COMPETENCY APPRAISAL OF LAW CATALOGUERS' JOB PERFORMANCE IN UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTHERN NIGERIA

Rita John-Okeke (*Ph.d*)
(*Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, Lagos*)
Email: rita.johnokeke@gmail.com

Abstract:
This study was set out to investigate the competence of the law cataloguers in the use of cataloguing tools and resources for their job performance in university law libraries in Southern Nigeria. Descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. A self-developed questionnaire was used to gather information on the competency level of the law cataloguers from the twenty-two universities studied. A total of sixty-six copies of the questionnaire were distributed while fifty-three copies were returned and used for the analysis. The results revealed that the law cataloguers have high competence in the use of Moys Classification Scheme and Thesaurus for Legal Materials and also in Library of Congress Subject Heading List. However, their competence in the use of the tools did not lead to high job performance. The study conclude that the law cataloguers' competence is doubtful, hence, the low performance. The study recommend that the universities should be committed to providing training for the law cataloguers in order to improve their competence and that experienced law cataloguers should be employed to handle the job of cataloguing and classification of law resources in Nigerian university law libraries.

Keywords: Competency Appraisal, Job performance, Cataloguing Tools, Moys Classification Scheme, Library of Congress, Law Library.

Introduction

The competencies required of a cataloguer to perform cataloguing job optimally is basically professional knowledge. Sung (2013) succinctly explains that no competence is more important in cataloguing than professional knowledge. These include theoretical background as well as technical skills for cataloguing. According to Sung, knowledge of cataloguing tools is a must-have and the cataloguer must keep abreast of the latest changes and updates since cataloguing tools and rules change regularly to reflect or accommodate changes or new developments in knowledge. Without a certain level of competence (knowledge and skills), the law cataloguer will not be able to produce qualitative and quantitative bibliographic records nor provide timely access to legal information to law students and law teachers.

The primary responsibility of a cataloguer is to prepare bibliographic records and provide efficient access and retrieval tools for users. Cataloguers have constantly described this task as tortuous, brain tasking, boring, time-consuming and expensive. Omekwu (2007) supports this claim when he asserts that the journey of the book and other information resources do not just jump to the shelves, it follows a delineated process that is both technical and intellectual. Thus, for the job performance of the cataloguer to be effective and efficient, certain competencies in terms of knowledge and skills in the application of the rules and use of appropriate schemes, subject headings and ICT technologies are expected.

A cataloguer's job activities involve firstly;

identifying and describing the information items based on the information provided in the items such as the author, title, edition, imprint, collation, ISBN/ISSN. The cataloguer uses the cataloguing codes or rules to arrange the bibliographic information according to internationally accepted standards. This aspect is commonly done by support staff/ paraprofessionals or even library assistants under the supervision of the cataloguer. Secondly, he assigns subjects to the items using standard subject heading lists. This aspect is the most difficult and requires cataloguer's judgements to be able to provide and not misdirect access to the items being catalogued. Sung (2013) concurs with this by saying that in assigning subject headings, many issues arise causing uncertainty and ambiguity thus, requiring good judgement. The third aspect is the assigning of class marks or call numbers to the items using standardised classification scheme approved by the library. All these point to the fact cataloguers cannot perform these activities without proficiency in the use of cataloguing tools and resources. Miksa (2008) opines that just as a carpenter cannot build a house without his tools, a cataloguer cannot catalogue without using cataloguing tools and resources. Despite the established importance of the use of cataloguing tools and resources to cataloguers' job performance, it has been observed that cataloguers generally and law cataloguers in particular experience some challenges while using cataloguing tools and resources

Cataloguing and classification of legal information materials has a thorny beginning in Nigeria. The development of academic law libraries started after the country's independence in 1960. However, the classification of law books came later just like their counterparts in other countries (Jegede, 2007; Tuyo, 2011; Solon, 2006). There was a long debate over subject cataloguing as against author arrangement. Today, all the law libraries in Nigerian universities use Elizabeth Moys Classification and other cataloguing tools to classify their legal collection. By the mandate from the Council of Legal Education, the universities have employed lawyers, lawyer librarians and other staff to work in the law libraries. Law cataloguers are expected to be knowledgeable in the nature of information resources in law, legal professionals' use of the materials; and knowledgeable about the theory and principle of knowledge. However, it is often not easy to find cataloguers who have the competencies in cataloguing law materials mainly as result of the dual nature of law librarianship in Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Law cataloguing is a complex technique that requires firstly, the principles of knowledge organisation; secondly, subject knowledge of law and thirdly, law cataloguing experience in the use of cataloguing tools and resources. Efficient use of cataloguing tools and resources is a *sine qua non* for enhanced cataloguing performance. Without this, the cataloguer may not be able to efficiently perform the tasks of cataloguing and classification. However, it is

often not easy to have law cataloguers with such competencies. Experience has shown that in some universities in Nigeria, law materials are catalogued by new entry cataloguers who may have law degrees but do not have cataloguing experience. The problem may be that the cataloguer does not have the competencies to efficiently use the cataloguing tools and resources. Obviously, this will affect his level of job performance. Similarly where general subject cataloguer classifies law materials, knowledge of the nature of information sources in law may be lacking and this can also affect the competency of the cataloguer. These form the focus of this paper.

Purpose of Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the competence of law cataloguers in the use of cataloguing tools and resources for their job performance in university law libraries in Southern Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. determine the competency level of cataloguers in the use of the cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries in Nigerian universities;
2. find out the level of job performance of cataloguers in law libraries in Southern Nigerian universities;
3. find out the extent of relationship between law cataloguers' demographic characteristics and cataloguing tools utilisation for their job performance in law libraries in Nigerian universities;
4. identify challenges law cataloguers face in using cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries in Nigerian universities;
5. suggest ways of tackling the challenges cataloguers face while using cataloguing tools and resources.

Research Questions

1. What is the competency level of cataloguers in the use of cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries in Nigerian universities?
2. What is the level of job performance of cataloguers in law libraries in Southern Nigerian universities?
3. What is the extent of relationship between law cataloguers' demographic characteristics and cataloguing tools utilisation for their job performance in law libraries in Nigerian universities?
4. What challenges do law cataloguers face in using cataloguing tools and resources?
5. What strategies could be adopted to tackle challenges cataloguers face while using cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries in Nigerian universities?

Literature Review

Proper organisation of the collection in a law library facilitates quick and easy access as well as

effective retrieval of the legal information resources. This enables law students and faculty members to fully utilise the law resources in the law library with relative ease. One primary professional obligation of law librarians is to provide their readers access to the literature of the law (Cohen cited in Butler, 2006). Hence, the overall goal of a law library is to provide access to its priceless collections to its clientele in order to satisfy their information needs. Cohen emphasises that law librarians must provide their readers access to the materials they collect and administer. Without both physical access to the books and bibliographic access to the information within them, the readers cannot be adequately served (Butler, 2006).

Cataloguing and classification of information resources is the basis for the provision of access to information resources in all types of libraries (digital, electronic and traditional libraries). It is an aspect of a broader term- knowledge organisation (KO) or organisation of information. The practice and research on knowledge organisation in libraries are largely based on pragmatic traditional principles laid by people like Panizzi, Cutter, and Dewey. The principles they expounded are still observed in the structure of modern online retrieval systems (Smiraglia, 2002; Hjorland, 2008). Some of the principles are: principle of controlled vocabulary, Cutter's rule about specificity and principle of organising from the general to the specific. The principle of domain specifics is another important principle that ensures that indexing of a given document reflects the needs of a given group of users or a given ideal purpose (Hjorland, 2008). This principle informs the management of research libraries and bibliographic databases such as MEDLINE where subjects specialists are often hired to do the work in KO. The need for a specialist approach to the cataloguing of legal materials is that the structure of legal information is distinct from other disciplines; this according to Lawal (2007) is because it consists of hierarchically organised information of primary and secondary sources and other search tools which is an important aid in the research process. Moreover law, both as a profession and an academic discipline has various unique attributes which significantly differ from those of the arts and sciences, and which must be taken into account in its instruction and literature (Ryesky, 2007).

Views about a specialist approach for the cataloguing of law is due to the nature of legal materials. Modeste and Dina (2007) also opined that the task of designing a class scheme for legal materials could be rather complicated and that the challenge for the designer of the classification scheme is the manner in which primary and secondary materials are dealt with in the scheme. Moys (2001) further explains that it is virtually impossible to divide the subjects of law into neat watertight compartments, as there is inevitably a great deal of overlapping of different aspects of subjects. This explains the delay in accepting subject cataloguing in law libraries. The

major reasons for delay in law classification are the absence of suitable classification scheme for law and a long debate over author arrangement against subject classification by law librarians (Milles, 2004). Though the Library of Congress Classification Scheme existed since 1920, class K (Law) was not developed until 1968. This led to the establishment of so many in-house classification schemes for law. Consequently, Elizabeth Moys developed *Moys Classification and Thesaurus for Legal Materials* (MCT) to fill the void created by absence of suitable classification scheme for law. The Lagos High Court and the Ministry of Justice libraries existed since 1900 in the Southern Nigeria but cataloguing and classification of law resources were not practiced in the law libraries until the establishment of academic law libraries in Nigerian universities.

The unique nature of law and information resources in law requires that certain competencies be employed in the organisation of legal materials. Cataloguers cannot perform their roles without appropriate competencies. Omekwu (2008) rightly observed that roles are correlates of competences [and] it is difficult to discharge a role without appropriate professional skills and competence. According to him, cataloguers will need professional upgrading in skills and tools to work in dominantly global information network environment. Taylor cited in Bello and Mansor, (2012) concurs to this by saying that for the cataloguer to accomplish the task of cataloguing and classification, the cataloguer needs requisite skills, abilities and knowledge. The knowledge, skills and personal abilities needed for effective cataloguing work both in print and digital environments is what Neerputh, Lead and Hoskins (2006) refer to as core competencies. They define core competencies as the skills, knowledge and personal attributes which contribute to an individual success in a particular position. They classified the competencies into two- professional and personal. It is the combination of these two they referred to as core competencies. Knowledge of bibliographic tools is among the core competencies a subject librarian requires.

The unique competence of librarians (cataloguers specifically) as highlighted by ALA Task Force on Core Competencies (Bair, 2005) is the ability to organise collections of informational materials in order that desired items can be retrieved quickly and easily. Bair (2005) reported Park and Caimei's job description study in selected journals between 1999 and 2000 which demonstrates that knowledge on cataloguing and classification standards was the most frequently required qualification in job description and the activities expected of cataloguer were the core skills of cataloguers: original cataloguing, authority control, copy cataloguing, descriptive and subject cataloguing. In addition, ability to use standard cataloguing tools (AACR, MARC, LC, and LCSH) was equally stressed. Manaf, Nadzar and Ibrahim (2009) reported Letarte, *et al.* survey on the competency of cataloguers in which they found that it

involves a broad knowledge of cataloguing tools and the standards needed for descriptive and subject cataloguing. Thus, the ability of the cataloguer to perform his/her duty depends so much on the knowledge and expertise with the cataloguing tools and resources available to him (Miksa, 2008).This equally depends on the level of education, training and practice in which a cataloguer engages while applying the rules (Schultz-Jones, Snow, Miksa and Hasenyager, 2012).

On the competencies specific to law cataloguing, Levor (2006) opines that in order to apply classification system to the physical arrangement of materials in the library, highly skilled and specialised library professionals are needed. The knowledge of the way the law is produced should be absolute necessity for technical services law librarians. He needs to understand the complex supplementation and publishing patterns of unique legal materials. Specifically, the knowledge and skills required are knowledge of jurisprudence, legal systems and concepts, legal literature, comparative law, and international law. It has been observed that subject discipline is becoming more important especially in professional fields such as law and medicine where LIS professionals need to develop or acquire skills and knowledge unique to that field (Raju, 2014). Raju found that subject knowledge requirement emanates largely from law libraries. Middleton and Hallam (2001) identify three categories of staff in law libraries as those with law degree who may have spent some years practicing law prior to moving into law librarianship; paraprofessionals with experience who complete the academic requirements to become librarians; and others that joined the ranks after gaining experience in other areas of librarianship or fields of employment. Mayer and Terrill's (2005) survey on subject degree reveals a positive relationship with job performance in reference, bibliographic instruction, cataloguing, collection development, distance education and electronic resources.

Work experience can also be seen as a substitute of knowledge (Almeida *et al* cited in Salleh, Yaakub and Dzulkifi, 2011). Jegede (2001) believes that experience can be a good alternative to having subject degree when she says that "some professionally trained librarians with or without law training who have been given the chance, have proved that with devotion and sense of duty, they could be effective law librarians". Modesta and Dina (2007) found a positive relationship between experience of law cataloguers and their use of Moys Classification and Thesaurus for Legal Materials in the Caribbean law libraries. Another important aspect of job performance is continuous professional development which has to do with series of activities an organisation puts in place to assist its staff members acquire the skills and knowledge necessary for efficient and effective performance of jobs and responsibilities in the organisation. Saka and Haruna (2013) opine that professional development may

cover a wide spectrum of activities ranging from reading professional journals, attending conferences, mentoring, receiving specialised training or attending continuing education classes. They posit a significant relationship between training programme and job performance while Eze (2012) concurs that training of personnel enhances productivity. Thus, it is necessary for law librarians,(in order to cope with mass legal literature in books and electronic forms), to be exposed to training in literature of law at the library school (Jegede, 2001). Expectedly, library schools in Nigeria should broaden their curricula to cater for the needs of professionals in special libraries such as the law library.

Today, cataloguing principles have been greatly modified to meet the challenges posed by digital information and the users of information. Hall-Ellis (2006) rightly observed that twenty-first century library users demand access to electronic materials and use of computers to search, and receive information, create documents, and communicate with others. Thus, the quantum of available information on the web poses great challenge to both the information user and those saddled with the responsibility of cataloguing the information carriers. Omekwu, (2008), and Wang (2011) all agree that massive increase of digital resources especially web resources help to compound the work of the cataloguer. Furthermore, the existence of large databases such as Law Pavilion, LexisNexis, Westlaw, Bloomberg, HeinOnline, and so on has added to law cataloguers' job and the need to master and apply new cataloguing principles and standards has arisen.

This study adopted the competency approach in measuring the knowledge and skills of the law cataloguers in the use of cataloguing tools and resources and also their achievements. The competency approach is a relatively new method of performance appraisal (Neerputh, Leach and Hoskins, 2006). According to them, competency approach measures the capabilities of individuals in a job task and more specifically, it is the analysis of what behaviours, skills, knowledge, understanding and personal qualities [that] determine a competent performance. What is different about the competency approach is that in addition to assessing achievement (the what) the behaviour of the employee in meeting targets is taken into account (the how).

Research Method

The study used descriptive research design. The instruments employed for data collection was a questionnaire. The population of the study comprised 66 law cataloguers from 22 university law libraries in Southern Nigeria. These 66 cataloguers comprised of 20 lawyer librarians, 30 librarians, 11 library officers/assistants and 5 lawyers who catalogue law materials in the law libraries studied. The universities and the number of cataloguers studied are as follows: University of Nigeria, Nsukka (8), Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (1), University of Lagos (8), University of Ibadan (2), Nnamdi Azikiwe University,

Awka (2), University of Benin (5), University of Port Harcourt (1), University of Uyo (8), University of Calabar (10), Adekunle Ajasin University, Ondo (1), Ebonyi State University (1), Ekiti State University (1), Abia State University (2), Delta State University (1), Rivers State University of Science & Technology (2), Ambrose Alli University, Edo State (1), Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ogun State (1), Chukwu Emeka Odimegwu Ojukwu University of Science & Technology, Anambra State (2), Osun State University (1), Niger Delta University, Bayelsa (2), Lagos State University, Ojoo (5) and Enugu State University of Science & Technology (1).

No sampling was done as the entire population was studied since the number is small. Ten copies of the questionnaire were distributed to ten law cataloguers from Babcock and Afe Babalola Universities. The data collected were analysed using Cronbach Alpha to determine the internal consistency of the items in the instrument. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient revealed the reliability level of 0.97 and this was considered high enough for reliability.

Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive mean and standard deviation were used to analyse research questions 1,2,4 and 5 while Pearson Product Moment Coefficient was used to answer research question 3.

RESULTS

Data collected were analysed based on the research questions and presented in tables as below.

Research Question 1:

What is the competency level of cataloguers in the use of cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries in Nigerian universities?

Table 1:
Mean rating of respondents on competency level of cataloguers in the use of cataloguing tools and resources

S/N	ITEMS	VLS	LS	HS	VHS	$\bar{x}$	STD	D
1	Moys Classification and Thesaurus for Legal Materials (MCT)	1	4	9	39	3.62	0.71	VHS
2	CIP	1	5	8	39	3.60	0.56	VHS
3	Library of Congress Classification Scheme (LC)	1	4	9	39	3.58	0.71	VHS
4	National Union Catalogue	1	6	9	37	3.55	0.77	VHS
5	Internet Facilities	5	9	9	30	3.21	1.04	HS
6	Computers	5	9	9	30	3.21	1.04	HS
7	Cutter Tables	4	12	12	25	3.13	0.87	HS
8	Library of Congress Subject Headings List (LCSH)	8	7	14	24	3.02	1.34	HS
9	Stylus Pen	14	10	5	24	2.74	0.34	LS
10	Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules2 (AACR2)	5	22	16	10	2.58	0.91	LS
11	Typewriters	12	20	6	15	2.45	1.14	VLS
12	Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC)	17	20	8	8	2.13	1.03	VLS
13	Sears List of Subject Headings	17	20	10	8	2.13	1.04	VLS
14	Integrated Library System (Software), VTLS	18	25	10	-	2.03	0.82	VLS
15	Library of Congress Rule Interpretations	14	29	7	3	1.98	0.81	VLS
16	Adelaide University Law Library Online Catalogue	19	21	9	4	1.96	0.92	VLS
17	Online catalogue databases such, LC Online Catalogue	19	21	9	4	1.96	0.92	VLS
18	Millennium	22	25	3	3	1.75	0.81	VLS
19	Alice for Window	22	25	3	3	1.75	0.81	VLS
20	KOHA	24	27	1	1	1.6	0.63	VLS
21	Dublin Core	26	24	2	1	1.59	0.66	VLS
22	MARC Format	26	24	2	1	1.58	0.66	VLS
23	Resources Description and Access (RDA) Toolkit	26	26	1	-	1.23	0.75	VLS

NOTE: VLS= Very Lowly Skilled; LS=Lowly Skilled; HS=Highly Skilled; VHS=Very Highly Skilled; $\bar{x}$ =Mean; SD=Standard Deviation; D-Decision

Responses in Table 1 reveal that majority of the respondents were very highly skilled in the use of *Moys Classification and Thesaurus for Legal Materials* ($\bar{x}$=3.62), CIP ($\bar{x}$=3.60), *Library of Congress Classification Scheme* ($\bar{x}$=3.58), National Union Catalogues ($\bar{x}$=3.55) while the cataloguers have high skills in the use of Computers and Internet ($\bar{x}$=3.21) respectively *Library of Congress Subject Headings List* ($\bar{x}$=3.02) and *Cutter Tables* ($\bar{x}$=3.13). On the other hand, majority of the respondents have low skills in the use of *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules2* ($\bar{x}$=2.58), Typewriters ($\bar{x}$=2.45), *Dewey Decimal Classification* (DDC) and *Sears List of Subject Headings* ($\bar{x}$=2.13) respectively, VTLS ($\bar{x}$=2.09). Library of Congress Rule Interpretations ($\bar{x}$=1.98), Adelaide University Law Library Online Catalogue and LC Online Catalogue ($\bar{x}$=1.96) respectively, Millennium and Alice for Window ($\bar{x}$=1.75) respectively, KOHA ($\bar{x}$=1.60), Dublin Core ($\bar{x}$=1.59), MARC Format ($\bar{x}$=1.58) and Resource Description and Access toolkit ($\bar{x}$=1.23). In all, most of the respondents were highly skilled in the use of traditional cataloguing tools and resources but not in electronic tools such as VTLS, Adelaide University Law Library Online Catalogue and LC Online Catalogue, Millennium, Alice for Window, KOHA, Dublin Core, MARC Format and Resource Description and Access toolkit.

- **Research Question 2:**
- What is the level of job performance of cataloguers in the law libraries in Southern Nigerian universities?

Table 2:
Mean ratings of respondents on their level of cataloguing job performance in the university law libraries in Southern Nigeria

S/N	ITEMS	VL	L	H	VH	$\bar{x}$	SD	D
1	Identification and description of legal information materials	2	1	19	31	3.49	0.72	H
2	Creating and updating shelf list records	2	2	21	28	3.42	0.75	H
3	Copy cataloguing	2	6	27	18	3.15	0.77	H
4	Vetting cataloguing records	4	3	28	18	3.13	0.83	H
5	Filing of cataloguing cards on the public catalogue	9	10	13	21	2.87	1.13	L
6	Using cataloguing tools	3	7	10	33	2.67	0.79	L
7	Assigning subject headings	1	8	30	14	2.66	0.90	L
8	Supervising cataloguing work	10	14	15	14	2.62	1.08	L
9	Assigning Classification marks	2	8	30	11	2.56	0.87	L
10	Providing activity reports	9	16	17	11	2.56	1.01	L
11	Educating new entry cataloguers	8	22	13	10	2.47	0.97	VL
12	Publishing books on cataloguing	11	16	19	7	2.42	0.97	VL
13	Keeping up with evolving cataloguing standards	13	18	12	10	2.36	1.06	VL
14	Spine labeling	13	24	6	10	2.31	0.23	VL
15	Organising training activities for staff	29	5	13	6	2.23	1.23	VL
16	Production of catalogue cards	14	23	8	8	2.19	1.00	VL
17	Publishing journal articles on cataloguing	16	23	11	3	2.02	0.87	VL
18	Authority control	29	5	10	9	1.98	1.20	VL
19	Encoding cataloguing data on the OPAC	28	12	3	10	1.91	1.16	VL
20	Making cataloguing judgment	29	13	5	6	1.77	1.03	VL

NOTE: VL=Very Low; L=Low; H=High; VH=Very High; $\bar{x}$ =Mean; SD=Standard Deviation;; D=Decision

Responses to Table 2 show that majority of the respondents rated their performance in identification and description of legal information materials ($\bar{x}$=3.49), creating and updating shelf list records ($\bar{x}$=3.42), copy cataloguing ($\bar{x}$=3.15) and vetting cataloguing records ($\bar{x}$=3.13) high, while in filing of catalogue cards on the public catalogue ($\bar{x}$=2.89), using cataloguing tools ($\bar{x}$=2.67), assigning subject headings ($\bar{x}$=2.66) and assigning classification marks ($\bar{x}$= 2.56) their performance was low. However, in keeping pace with evolving cataloguing standards and educating new entry cataloguers, the mean ratings were ($\bar{x}$=2.47) respectively whereas publishing books on cataloguing ($\bar{x}$=2.42), production of catalogue cards ($\bar{x}$=2.19), publishing journal articles on cataloguing ($\bar{x}$=2.02), authority control ($\bar{x}$=1.98), encoding cataloguing data on the OPAC ($\bar{x}$=1.91) and making cataloguing judgment ($\bar{x}$=1.77), the cataloguers' performance was very low. The overall result indicates that the cataloguers' performance was high in four cataloguing activities, low in six and very low in ten.

Research Question 3: What is the extent of relationship between law cataloguers' demographic characteristics and cataloguing tools and resources utilisation for their job performance in law libraries in Nigerian universities?

Table 3:
Correlation analysis between demographic characteristics, cataloguing tools and resources utilisation and job performance

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Age	1	0.39	0.17	0.47	0.22	0.15	0.15
2	Gender		1	0.03	0.16	0.19	0.16	0.23
3	Subject background			1	0.09	0.05	0.12	0.15
4	Experience				1	0.14	0.65	0.62
5	Professional development					1	0.77	0.52
6	Utilisation						1	0.61
7	Performance							1

The results on the relationships between independent variables (age, gender, subject background, experience, professional development, utilisation of cataloguing tools and resources) and dependent variables (job performance) of law cataloguers in Table 3 reveal that cataloguing tools and resources utilisation (r=0.61), experience (r=0.62) and professional development (r=0.52) were strongly and positively correlated with job performance of the law cataloguers. On the other hand, subject background (r=0.15, age (r=0.15) and gender (r=0.23) were found to be negatively correlated with cataloguers' job performance, though the relationship was weak. Further analysis of relationships between the variables show that utilisation of cataloguing tools and resources by law cataloguers was strongly and positively correlated with experience (r=0.65) and professional development (r=0.77). On the other hand, age (r=0.15), gender (r=0.16 and subject background (r=0.12) were found to be negatively correlated with utilisation of cataloguing tools and resources.

Research Question 4: What challenges do law cataloguers face in using cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries in Nigerian universities?

Table 4:
Mean ratings of respondents on challenges of using cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries

S/N	ITEMS	VLE	LE	GE	VGE	$\bar{x}$	SD	D
1	Unavailability of cataloguing tools and resources	5	3	26	19	3.11	0.89	GE
2	Few books are published on law cataloguing	5	6	22	20	3.08	0.94	GE
3	Poor mentorship from experienced law cataloguers	5	6	23	19	3.06	0.93	GE
4	Inadequate sponsorship to conference /workshops	5	6	23	19	3.06	0.93	GE
5	Lack of research on cataloguing and classification	5	7	21	20	3.06	0.95	GE
6	Lack of awareness and use of Online bibliographic utilities	5	7	24	17	3.00	0.92	GE
7	None reading of journal articles on cataloguing and classification	5	8	27	13	2.91	0.88	LE
8	Lack of experience and Knowledge	10	7	27	9	2.66	0.98	LE
9	Lack of law degree	17	8	19	9	2.38	1.11	VLE
10	Lack of librarianship degree	21	16	7	9	2.08	1.11	VLE

NB= VLE= Very Low Extent; LE=Low Extent; GE=Great Extent; VGE=Very Great Extent; $\bar{x}$ = mean, ***SD=Standard Deviation; D=Decision.***

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the items in table 4 pose challenges to their cataloguing job performance. The responses as shown in Table 4 reveal that majority of the responses with mean score of ($\bar{x}$=3.11) agree that unavailability of cataloguing tools and resources poses the greatest challenge to their use of cataloguing tools and resources in the law libraries. Further analysis show that few books are published on law cataloguing ($\bar{x}$=3.08), poor mentorship from experienced law cataloguers ($\bar{x}$=3.06), inadequate sponsorship to conferences/workshops ($\bar{x}$=3.06), lack of research on cataloguing and classification ($\bar{x}$=3.06) and lack of awareness and use of online bibliographic utilities ($\bar{x}$=3.00) are great challenges to their performance. The Table also shows that the law cataloguers were challenged to a very low extent by lack of law degree ($\bar{x}$=2.38) and librarianship degree ($\bar{x}$=2.08).

Research Question 5: What strategies could be adopted to tackle challenges cataloguers face while using cataloguing tools and resources in law libraries in Nigerian universities?

Table 5: Strategies to improve the use of cataloguing tools and resources to enhance job performance

S/N	ITEMS	NA	NVA	A	VA	$\bar{x}$	SD	D
1	Mentoring from experienced law cataloguers	1	2	15	35	3.68	0.66	VA
2	Attendance to conference/workshops	-	6	5	42	3.68	0.67	VA
3	Use of Moys Listserv	3	2	12	36	3.58	0.82	VA
4	Attendance to Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (NIALS) Law Library workshops	-	5	12	36	3.58	0.66	VA
5	Attendance to Cataloguing and Classification Section of NLA Annual Workshop	1	5	13	34	3.51	0.75	VA
6	Researching on cataloguing and classification	1	2	20	30	3.49	0.67	A
7	Attendance to Nigerian Association of Law Libraries (NALL) workshop	2	6	11	34	3.45	0.85	A
8	Attendance to International Association of Law Libraries (IALL) workshop	1	8	11	33	3.43	0.82	A
9	Reading journal articles on cataloguing and classification	1	3	21	28	3.43	0.69	A
10	Nigeria Law School Library	2	4	17	30	3.42	0.8	A
11	Use of CIP for copy cataloguing	3	5	13	32	3.40	0.88	A
12	Use of online bibliographic utilities, eg. LC online catalogue	1	6	19	27	3.36	0.76	A
13	Pursuing advanced degree in Library and Information Science	4	3	23	23	3.23	0.87	A
14	Use of Adelaide University Law Library online catalogue	4	8	20	21	3.09	0.93	A
15	Pursuing law degree	3	14	20	16	2.92	0.90	NVA

NA= Not Appropriate; NVA= Not Very Appropriate; AP= Appropriate; VA= Very Appropriate; $\bar{x}$=Mean; SD= Standard Deviation

Table 5 reveal that majority of the respondents considered mentoring from experienced law cataloguers and attendance to conference/workshops with mean ($\bar{x}$=3.68) respectively and use of Moys Listserv ($\bar{x}$=3.58) as very appropriate to improve their use of cataloguing tools and resources. Researching on cataloguing and classification ($\bar{x}$=3.49), reading journal articles on cataloguing and classification ($\bar{x}$=3.43), use of CIP for copy cataloguing ($\bar{x}$=3.40), use of online bibliographic utilities ($\bar{x}$=3.36) and pursuing advanced degree in Library and Information Science ($\bar{x}$=3.23) were rated as appropriate for the improvement of the use of cataloguing tools and resources. However, pursuing law degree ($\bar{x}$=2.92) was rated as less appropriate for improving the use of cataloguing tools and resources.

Discussion of Findings

The findings on law cataloguers' level of competence in utilising cataloguing tools and resources in the Nigerian university law libraries indicate that majority of them had skills in the use of MCT, CIP, LC, NUC, computers, Internet, LCSH, AARC2 and Cutter Tables. The result further indicate that majority of the respondents had low skills in the use of DDC, VTLS, Library of Congress Rule Interpretations, Adelaide University Law Library Online Catalogue, Millennium, Sears List of Subject Headings, KOHA, Typewriters, Alice for Window and LC Online Catalogue. Furthermore, majority of the cataloguers had very low skills in Dublin Core, MARC Format and Resource Description and Access toolkit. From the findings of this research, it can be deduced that the law cataloguers have skills in most of the traditional cataloguing tools and resources but not in the electronic tools. This finding corroborates the findings of Bello and Mansor (2012) whose survey indicate the need for core cataloguing skills and knowledge, Internet cataloguing, digital library development, web authority and designing. This study also affirms the findings of Adebayo (2013) which revealed that graduates of library schools lacked required skills for various cataloguing positions in libraries, especially in the electronic or automated environment.

On the level of job performance, the cataloguers performed highly in the identification and description, vetting cataloguing records and copy cataloguing. On the other hand, filing of catalogue cards on the public catalogue, assigning subject headings and assigning classification marks as cataloguing activities were rated poorly. This affirms the findings of Cabonero and Doleendo (2013) that it is in the area of subject analysis that LIS practitioners have difficulty. From the above analysis, one can safely say that the law cataloguers did not perform optimally having performed very low in 80% of the cataloguing job activities. Part of the reasons for the low rating could be that they have not imbibed some changes that are taking place in modern organisation of knowledge. Another reason for their low performance could be low competence in the use of cataloguing tools and resources as well as inadequate knowledge about law and legal information resources. The performance of the cataloguers could have been better if the cataloguers possessed required skills and knowledge of law cataloguing.

The correlation analysis of those who possess law degree and their performance revealed a no significant effect. The finding is in consonance with Mayer and Terrill's (2005) findings that subject degree is irrelevant to cataloguing performance; that experience as a librarian is more important. This finding is also in tandem with Saka and Haruna's (2013) findings that formal education does not enhance job performance and that conferences/seminar and conference attendance enhance job performance of staff. On the other hand, a correlation results obtained from those with

experience showed that there is a significant relationship between experience and law cataloguers' job performance. This finding confirms Deeken and Thomas' (2006) study which revealed that Sixty-nine (69%) adverts required some kind of previous work experience in cataloguing job. Also, Modesta (2007) found a positive relationship between experience of law cataloguers and their use of *Moys Classification and Thesaurus for Legal Materials* in the Caribbean law libraries. Similarly, continuous professional development tested significance and thus contributed positively to cataloguers' job performance. Thus, the reason for low performance by the law cataloguers may be due to poor training or/and lack of law cataloguing experience of the law cataloguers.

On the challenges inhibiting law cataloguers' competency, majority of the respondents agreed that non-availability of cataloguing tools and resources posed the greatest challenge to their use of cataloguing tools and resources in the law libraries. In addition, few books are published on law cataloguing, poor mentorship from experienced law cataloguers, inadequate sponsorship to conferences/workshops, lack of research on cataloguing and classification and lack of awareness and use of online bibliographic utilities also posed great challenge to their use of cataloguing tools and resources and performance. The result hoever showed that the law cataloguers were challenged to a low extent by lack of law degree and librarianship degree. These findings are in tandem with Nampaye's (2009) research report which showed that law cataloguers encountered various problems with the tools which most of them attributed to a lack of training to adequately prepare them for cataloguing requirements. The results also corroborate Miksa's (2008) study which revealed lack of participation in the area of professional communication and the exchange of information as factors hindering the use of cataloguing tools and resources and ultimately negatively influencing cataloguers' job performance.

On how to improve their competencies, majority of the respondents considered mentoring from experienced law cataloguers and attendance to conference/workshops as very appropriate for improvement on the use of cataloguing tools and resources. Use of Moys Listserv, researching on cataloguing and classification, reading journal articles on cataloguing and classification, use of CIP for copy cataloguing, use of online bibliographic utilities and pursuing advanced degree in Library and Information Science were also suggested as strategies to enhance the use of cataloguing tools and resources. This finding corroborates Nampaye's (2009) recommendations on the areas of policy review to enhance adequate provision of cataloguing tools and resources and implementation of training programmes for cataloguers in order to enhance their job performance. The results further showed that pursuing law degree was rated the least appropriate for improving the use of cataloguing tools and resources. This shows that the policy that mandates law librarians to possess law degree to work in law libraries may need to be reviewed.

Conclusion

This study was set to appraise the competency level of law cataloguers in the use of cataloguing tools and resources in relation to their job performance in cataloguing. The overall result revealed that the cataloguers were not very competent in the use of cataloguing tools and resources thus, they performed poorly. However, the results revealed high competence in the use of *Moys Classification and Thesaurus for Legal Materials* and *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, yet the cataloguers performed poorly in assigning subject headings and classification marks. This casts a doubt concerning their competence in the use of the tools. For if they were competent, their job performance would have been high especially in the two basic cataloguing activities. Further analysis revealed that those who have law degree did not perform better than those who do not have. Instead a positive relationship was revealed between those who have experience and their performance, likewise between those who engaged in professional development more often and their performance.

Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, it was recommended that the law cataloguers should engage in continuous professional development more often. This will enhance the law cataloguers' skills and competence in law cataloguing. Moreover, experienced law cataloguers should be employed by the universities. This is the surest way to improve law cataloguing performance. Furthermore, there should be adequate provision of cataloguing tools and resources (both traditional and online tools) in the law libraries.

References

Adebayo, O. (2013). Challenges associated with cataloguing electronic resources in selected university libraries in Southwest Nigeria. *Chinese Librarianship: An International Electronic Journal* 36:15-24. Available at: http://www.Iclc.us/cliej/cl36adebayo.pdf .

Bair, S. (2005). Toward a code of ethics for cataloguing. *University Libraries Faculty and Staff Publications*, Paper 11. Available at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/library_pubs/11.

Bello, M. & Mansor, Y. (2012). Duties and job performance factors of cataloguers in Nigerian academic libraries. *Library Philosophy and Practice.* Available at: http://www.digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/829.

Butler, A. (2006). Frederick Hicks's strategic vision for law librarianship. *Law Library Journal* 98(2):367-379.

Cabonero, D. & Dolendo, R. (2013). Cataloguing and classification skills of library and information science practitioners in their workplaces. *Library Philosophy and Practice.* Available at: http://www.digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/960.

Chapman, A. & Massey, O. (2002). A cataloguing quality audit tool. *Library and Information Research News* 26(82):26-37.

Deeken, J. & Thomas, D. (2006). Technical services job ads: changes since 1995. *College and Research Libraries* March, 136-145.

Eze, J. (2012). Staff training programmes in Nigerian public libraries: The case of Enugu State Public Library. *Library Philosophy*: 7-19. Available at: http://www.digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/775.

Hall-Ellis, S. (2006). Cataloguing electronic resources and metadata: employers' expectations as reflected in American libraries and AutoCat, 2000-2005. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 47(1):38-51. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40324336.

Hjørland, B. (2008) What is knowledge organisation (KO)? *Knowledge Organisation International Journal, devoted to Concept Theory, Classification, Indexing and Knowledge Representation* 35(2/3): 86-101.

Jegede, O. (2001). Law libraries and librarianship in Nigeria. In S. Olanlokun & T. Salisu (Ed.), *Libraries and Librarianship in Nigeria: A Festschrift for Ezekiel Bejide Bankole* (pp.201-218). Lagos: Ikofa Press.

Jegede, O. (2007). Introduction to the Moys Classification Scheme. In Proceedings of the National Workshop on Technical Services in Law Libraries, Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, Lagos, June 26-28

Lawal, V. (2007). Legal research and legal education in Africa: the challenge for information literacy. *Starr Workshop Papers* Paper 5. Available at: http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/sws_papers/5.

Levor, R. (2006). The unique role of academic law libraries: Toolkit for academic law libraries. *Academic Law Libraries Special Interest Section, American Association of Law Libraries*. Available at: www.aallnet.org>marketingtoolkit2004.

Manaf, Z., Nadzar, F. & Ibrahim, I. (2009). Assessing the cataloguing practices in libraries of private colleges in Sarawak. Malaysia: University Teknologi Mara. Available at: http//:www.irdc.uitm.edu.my.

Mayer, J. & Terrill, L. (2005). Academic librarians' attitudes about advanced subject degrees. *College & Research Libraries* January.66 (1)59-73.

Middleton, M. & Hallam, G. (2001).Generic education for specialist information professionals. *Australian Law Librarian* 9(3*)*:181-194.

Miksa, D. (2008). A survey of local library cataloguing tool and resource utilisation. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 49(2):128-146. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40323781.

Modeste, J. & Dina, Y. (2007). The use of Moys Classification Scheme for Legal Materials in the Caribbean. In C. Peltier-Davis & S. Renwick (Ed.), *Caribbean Libraries in the 21st Century: Changes, Challenges, and Choice* (pp.119-127). Information Today Inc. Available at: http://www.books.google.com.ng/books?id=Ss-gujZevQC.

Moys, E. (2001). *Moys Classification Scheme and Thesaurus for Legal Materials.* 5th ed. Munchen: K G Saur.

Nampeya, C. (2009). The use of cataloguing tools and resources by cataloguers in the University of Malawi Libraries and the Malawi National Library service in providing access to information. Unpublished master thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.

Neerputh, S., Leach, A. & Hoskins, R. (2006).Towards establishing guidelines for performance appraisal of subject librarians in Kwazulu-Natal academic libraries. *Mousaion* 24(1):51-74.

Omekwu, C. (2008). Cataloguers in the global information network environment. The *Electronic Library* 26(2):188-201.

Omekwu, C. (2007). Information technology and technical services. Paper presented at the National Workshop on Technical Services in Law Libraries Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, Lagos, June 26–28.

Raju, J. (2014). Knowledge and skills level for the digital era academic library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40:163–170.

Ryesky, K. (2007). On solid legal ground: bringing information literacy to undergraduate-level law courses. *Journal of Effective Teaching* 7(2):21-35.

Saka, K. & Haruna, I. (2013). Relationship between staff development and job performance among personnel in branch libraries, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 4(5):9-17.

Sallah, F., Yaakubu, N. & Dzulkifi, Z. (2011). The influence of the skill levels on job performance of public service employees in Malaysia. *Business and Management Review* 1(1):31-40.

Schultz-Jones, B., Snow, K., Miksa, S. & Hasenyager, R. (2012). Historical and current implications of cataloguing quality for next generation cataloguers. *Library Trends* 6(1):49-82.

Smiraglia, R. (2002).The progress of theory in knowledge organisation. *Library Trends* 50(3):309-574.

Solon, K. (2006). Present in its absence: law librarians and technology at the founding of AALL. *Law Library Journal* 98(3):515-530.

Sung, M. (2013). Ten essential qualities for success: a new cataloguing librarian' guide from a supervisor's perspective. Available at: http://publiclibrariesonline.org/2013/06/tenessential-qualities-for-success-a-new-cataloguing-librarians-guide.

Tuyo, O. (2011). Use of Moys Classification Scheme in Classification for Legal Materials. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology* 5(2):1-3.

Wang, S. (2011). A study of library organisation objects and levels of organisation. *Journal of Library Science in China* 3:43-