mentoring exhibit agreement percentages of (47.8%) and (43.5%), respectively. Addressing these challenges is essential for enhancing the overall research capabilities and professional development of researchers. In conclusion, "Inaccessibility of research grants" ($\bar{x}=3.57$), "Economic constriction" ($\bar{x}=3.39$), "Insufficient infrastructural facilities" ($\bar{x}=3.26$), "Administrative work burden" ($\bar{x} = 3.26$), and "Family constraint/challenges" ($\bar{x}=3.22$) are the major challenges confronting research productivity of young librarians in academic libraries.

Hypothesis one: There is no significant relationship between mentoring and research productivity of young librarians in academic libraries

Table 6: Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) showing the relationship between mentoring and research productivity of young librarians

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	n	r	p-value	Remarks
Research productivity	35.3913	3.98565	23	.488*	.018	Sig.
Mentoring	15.2174	3.01446				

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6 showed that there is a statistical significant relationship between mentoring and research productivity of Young Librarians in academic libraries ($r=.488$, $n=23$, $p(.018)<.05$). Hence, mentoring influenced/enhanced research productivity of Young Librarians in academic libraries in the study.

The hypothesis is rejected.

Discussion of findings

The result showed that; research funding/grant, mentoring, electronic information and research competence are the major factors promoting research productivity among Young Librarians in the academic libraries in the study. To corroborate the result, Ocampo, Aro, Evangelista, Maturan, Yamagishi, Mamhot, Mamhot, Calibo-Senit, Tibay, Pepito and Quiñones (2022) in their findings revealed that; research skills and competence, mentoring, electronic information resources, and research funding were among the major factors driving research productivity.

The result also revealed that; webinars/seminars, conferences and group/individual mentoring were the most available mentoring programmes to Young Librarians. Nnabuike, Okoli, Nwakoby and Nnenne (2021) also validated this result in their survey which indicated that; group mentoring, team mentoring, peer mentoring, and e-mentoring were the major forms of

mentoring.

Again, the result showed an overall positive perception of the impact of mentoring on research productivity of the Young Librarians. The implication is that most of the Young Librarians had positive perception of mentoring programmes. To corroborate the result of this finding, Kamarudin, Md. Shah, Ismail, Yen, Shamsul, Che Razali and Salam (2021) examined the perceptions of mentors and mentees towards the mentoring system at the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia Medical Centre. Their study revealed that; most 110.24/144 (77%) of the mentees and 51.11/64 (80%) mentors had positive perceptions of the mentoring system.

Moreover, the result also revealed that; inadequate research skills and inaccessibility to research funding/grants were the most noticeable challenges confronting the research productivity of Young Librarians. To substantiate the result of this finding, some studies have

discovered that; most of the challenges of research productivity include; inadequate research funding and lack of research skills (Alemu, 2023, Ladipo, Alegbeleye, Soyemi and Ikonne, 2022).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The research productivity of young librarians is crucial because it enables them to maintain a good academic status, enjoy regular promotions and other benefits and make scholarly contributions to the frontiers of knowledge. A young librarian whose research productivity is low may find it very hard to enjoy most of the inherent advantages attached to it both within and outside his/her domain. And it may delay such young librarian from moving on as expected. Therefore, the research productivity of young librarians is a compulsory prerequisite as far as academics is concerned.

1. Nevertheless, in a bid to ease

their research productivity of the young librarians, the position of mentoring should be encouraged and prioritised.

2. In a bid to foster a higher level of research productivity among the young librarians, it is recommended that further effort be made by the library management of different universities to facilitate persistent mentoring programmes. This can also be achieved by probably attaching young librarians to their senior colleagues for them to learn easily.
3. Library management should also see the need to regularly allow Young Librarians to attend conferences and other professional gatherings so as to expose them to the nitty-gritty of research activities.

References

- Abbot, J. D. 2009. Mentoring: lasting principles and evolutionary changes. [Online] Retrieved October 15, 2023, from <http://www.coachingnetwork.org.uk/ResourcesCentre/WhatAreCoaching>
- Adeniji, M.A. and Adeniyi, S.E. 2010. Mentoring and academic institution proceedings of second summit on Information Science and Technology (PSIST), Nsukka 397-407.
- Aladejana, A, Aladejana, F. and Ehindero, S. 2006. Analysis of mentoring relationships among teachers: a case study of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *International Journal of Evidenced Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 4.1: 20-29.
- Alemu, A. 2023. Factors determining research productivity in Ethiopian Universities: the case of Madda Walabu University. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open* 8: 1-8
- Allen, T. D. and O'Brien, K. E. 2006. Formal mentoring programs and organizational attraction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 17: 43–58.

- Ani, O. E. and Onyancha, O. B. 2011. A Measure of Research Productivity of Nigerian Universities: a Bibliometric Analysis. Noyons, Patrick Ngulube & Jacqueline Leta (Eds). Proceedings of the ISS 2011 Conference: 13th International Conference of International Society for Scientometrics and Informatic, Durban, South Africa. 4-7 July, 2011, Vol. 1.
- Asadu, B. U. 2010. Mentoring as a tool for re-skilling the 21st Century Librarians. Proceedings of second professional summit on Information Science and Technology (PSIST) Nsukka, 307-312.
- Atanda, A.I. 2012. Perceived ethics in academic research: Implications for quality Research. *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 10: 34-42.
- Atanda, A.I. 2018. Mentoring and career growth of junior faculty in the University of Ibadan. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, 7.1: 419-428.
- Billings, D. and Kowalsk, K. 2008. Developing your career as a nurse educator. the importance of having or being a mentor. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing* 39.11: 490-491.
- Carter, M. and Francis, R. 2000. Mentoring and Beginning Teachers' Workplace Learning, Paper presented Oct. 1. the AARE Conference, Sydney, Australia retrieved from [http:// www.aare.edu.au/00pap/car00232.htm](http://www.aare.edu.au/00pap/car00232.htm)(accessed 1st February 2006).
- Chukwu, S.A.J.; Emezie, N; Nwaohiri, N. M; and Chima-James, N. 2018. The Librarian in the digital age: a preferred nomenclature, perceptions of Academic Librarians in Imo State Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1973. Retrieved December 14, 2023, from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1973>
- David-West, B. T. and Nmecha, J. A. 2009. Mentoring: a tool for career development in academic libraries. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*.
- Ekechukwu, R.O. and Horsfall, M.N. 2015. Academic mentoring in higher education: a strategy to quality assurance in teacher education in Nigeria. *European Journal of Research and reflection Educational Science*, 3.4: 37 – 45.
- Ghabban, F.; Selamat, A.; Ibrahim, R.; Krejcar, O.; Maresova, P. and Herrera-Viedma, E. 2019. The influence of personal and organizational factors on researchers' attitudes towards sustainable research productivity in Saudi universities. *Sustainability*, 11, 4804.
- Iqbal, M.Z. 2011. Factors related to low research productivity at higher education level. *Asian Social Science*. 7.2: 188-193.

- Hart, R. L. 1999. Scholarly publication by university librarians: a study at Penn State. *College and Research Libraries* 60: 454-62.
- Howland, J.S. 2018. Beyond recruitment: retention and promotion strategies to ensure diversity and success. *Library Administration and Management* 13.1: 4-14.
- Idoko, N. A., Ugwuanyi, R. N. and Osadebe, N. E. 2016. Mentoring: a strategy for professional development of librarians in Nigerian Universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e- journal)*. Paper 1360. [Http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/136](http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/136)
- Jaiyeoba, A.O. and Atanda, A. I. 2009. An analysis of staff productivity and qualitative research output in South-West Nigerian Universities. *East African Journal of Educational Research and Policy (EAJERP)*, 87-98.
- Kamarudin M.A., Md Shah A.M., Ismail N.A.S., Yen T.P., Shamsul A.S., Che Razali H.I. and Salam, A. 2021. Perceptions of mentors and mentees towards the mentoring system at the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia Medical Centre. *Education in Medicine Journal*. 13.2: 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.21315/eimj2021.13.2.5>
- Kennedy, M. R. and Brancolini, R.M. 2012. Academic librarians' research: a survey of attitudes, involvement and perceived capabilities. *College and Research Libraries*, 73 (5), 431-448.
- Ladipo, S.O.; Alegbeleye, G.O.; Soyemi, O.D. and Ikonne, C.N. 2022. Research productivity of Lecturers in Federal Universities in Nigeria: the place of institutional factors. *International Journal of Research in Library Science (IJRLS)*. 8.2: 134-150.
- Mundia, C.N. and Iravo, M. 2014. Role of mentoring programs on the employee performance in organisations: A survey of public universities in Nyeri County, Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4.8: 393-412.
- Nnabuife E. K, Okoli I. E. N., Nwakoby N. P., and Nnenne, I. A. 2021. Mentoring: the way to academic excellence. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 4.1: 130-140.
- Nwabueze, A. U. and Anike, N. A. 2016. Mentoring strategies in use for professional development of librarians in South-East Federal University libraries. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*, 9. 1.
- Nwabueze, A. U. and Ozioko, R. E. 2012. Mentoring in Library and Information Science. *Delta Library Journal*, 6.1&2:19-24.
- Nygaard, L.P. 2017. Publishing and perishing: an academic literacies framework for investigating research productivity. *Stud. High. Educ.* 42: 519–532.

- Ocampo, L.; Aro, J.L.; Evangelista, S.S.; Maturan, F.; Yamagishi, K.; Mamhot, D.; Mamhot, D.F.; Calibo-Senit, D.I.; Tibay, E.; Pepito, J. and Quiñones, R. 2022. Research productivity for augmenting the innovation potential of higher education institutions: An Interpretive Structural Modeling Approach and MICMAC Analysis. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*. 8,148:1-25
- Ohio State University 2018. Libguides: Scholarly impact and citation analysis: Journal impact factor: What is it? Retrieved November 15, 2023, from <https://osu.libguides.com/c.php?g=110226&p=714742>
- Ojeaga I.J. and Okolocha C.C. 2019. Influence of mentoring on professional commitment of business educators in tertiary institutions in Edo and Delta States, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education, Learning and Development*. 7.12: 11-23.
- Okafor, V.N. 2011. Comparative analysis of research output of federal universities in Southern Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved October 12, 2023, from <http://www.webpages.edu/~mbolin/okafor.htm>
- Okafor, K. 2020. Public library services in Nigeria: challenges and strategies. *Library and Information Science Digest*. 13: 116-125.
- Okogwu, F. I. 2022. The role of academic libraries in promoting clientele centered services. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 7094. Retrieved December 12, 2023 from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7094>
- Ongek M. 2016. Mentoring as a process of developing effective school leaders in the 21st Century. *International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies* 2.6: 331-337.
- Oso, O.O. and Olorunsola, R. 2015. Research activities and promotion prospects of young academic librarians in Nigeria universities. *Library Journal of Library and Information Science*, 4.1/2: 1-8.
- Oyeyemi A.Y, Ejakpovi D.R, Oyeyemi A.L. and Adeniji T. 2019. Research productivity of academic staff in a medical school. *Sahel Medical Journal* 22:219-25.
- Pal, J.K. and Sarkar, S. 2020. Understanding research productivity in the realm of evaluative scientometrics. *Annals of Library and Information Studies* 67: 67-69
- Pertin, R. D. 2011. *Mentoring: A Business Strategy that Works*. eBook: Rene D. Pertin Management Mentors Inc.
- Reitz, J.M. 2004. *ODLIS: Online Dictionary of Library and Information Science*
- Ritchie, A. and Genoni, P. 2008. Mentoring in professional associations: continuing professional development for librarians. In *Health Libraries Review*, 16.4: 216-225.

- Ronald T. B., Brian P.D., and Frederick T.L. 2009. Mentoring in research: a developmental approach, *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 40.3:306–313.
- Sambunjak, D, Straus, S.E. and Marusic, A. 2009. A systematic review of qualitative research on the meaning and characteristics of mentoring in academic medicine. *J-GenInternMed*, 25: 72-78.
- Schlee, R. 2011. Mentoring and professional development of business students. *Journal of Management Education*, 24.3: 322-347.
- Sodipe, O. D., & Madukoma, E. I. 2013. Mentoring and career success of academic librarians in selected universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. In R. Abdulsalami, & Z. Mohammed (eds.), *Future Nigerian Libraries; Infinite Possibilities*, 131-144.
- Spencer, C. 2010. Mentoring made easy: a practical guide. Retrieved October 15, 2023, from <http://www.eco.gov.au/careers/mentor.htm>.
- Talukdar, D. 2015. Research productivity patterns in the organizational behavior and human resource management literature. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 26: 467–484.
- Terrion, J. and Leonard, D. 2007. A taxonomy of the characteristics of students peer mentors in higher education: findings from a literature review: mentoring and tutoring: partnership in learning, 15.2: 149-164.
- Tracy, E. E., Jagsi, R., Starr, R. and Tarbell, N. J. 2004. Outcomes of a pilot faculty mentoring program. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 191: 1846–1850.
- Nwankwo, T.V., Ike, C.P. and Anozie, C.O. 2017. Mentoring of young librarians in South East Nigeria for improved research and scholarly publications, *Library Management*, 1-28.
- Ubogu, J. 2019. Mentoring for professional development of academic Librarians in Nigerian university libraries. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2357. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2357>
- Ugwuanyi, R.N. 2011. Mentoring as a tool for capacity building in libraries. *Nigerian library Link. Journal of Library and information Science*, 9.1&2: 97-105.
- Wadesango, N. 2014. Publish or perish: impediments to research output and publication. *International Journal of Educational Science*, 6.1: 57-63.