

# Students' Perception of Charging Fines for Overdue Books: Case of Islamia College of Science and Technology Library

Hanif Bhatt

*Islamia College of Science & Communication, Srinagar, J&K-190 002*  
*E-mail: mhanief30@yahoo.co.in*

## ABSTRACT

The study explores the students' perception of fines charged by libraries for overdue books, etc., borrowing privileges, and lending periods in an Indian academic library. The study seeks to discover the extent to which borrowers are satisfied towards borrowing privileges, lending periods, and fine amount. The study also seeks to examine to what extent fines are perceived by the borrowers to be a deterrent to overdue library materials, how borrowers feel when asked to pay fine, whether the fines should be scrapped in future or not, and whether or not the level of fine is sufficiently high to compel the users to return the library materials on time. The research method for this study was the survey method using a questionnaire to collect data. The findings of the study reveal that majority of the borrowers are satisfied with the borrowing privileges, lending periods, and the fine amounts. The majority of the respondents feel that library fines encourage users to return the borrowed items on time. Most of the students favoured discontinuation of fines in future, besides consulting them about the amount to be fixed as fine. Majority of students prefer keeping books beyond due date and paying fine later. No significant differences were found between genders and faculties (Science, Commerce, Management) wrt their perception of library fines. The recommendations can help libraries to devise policies regarding library fines.

**Keywords:** Academic libraries, borrowing privileges, lending period, overdue charges

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The imposition of fines in academic libraries for overdue items is a global phenomenon and penalties for overdue materials have been levied by libraries for centuries<sup>1</sup>. Besides fines, librarians have resorted to short-term, charitable, and legalistic means to resolve the mounting problems associated with overdues. In their quest to retrieve overdue materials the librarians confront delinquent borrowers by sending staff to their residence, filing criminal charges or claims in small courts, engaging credit collection agencies, sending overdue notices, conducting 'fine free' amnesty days for return of all overdue materials, and offering rewards for returning books<sup>2</sup>. Librarians have long assumed that imposing a fine on borrowers who keep books out for more than their prescribed period will prompt those borrowers to bring the books back on time. Bringing books back on time is a concept central to library functions—a book not in active use should be on shelf in its proper location so that browsers, or focused users, can find<sup>3</sup>. Fine amounts can be per day beyond the due date, especially in cases of materials borrowed from open access collections, or can

be on an hourly basis, especially with respect to materials from restricted loan collections, such as reserve materials<sup>4</sup>.

From the very beginning this familiar practice has excited comment and controversy. Fines are thought by many to deter patrons from keeping materials too long. However, others believe there is little persuasive evidence that fines are more effective at minimising overdues than are reminder notices. Further, some critics contend charging fines is unethical especially in public or school libraries<sup>5</sup>.

The present study endeavours to ascertain the attitudes of student users of Islamia College of Science & Commerce (ICSC), Srinagar (India) towards the borrowing privileges, lending period and overdue fines, as there is no evidence of research on the problem in India hitherto. As a result the perception of student community towards borrowing privileges, lending periods and overdue fines in Indian academic libraries is not fully understood. The research will help libraries to devise policies regarding library fines in India and abroad. Established in 1961 by

the government of Jammu and Kashmir as an autonomous educational institution of higher learning, the ICSC has a collection of 76,861 volumes and 60 current periodical subscriptions. As of May 2010, the library had 4930 registered student readers, comprising 3648 (74 %) Commerce & Management faculty students, and 1282 (26 %) Science faculty students, studying for Bachelor's and Master's courses (BSc, BCom, BBA, BCA and MBA). Of the 4930 students 3928 (79.67 %) are males and 1002 (20.32 %) are females.

Presently the students of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year (BSc and BCom) are allowed to borrow three books at a time where as the students of Final year (BSc and BCom), BBA and BCA are allowed to borrow four books at a time. The MBA students are allowed to borrow seven books at a time. The users are allowed to retain books for a period of 15 days and thereafter library charges Rs 0.50 per day per book from the student borrowers. The renewals are allowed only for those books which are not in demand.

## 2. RELATED LITERATURE

Withholding library materials beyond due dates by the users is a problem faced by libraries all over the world. In 1991, Okotore<sup>6</sup> reported that retaining library books beyond due dates was a baffling practice among students. Some research has been done to unveil the reasons behind this tendency. These include forgetfulness, and tendency to personalise library materials<sup>7</sup>, sheer greediness or lack of consideration for others who need these materials<sup>8</sup>, besides users not finishing with books<sup>9</sup>.

There is surprisingly little hard evidence that can guide policy decisions to reduce the probability of overdue materials<sup>2</sup>. The various measures adopted in libraries for the timely return of the materials include library notices and overdue fines<sup>10</sup>. Many librarians claim that fines act as deterrent and encourage borrowers to return materials promptly and that heavy fines make more of an impact on borrowers than minimal charges<sup>11</sup>. Ahiakwo & Obokoh<sup>7</sup> recommend stiff fines to overcome the tendency of late return of library materials. A survey by Barber<sup>12</sup> found that 96.3 per cent of respondent libraries charge fine for overdue materials in UK and a majority (94.3 %) of these favoured carrying on with this existing fine system. In another such survey on circulation and fine policies among medical libraries by Lyons<sup>11</sup>, it was found that 61 per cent of the institutions surveyed collected fines for overdue books from students, faculty or both. However, opinions regarding the effectiveness of fines among librarians differed. Abareh<sup>13</sup> has considered introduction of special fine of NGN 30 for retaining reserve books beyond due date, besides denying the use of reserve materials for a determined period at Abubakar Tawafa Balewa University Library, Bauchi, Nigeria. It is found that some

people consider fine a price rather than a penalty<sup>14,15</sup>. However, Seteras<sup>16</sup> has reported that the introduction of fines at the Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration reduced overdue library books in the institution. A study by Shontz<sup>3</sup> found that besides fines many other factors, such as convenience of renewal and return, conscientiousness and the time when the user had finished the material, determine when users return the library materials. On the other hand, the publication of defaulter's names in local newspapers reduced overdue library books in Iowa Public Library<sup>17</sup>. Burgin & Hansel<sup>18</sup> found that speedy notification and making last notice a bill for the item had some effect on overdue returns in South Carolina Public Libraries, however they did not found any statistically significant effect of charging fines on overdue returns. Sending reminders on-time significantly increased the rate of return of library books at ICSC<sup>19</sup>.

Despite a divided opinion over the efficacy of fines on overdue returns among the researchers, the library users consider library fines as a deterrent to overdue library materials. A study by Adomi<sup>4</sup> found that 77.3 per cent of the respondents are of the opinion that overdue fines encourage users to return the library materials on time in Nigerian University's libraries. The same sentiments are of the student borrowers in a New Zealand academic library. The students also favoured the continuation of the library fines<sup>20</sup>. In another such study by Ajayi & Okunlola<sup>1</sup> at Hezekiah Oluwasanmi library, it is found that students perceived the increase in fines as a welcome measure, which would make library books readily available and accessible.

During the past few years some alternative methods are also being experimented at various institutions to replace the existing fine system and ensure the timely return of overdue library materials. For instance Southampton Solent University does not charge fines but instead uses a penalty points system. After determined penalty points are acquired the students are banned from borrowing items for a specific period<sup>2</sup>. A compromise solution is implemented at Texas A&M University libraries, maintaining fines for some materials but using an inconvenience motivator to prompt timely renewal or return of regular stack materials<sup>21</sup>. The other measures include extended loan periods<sup>22</sup> and positive reinforcements<sup>5</sup>.

## 3. SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The scope of the present study is limited to student borrowers of ICSC library. The following objectives have been put forth for the study:

- To discover the attitude of students towards borrowing privileges, lending periods, and library fines

- To discover whether or not the fines encourage/compel the users to return the library materials on time
- To discover whether or not the level of fine is sufficiently high to compel the users to return the library materials on time
- To ascertain whether or not attitudes towards fines vary among male and female and Science and Commerce & Management students.

#### 4. METHODOLOGY

The research method for this study is the survey method using a questionnaire to collect data. Copies of the questionnaire were administered and returned in months of May and June 2010. To take sample from every category of student borrowers (science and commerce & management, male and female, level of course, i.e., 1<sup>st</sup> year, 2<sup>nd</sup> year, and Final year students) the following statistical formula is used:

$$n = \frac{z^2 Npq}{NE^2 + z^2 pq}$$

where,  $z$  is the probability given under 95.5 per cent reliability;  $N$  is the population or universe;  $E$  is the sampling error; and  $pq$  is the proportion of the total population.

The value of  $pq$  is obtained from Science v/s Commerce & Management ratio. The 95.5 per cent confidence level is pre-assigned and a small sampling error (0.05) is fixed to ensure optimal sample size.

$$n = \frac{z^2 Npq}{NE^2 + z^2 pq} = \frac{(2)^2 (4930)(0.74)(0.26)}{(4930)(0.05)^2 + (2)^2 (0.74)(0.26)} = 290$$

where,  $z = 2$ ,  $N = 4930$ ,  $E = 0.05$ ,  $pq = (.74)(.26)$

The sample size of different categories is determined by the population allocation method as:

$$n_i = n Ni/N$$

where,  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots, n = 290$  (total sample size);  $N_i$  is total number of students in the category; and  $N$  is the total population.

Out of the 290 students, the 231 males and 59 females were chosen; the number of science students was 76 and that of commerce & management students was 214. The number of 1<sup>st</sup> year students was 136; 2<sup>nd</sup> year students was 83; final year 68; and that of MBA students was 3. The number of BSc students was 67; BCom - 200; BBA - 11, BCA - 9; and MBA - 3.

#### 5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of this study are presented in Tables 1-5. It is evident from the data (Table 1) that majority of the respondents 207 (72.88 %) are satisfied with the

borrowing privileges. The females seem more satisfied (79.66 %) than their male counterparts (71.11 %), so are Science students (76.38 %) to Commerce & Management students (71.69 %). Keeping in view the availability of books in library, the students of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year (BSc & BCom) are allowed to borrow three books at a time where as the students of final year (BSc and BCom), BBA and BCA are allowed to borrow four books at a time. The MBA students are allowed to borrow seven books at a time. Just 17.60 per cent respondents are not satisfied. Some of the unsatisfied borrowers have demanded the limit to be raised to eight books in their remarks.

Table 2 shows that 154 which is over half of the respondents (53.47 %) feel that the lending period of 15 days is adequate, compared to 127 (44.09 %) who feel otherwise. There is a slight variation in the attitude of male and female users (54.11 % versus 50.87 %), and Science and Commerce and Management (52.63 % versus 53.77 %) respondents. Shontz<sup>3</sup> maintains that period for which users can retain the library materials is the best compromise between the current users' convenience and future users' needs. It has been found that loan period for monographs is usually two weeks<sup>11</sup>. Pertinently the users are allowed to retain books for a period of 15 days at ICSC library and the renewals are allowed only for those books which are not in demand. The students in their remarks have expressed the desire of 30 days loan period, and in some cases, a full academic session. However it is not possible for the library having limited copies of various book titles, to extend the lending periods beyond 15 days.

Of the 290 respondents (Table 1), 207 (71.37 %) are satisfied with the amount fixed as library fine. The females are more satisfied (79.66 %) than their male counterparts (69.26 %). There is a great deal of difference in the attitudes between the students of Science and Commerce and Management faculties (55.26 % v/s 77.10 %) towards the amount of overdue fine. Presently, the library charges Rs 0.50 per day per book from the borrowers. An increase in overdue fines is perceived a welcome step by students as it makes library materials readily available and accessible<sup>1</sup>.

It is revealed from the data of Table 1 that 78.12 per cent (225) respondents feel that overdue fines compel users to return the borrowed books on time. The basic purpose of enforcing the overdue fines is to encourage the library users to return the borrowed books on time, so that the same are issued to other users in queue. As it is not possible for a library (particularly in the developing world) to have a copy of the book for each user, the only way out is to circulate the available stock to as many users as possible. This seems to be working as a small portion of respondents 13.88 per cent (40) are not convinced that the overdue fines compel users to return the borrowed materials on time. The data also reveals that there is a

**Table 1. Students' perception of library fines (male/female)**

S.No.	Item	Agree			Disagree			Undecided			No response		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1.	The number of books that library allows me to borrow is adequate	160 (71.11)	47 (79.66)	207 (72.88)	46 (20.44)	4 (6.77)	50 (17.60)	19 (8.44)	8 (13.55)	27 (9.50)	6	0	6
2.	The lending period of 15 days, after which the fine is due, is adequate	125 (54.11)	29 (50.87)	154 (53.47)	104 (45.02)	23 (40.35)	127 (44.09)	2 (0.86)	5 (8.77)	7 (2.43)	0	2	2
3.	The amount fixed as fine is adequate	160 (69.26)	47 (79.66)	207 (71.37)	65 (28.13)	12 (20.33)	77 (26.55)	6 (2.59)	0 (0.00)	6 (2.06)	0	0	0
4.	Library fines compel me to return borrowed materials on time	183 (79.91)	42 (71.18)	225 (78.12)	29 (12.66)	11 (18.64)	40 (13.88)	17 (7.42)	6 (10.16)	23 (7.98)	2	0	2
5.	I prefer to keep important books beyond due dates and pay fines later	136 (59.91)	36 (63.15)	172 (60.56)	77 (33.92)	19 (33.33)	96 (33.80)	14 (6.16)	2 (3.50)	16	4	2	6
6.	I feel bad when asked to pay fines	106 (46.69)	33 (55.93)	139 (48.60)	108 (47.57)	26 (44.06)	134 (46.85)	13 (5.72)	0 (0.00)	13 (4.54)	4	0	4
7.	Library fines assist libraries in generating funds for the libraries	150 (65.50)	31 (53.44)	181 (63.06)	42 (18.34)	12 (20.68)	54 (18.81)	37 (16.15)	15 (25.86)	52 (18.11)	2	1	3
8.	Library fines should be scrapped	108 (48.43)	17 (28.81)	125 (44.32)	69 (30.94)	19 (32.20)	88 (31.20)	46 (20.62)	23 (38.98)	69 (24.46)	8	0	8
9.	Fine is a disciplinary measure intended against library defaulters	173 (78.28)	42 (73.68)	215 (77.33)	27 (12.21)	0 (0.00)	27 (9.71)	21 (9.50)	15 (26.31)	36 (12.94)	10	2	12
10.	It is not wrong to ask library staff to forgive fines	137 (59.56)	34 (57.62)	171 (59.16)	72 (31.30)	23 (38.98)	95 (32.87)	21 (9.13)	2 (3.38)	23 (7.95)	1	0	1
11.	The library staff should reduce the amount to defaulters when the fine is very high	183 (79.22)	40 (67.79)	223 (76.89)	36 (15.58)	12 (20.33)	48 (16.55)	12 (5.19)	7 (11.86)	19 (6.55)	0	0	0
12.	The amount charged as fine should be the same (no matter when one returns an overdue book)	151 (65.93)	36 (61.01)	187 (64.93)	61 (26.63)	17 (28.81)	78 (27.08)	17 (7.42)	6 (10.16)	23 (7.98)	2	0	2
13.	Students should be consulted about the amount that should be paid as fine	190 (82.25)	48 (81.35)	238 (82.06)	33 (14.28)	8 (13.55)	41 (14.13)	8 (3.46)	3 (5.08)	11 (3.79)	0	0	0

\*Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

little difference of opinion between males and females/ Science and Commerce & Management students (Table 2). The finding is in accordance with the earlier studies by Adomi<sup>4</sup> and Anderson<sup>20</sup> who found that overdue fines encourage users to return the borrowed items on time.

It is interesting to note that 60.56 per cent (172) respondents prefer to keep important books beyond due date and pay fine later (with a little gender and faculty variation), as it is found that fine is considered by some people a price rather than a penalty<sup>14,15</sup>. The overdue fine of Rs 0.50 per day per book is a meager amount. It seems that some of the students who can afford, willingly pay the fine and keep the books beyond due date, as many librarians claim that heavy fines make more of an impact on borrowers than minimal charges<sup>11</sup>. However most of the respondents who prefer to keep the books beyond due date and fine pay later belonged to lowest annual income group of < Rs 1 Lakh (70.34 %). This may be due to the fact that students of high family income may buy the books and therefore there is no need for them to check

out the book from the library and no way to retain the library's book beyond due date. The remaining respondents belonged to these income groups (1-2 Lakh 14.53 %; 2-3 Lakh 3.48 %; 3-5 Lakh 6.39 %; >5 Lakh 5.23 %).

It is noteworthy that more of female respondents (55.93 %) to male (46.69 %) feel bad when asked to pay fine. On the whole 48.60 % respondents feel bad when asked to pay fine, compared to 46.85 per cent who feel otherwise (Table 1). It is also evident from the data that there is a great deal of difference of opinion between Science and Commerce & Management faculty respondents (61.84 % v/s 43.80 %) (Table 2). Different aspects of fines have been a matter of investigation for psychologists, as it is being referred to as a century long experiment in behavioural psychology by Caywood<sup>23</sup>.

Table 1 shows that 63.06 per cent (181) respondents are of the view that library fines assist libraries in generating funds for the libraries, compared to 18.81 per cent (54) who number of respondents who feel that

**Table 2. Students' perception of library fines (Science, Commerce & Management)**

S.No.	Item	Agree			Disagree			Undecided			No response		
		Science	Com. & Mgt.	Total	Science	Com. & Mgt.	Total	Science	Com. & Mgt.	Total	Science	Com. & Mgt.	Total
1.	The number of books that library allows me to borrow is adequate	55 (76.38)	152 (71.69)	207 (72.88)	7 (9.72)	43 (20.28)	50 (17.60)	10 (13.88)	17 (8.01)	27 (9.50)	4	2	6
2.	The lending period of 15 days, after which the fine is due, is adequate	40 (52.63)	114 (53.77)	154 (53.47)	32 (42.10)	95 (44.81)	127 (44.09)	4 (5.26)	3 (1.41)	7 (2.43)	0	2	2
3.	The amount fixed as fine is adequate	42 (55.26)	165 (77.10)	207 (71.37)	33 (43.42)	44 (20.56)	77 (26.55)	1 (1.31)	5 (2.33)	6 (2.06)	0	0	0
4.	Library fines compel me to return borrowed materials on time	57 (75.0)	168 (79.24)	225 (78.12)	19 (25.0)	21 (9.90)	40 (13.88)	0 (0.00)	23 (10.84)	23 (7.98)	0	2	2
5.	I prefer to keep important books beyond due dates and pay fines later	48 (63.15)	124 (59.61)	172 (60.56)	28 (36.84)	68 (32.69)	96 (33.80)	0 (0.00)	16 (7.69)	16 (5.63)	0	6	6
6.	I feel bad when asked to pay fines	47 (61.84)	92 (43.80)	139 (48.60)	26 (34.21)	108 (51.42)	134 (46.85)	3 (3.94)	10 (4.76)	13 (4.54)	0	4	4
7.	Library fines assist libraries in generating funds for the libraries	40 (53.33)	141 (66.50)	181 (63.06)	13 (17.33)	41 (19.33)	54 (18.81)	22 (29.33)	30 (14.15)	52 (18.11)	1	23	
8.	Library fines should be scrapped	36 (50.0)	89 (42.38)	125 (44.32)	23 (31.94)	65 (30.95)	88 (31.20)	13 (18.05)	56 (26.66)	69 (24.46)	4	4	8
9.	Fine is a disciplinary measure intended against library defaulters	50 (65.78)	165 (81.68)	215 (77.33)	8 (10.52)	19 (9.40)	27 (9.71)	18 (23.68)	18 (8.91)	36 (12.94)	0	12	12
10.	It is not wrong to ask library staff to forgive fines	41 (53.94)	130 (61.03)	171 (59.16)	27 (35.52)	68 (31.92)	95 (32.87)	8 (10.52)	15 (7.04)	23 (7.95)	0	1	1
11.	The library staff should reduce the amount to defaulters when the fine is very high	66 (86.84)	157 (73.36)	223 (76.89)	9 (11.84)	39 (18.22)	48 (16.55)	1 (1.31)	18 (8.41)	19 (6.55)	0	0	0
12.	The amount charged as fine should be the same (no matter when one returns an overdue book)	52 (68.42)	135 (63.67)	187 (64.93)	17 (22.36)	61 (28.77)	78 (27.08)	7 (9.21)	16 (7.54)	23 (7.98)	0	2	2
13.	Students should be consulted about the amount that should be paid as fine	58 (76.31)	180 (84.11)	238 (82.06)	13 (17.10)	28 (13.08)	41 (14.13)	5 (6.57)	6 (2.80)	11 (3.79)	0	0	0

library fines should be scrapped is 125 (44.32 %) than those who feel that it think otherwise, and an equally 18.11 per cent (52) are silent on the issue. There is however difference of opinion on the basis of gender and faculty. The male respondents who think that overdue fines assist libraries in generating the funds is 65.50 per cent compared to 53.44 per cent females. Table 2 shows the 66.50 per cent Commerce & Management students and only 53.33 per cent of Science students think in the same terms. The revenue generated through overdue fine is a meager amount and is not regarded as a source of income by most of the libraries, but as a deterrent to delinquent users to return the borrowed materials on time, although some consider it a source of income<sup>4</sup>. The amount generated at ICSC library through overdue fines is approximately Rs 37,000.00 annually which is deposited in the library local fund to meet some minor expenses.

The number of respondents who feel that library fines should be scrapped is 125 (44.32 %) than those who feel that it should be continued 88 (31.20 %). There is a

remarkable gender difference in the opinion of those who feel that it should be scrapped (48.43 % males v/s 28.81 % females). However, a good number of respondents 69 (24.46 %) are silent on the issue. This is in contrast to study by Anderson<sup>20</sup>, who found that users favour the continuation of the library fines. It may not be proper to discard overdue fine as it will encourage users to retain the books beyond due dates, as agreed by the users that it compels them to return books on time. It is due to this reason that an overwhelming majority of libraries still charge fine for overdue materials and also favour carrying on with this existing fine system<sup>12</sup>.

About 77.33 per cent (215) respondents are aware of the fact that overdue fines are a disciplinary measure intended against library defaulters as against 9.71 per cent (27) who believe it is not. There is a little difference of opinion on the issue between males and females (78.26 % versus 73.68%) and a great deal of difference between Science, and Commerce & Management students (65.78 % versus 81.68%). The main purpose of enforcing fines for overdue

materials in libraries is disciplinary and it is quite encouraging that majority of the students are aware of this fact.

It is evident from the data, 59.16 per cent (171) respondents feel that it is not wrong to ask library staff to forgive the overdue fines, with a slight gender variation. The number of respondents who feel otherwise is almost half 32.87 per cent (95).

An overwhelming majority of respondents 76.89 per cent (223) are of the opinion that amount to defaulters should be reduced when the overdue is very high, out of which 79.22 per cent (183) are males and 67.79 per cent (56) are females. More of the Science students 86.84 per cent to Commerce & Management 73.36 per cent support the argument. This may be due that fact that Science students need more books than their counterparts for their assignments and consequent overdue of books. 16.55 per cent (48) respondents do not think that the amount to defaulters should be reduced.

It has been found that often the students ask library staff at ICSC to reduce the amount citing various reasons like holidays, strikes, ill health, etc. However, the circulation staff can not reduce the amount as it is beyond their control.

One can note that respondents who would like that the amount charged as fine should be the same no matter when one returns the overdue material is 64.93 per cent (187) compared to 27.08 per cent (78) who would like it to be otherwise. There is a slight variation of opinion on the issue so far as males and females are concerned (65.93 % versus 61.01 %), Science and Commerce & Management users (68.425 versus 63.67 %). Going by the students, if such a practice is adopted, it will be very difficult for the library to retrieve the borrowed items on time as delinquent users would know that they will not have to pay more than a fixed amount.

An overwhelming majority of respondents across the board (with slight gender and faculty variations) 82.06 per cent (238) believe that the students should be consulted about the amount that should be fixed as library fine. This is much higher (47.9 %) than reported by Adomi<sup>4</sup>. Only 14.13 per cent (41) respondents feel that the students should not be consulted on the issue.

The *t*-test static were carried out to find out any significant difference by gender and faculty with respect to students' perception of library fines at 0.05 level of significance. As is evident from Table 3, no significant differences were found between male and female students as the observed *t* of 1.02 is lower than the critical value of 1.96. Similarly, no significant difference were found between the Commerce & Management and Science students, as the observed value of 1.28 is less than the critical value of 1.96. However, a mean difference of 1.53 is observed between the two faculties (Table 4 and Table 5).

**Table 3. Gender difference in students' perception of library fines**

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	df	t-cal	Critical value
Male	231	30.96	2.90	288	1.02	1.96
Female	59	30.53	3.36			

**Table 4. Faculty difference in students' perception of library fines**

Faculty	No.	Mean	SD	df	t-cal	Critical value
Commerce & Management	214	31.42	2.82	288	1.28	1.96
Science	76	29.89	3.10			

**Table 5. Relation between family income and retention of books beyond due dates**

Annual family income (Group)	No. of respondents retaining books beyond due date ( N=172)
< Rs 1 Lakh	121 (70.34)
Rs 1-2 Lakh	25 (14.53)
Rs 2-3 Lakh	6 (3.48)
Rs 3-5 Lakh	11 (6.39)
> Rs 5 lakh	9 (5.23)

*\*Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage*

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

The basic purpose of introducing library fines is to encourage the borrowers to return the library materials on time. While a majority of users agree that fines compel them to return the borrowed library materials on time, the amount of fine is not high enough to serve as an effective deterrent to overdue library materials. Keeping in view the findings of the study, the following recommendations are put forward:

- The amount of fine should be raised to the extent to which it serves as an effective deterrent to overdue library materials. Besides the amount of fine should be periodically reviewed.
- Besides fines, the suspension of borrowing privileges should be introduced to ensure the timely return of library materials.
- The users should be informed about the purpose of fines, besides informing them about renewals, borrowing rights, and lending periods.

## 7. FUTURE RESEARCH

As the faculty and staff are not liable to pay fines for overdue library materials at ICSC library, their perception of library fines need to be ascertained to identify differences in attitudes among various user groups. Besides, it could be explored from the borrowers as to what they think will be more effective deterrent to library overdues than fines.

## REFERENCES

1. Ajayi, N.A. & Okunlola, A.A. Students' perception of fine increases for overdue library books in an academic library. *J. Librar. Info. Sci.*, 2005, **37**(4), 187-93.
2. Little, P. Managing overdues: Facts from four studies. *Bottom line: Manag. Lib. Finan.*, 1993, **2**(2), 22-25.
3. Shontz, D. Effect of fines on length of checkout and overdues in a medical library. *Bull. Med. Lib. Asso.*, 1999, **87**(1), 82-84.
4. Adomi, E.E. Attitudes of university library users towards overdue fines in Nigeria. *Bottom line: Manag. Lib. Finan.*, 2003, **16**(1), 19-24.
5. Mitchell, W.B. & Smith, F.W. Using rewards to minimize overdue book rates. *J. Access Ser.*, 2006, **3**(1), 47-52.
6. Okotore, K. Misuse of library materials at Oyo State College of Education Library, Ilesa. *Nigerian Lib. Info. Sci. Rev.*, 1991, **9**(1).
7. Ahiakwo, O.N. & Obokoh, N.P. Attitudinal dimension in library overdue books among faculty members—a case study. *Lib. Inf. Sci. Res.*, 1987, **4**, 293-304.
8. Zaki, H.M. Delinquency in Ahmadu Bello University Library. *Zaria J. Librar.*, 1994, **1**(1-2), 102-9.
9. Alao, I.A. Students and overdue books in a medical library. *J. Med. Lib. Asso.*, 2002, **90**(3), 294-97.
10. Leung, Y.C. Prompt return by library notices. *J. Access Ser.*, 2008, **4**(3&4), 83-92.
11. Lyons, A.G. Circulation policies, overdues, and fines: results of a survey of academic health sciences libraries. *Bull. Med. Lib. Asso.*, 1981, **69**(3), 326-29.
12. Barber, G. Fines: A survey of SCONUL libraries. *SCONUL Focus*, 2005, **35**, 59-62.
13. Abareh, H.M. Pathos of circulation librarians: An exploratory study of Abubakar Tawafa Balewa University Library, Bauchi. *Inter. Lib. Move.*, 2001, **23**(1), 28-40.
14. Lin, C. & Yang, C.C. Fine enough or don't fine at all. *J. Eco. Behav. Organ.*, 2006, **59**, 195-213.
15. Gneezy, U. & Rustichini, A. A fine is a price. *J. Legal Stud.*, 2000, **29**(1), 1-17.
16. Seteras, I. Fines for overdue books at the library of the Norwegian School of Economics and Administration: Experience after the first year. *Synopsis*, 1997, **28**(5), 292-94.
17. Hoffman, R. Radical overdue technique. *Unabashed Librarian*, 1996, **100**(3).
18. Burgin, R. & Hansel, P. Library overdues: An update. *Lib. Archi. Sec.*, 1990, **10**(2), 51-75.
19. Bhat, M.H. The impact of 'on time' reminders on defaulters -A case study of Islamia College of Science and Commerce, Srinagar. *Ind. J. Lib. Info. Sci.*, 2010, **4**(1), 57-59.
20. Anderson, C.V. 'Are fines fine? School of Information Management, Victoria University of Wellington. 2008. *MLIS Dissertation*. (accessed on 30 June 2010) <http://library.canterbury.ac.nz/files/news/AndersonCINFO580ResearchReport.pdf>
21. Mosley, P.A. Moving away from overdue fines: One academic library's new direction. *J. Access Serv.*, 2004, **2**(1), 11-21.
22. Rupp, E.; Sweetman, K. & Perry, D. Updating circulation policy for the 21st century. *J. Access Serv.*, 2010, **7**(3), 159-75
23. Caywood, C. Penny wise, pound foolish. *Sch. Lib. J.*, 1994, **44**.