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ABSTRACT

Information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in terms of accessing well-resourced legal information collections is essential in their daily professional lives. The lack of legal information access by lawyers through their professional organization’s information service negatively affects the provision of competent legal services. This study endeavoured to empirically investigate the information needs and information behaviour of private practising lawyers in Swaziland regarding accessing legal information and the role played by their professional body, the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) to meet their information needs.

The study applied the pragmatism paradigm and used a mixed method approach by adopting and triangulating qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis. The population of the study was confined to all lawyers outside the civil service and corporate organizations in Swaziland, the Law Society executive officials and librarians in library collections that had legal information resources. A survey research design was used, with a survey questionnaire and interviews as tools. For reliability and validity of the results, a co-efficiency test on Cronbach Alpha was run on the findings of the questionnaire. A census sampling of all lawyers in private law firms registered with the Law Society of Swaziland was undertaken. About 170 questionnaires were distributed and 128 returned, giving a 75.3% response rate. Interviews with seven librarians and seven Law Society executive officials were conducted, giving a response rate of 100% and 77.5% respectively.

Quantitative and qualitative data obtained were captured using Census and Survey Processing System software (CSPro7) and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24 to generate descriptive and inferential statistics. Further, the qualitative data was also analysed using thematic content analysis.

Findings showed that a majority, 52% lawyers are in the Hhohho region followed by 42% in Manzini, while there is only 2% in the other two regions. Of this, a majority, 81% were male and a majority were in the age group of 26 to 45 years. Most, 65% were attorneys with 0 to 5 years’ experience in practice. Further, a majority 86% of the lawyers hold a basic law degree. The findings indicated that 100% lawyers need and use legal information for legal advice, disputes and negotiations, drafting legal documents, and representing clients, followed by 88% for legal research, 84% administration of estates and 66% administrative duties. On information resources used, the results showed that 100% are textbooks, while 99% are cases,
statutes, constitution, with 98% unreported cases. Other resources highly used are reference material (88%), law journals (83%) and 81% government publications.

The lawyers, 97%, access legal information from other colleagues, while 94% from their personal collection, and 87% from online databases. Further, 83% access it from their law firms. However, the results show that very few access legal information from the libraries in the country. The results showed that 43% access it from the University of Swaziland library, while 5% use public libraries or court library and only 2% access the Law Society library. Both the lawyers and the interviewed librarians identified several challenges in accessing legal information. The majority (53%) lawyers noted lack of time as their major challenge, followed by inadequate or outdated resources and lack of adequate electronic resources in all the collections they access. In relation to the Law Society library, the major challenge noted is that 77% are not aware or even use it. Findings in the study as confirmed by the librarians showed that the libraries faced challenges like lack of material, lack of funds and a lack of needs specification by the lawyers.

The study also reveal that 86% lawyers used the internet for legal information and further 95% access Google. In addition, a majority, 98% are comfortable with both the electronic and print formats resources. A majority (70%) rated their ability to search legal material by themselves as good.

Consequently, the study recommend that there is need for the establishment of online legal information access for lawyers through the Law Society library and improving awareness, utilization and acquisition of legal resources.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the background to the study and an outline of the research problem. The chapter also outlines the research questions, significance of the study, its scope and limitations as well as the research objectives, and methodology used.

Different scholars have observed and reiterated that ‘information’ plays a vital role in all nations and professions (Devi and Dlamini, 2014; Case, 2002). It is known that without information, bad decisions based on lack of access and / or poor and outdated information might fail in meeting the expectations of society (Mansour and Alkhurainej, 2011: 671) resulting in maladministration of justice (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). Information needs and access to information are significant ingredients in all professions, including the legal fraternity. This study investigated the legal profession’s information needs in terms of their dealing with issues in their legal practice, especially in undertaking their tasks and roles towards serving their clientele.

Discovering the information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers would help improve their legal services provision to their clients, in their particular environments. Researchers have equated the concept of information need to the need for “food and water” (Devi and Dlamini, 2014: 1). This need for such basics is the goal in information seeking. It is thus evident that the goal of the user’s information seeking activities is to find information that will satisfy their basics or information needs (Bystrom, 2002). According to Kuhlthau (1993) information needs is evolving from a vague cognizance of something required, ending in locating the information that contributes to understanding, clarifying the meaning, and expanding the information obtained in order to satisfy the need.

A number of studies delving into the information seeking behaviour of different groups of library users have given diverse meanings to the phrase ‘information seeking’. For instance, Taylor and Procter (2005:1) saw it as the ability to identify and examine useful literature and information that is in any format to meet relevant needs. While the term information behaviour describes the ways people interact with information in terms of seeking and utilization (Bates, 2010: 2381), it is said to be so broad as to cover information needs, information seeking
behaviour and information searching and use (Case, 2012). The relationship between these terms were explored in the present study within the context of lawyers in Swaziland.

Wilson (2000: 49) sees information behaviour as the entirety of human behaviour in relation to sources and channels of information, including both active and passive information seeking, information use and access. In addition, Wilson opines that information seeking behaviour is the purposive seeking for information emanating from a need to satisfy some goal or objective. The individual interact with manual information systems in the course of seeking the information. Further, information seeking is the process where the individual applies their knowledge and skills or personal information setup to solve an information need (Ikoja-Odongo and Ocholla, 2004). Marchionini (1995) states that information seeking is a fundamental human activity aimed at learning and problem solving. Bystrom (2002) also argued that information seeking is the purposive process where the individual attempts to acquire the relevant information in order to get solutions to issues at hand. Access to the relevant information for these solutions is thus imperative. This study investigated this aspect in terms of the legal service provision by the private practising lawyers in Swaziland.

Lawyers assume various names and different responsibilities in the legal profession, and are involved in the administration of justice (Ahmed and Batcha, 2014). In some instances they are referred to as attorneys, counsels, solicitors, barristers, advocates, public defenders, and prosecutors to depict the particular responsibilities they may have (Otike and Matthews, 2000; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). For the purpose of this research, the term lawyer refers to any person qualified to practice law irrespective of the particular responsibility in this study. Whatever their responsibilities they must know where to find and access, as well as use legal information resources.

Two categories of lawyers are practicing lawyers or academic lawyers. The latter includes those who teach law, for instance, professors, lecturers and researchers in academia, while the former refers to those who are in daily practice serving clients in different legal matters. For the purpose of this research, lawyers would mean those who are in private practice and hold a valid license to practice as provided by the Legal Practitioners’ Act of 1964 (Government of Swaziland, 1964). This Act provides that a lawyer is a:-

Person duly admitted to practise as an advocate, attorney, notary or conveyancer in terms of this Act or the law repealed by this Act and for the purposes of sections 24bis,
Access to legal information is a pertinent aspect and a tool of justice (Ahmed and Batcha, 2014: 28) in all societies. The United Nations’ Charter on Human Rights stipulates that:

“… Lawyers have to have access to appropriate information, files and documents … in sufficient time to enable lawyers to provide effective legal assistance to their clients. Such access should be provided at the earliest appropriate time” (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Charter (OHCHR), 1990).

With the growth of legal issues or concerns arising from law in the environment, individuals and all legal entities in society need the support of lawyers, particularly private lawyers, for the protection of their rights and solving of disputes among themselves and the states (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010: 3). The Office of the United Nations’ High Commissioner for Human Rights Charter (OHCHR) (1990) further points out the importance of governments in ensuring that all persons have access to the assistance of lawyers of their choice to defend them in all stages of legal proceedings. The main purpose of private lawyers is promoting justice in the legal profession, which they can do well when they have timeous access to quality legal information. This study examined this through an investigation into the information behaviour of Swaziland lawyers.

Lawyers may face different challenges as they seek for such information which includes poorly resourced personal libraries, difficulty or lack of easy access to those libraries that have law collections and timeous, as well as updated legal information sources (Ahmed and Batcha, 2014; Adewale and Mansor, 2014; Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi, 2016; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010a). The cost of legal information resources can also be another challenge that compromises their roles. Consequently, the OHCHR (1990), on the basic roles of lawyers, further requires governments and professional associations of lawyers to ensure that lawyers have appropriate education and training, are equipped with the ideals and ethical duties of the lawyer, human rights and fundamental freedoms recognized by national and international law. Appropriate access to legal information is thus imperative.

It is evident that professional associations for lawyers thus have a duty to meet this requirement. According to the OHCHR (1990), lawyers are supposed to form and join self-governing professional associations that will represent their interests, promote continuos education and
training, as well as protec the legal profession’s intergrity. It follows therefore that without legal information resources and access to the same, this would not be possible.

Countries worldwide have formed and established professional legal representative bodies of lawyers called Law Societies or Law Associations to meet the requirements as provided by the OHCHR. For instance, there is the Law Society of South Africa (LSSA) (2015) for South African lawyers and the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) (2012) for Swazi lawyers. These law societies further affiliate to other professional law bodies regionally or internationally, for example, the International Bar Association (2016), the SADC Lawyers’ Association for Southern African Development Community (SADC Lawyers’ Association, 2017), and the African Bar Association (2017) for the African continent at large.

Their main purpose as professional legal bodies is promoting justice through the legal profession and bringing together the professionals for support and sharing of ideas and further enhancing legal professional standards. These associations consequently need to have access to quality legal information on all aspects of the field of law and beyond. This is more so in terms of assisting their membership with current and timeous access to legal information as required for human rights goals. Most of these law societies have resource centres or collections that assist member lawyers with legal information in different ways as relevant in their particular environments.

As has been intimated, access to timely and appropriate information support is the foundation of every discipline and the legal profession is no exception (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996); Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001; Jones, 2006). Consequently, these professional representative bodies of lawyers need to have well equipped legal information resource facilities / centres in order to meet the needs of its members. For example, the Law Society of South Africa has developed its own well equipped and resourced library and an electronic help desk service which reaches out to all South African registered lawyers and candidate attorneys in South Africa (The Law Society Library, 2016).

1.1.1 The Swaziland Law Society

Just like in all other jurisdictions, Swaziland has one such legal professional body that regulates the legal profession in the country, called the Law Society of Swaziland. It is a professional body set up to uphold the principles of the rule of law, law reform and regulate admission and conduct of lawyers in Swaziland. The Law Society of Swaziland was established through the
Swaziland Lawyers’s Act in 1964. However it only started functioning properly in 2002, and has recently acquired its present office site in Mbabane, Swaziland, which has a few officers responsible for administration together with the Executive Committee (Thwala and Mngomezulu, 2016). Thwala and Mngomezulu further point out that activities of the Law Society include programmes on Continuous Legal Education (CLE) which is offered to the members of the Society as well as seminars and workshops on ethics and other issues of relevance to the lawyers. These activities require a well resourced legal information center that can also promote research facilities. Hence the present study intended to investigate how the Swaziland Law Society assists members in such service provision.

The Law Society of Swaziland consist of three categories of lawyers who are all members according to the Act. These are, those working for the Government of Swaziland as state counsels, legal advisors to government ministries and other legal offices thereof. The second category are those who work for parastatals as legal representatives, company secretaries of the organizations, legal advisors, and administrators in those parastatals. The last category are those who run their own private legal practice offices for the citizens or public, or are employed in these private practice offices as attorneys. All these categories serve in the administration of justice in the different spheres under the same goal. They are all automatically members of the Law Society of Swaziland which is their professional body and they are supposed to subscribe to and be accountable to the same. This study focused on the last category, which is those in private practice.

1.1.2 Swaziland and the judicial system

Swaziland is a small sovereign state ruled by a monarchy in the Southern Africa region. King Mswati 111 and the Queen Mother (Indlovukazi) Ntombi Tfwala rule it. Their main head office is at the Lozitha Palace, Lobamba in the Hhohho region, Swaziland. The Kingdom of Swaziland is landlocked between the Republic of South Africa in the south and western part and the Republic of Mozambique in the eastern part, with a total area of about 17, 363 sq. km (Sandbox Networks, 2017). It has four regions, namely the Hhohho, Lubombo, Manzini and Shiselweni regions (Swaziland Tourism Information Office, 2013). The capital town of Swaziland is Mbabane in the Hhohho region, while Manzini town in the Manzini region is the hub and administrative town of Swaziland. As such, these two regions have most administrative businesses and offices. Figure 1.1 is the map of Swaziland, which shows the main regions and the capital town, Mbabane, where there is the highest court of the land.
1.1.3 Swaziland’s judicial system

Swaziland has a dual judicial system that consists of courts based on a western model and western law and Swazi customary law based on customs and traditions. The Swazi National courts and community traditional meetings in the chiefdoms apply the latter, while civil courts apply the former. This is because Swaziland was a long time British protectorate or colony until 1968 when it gained its independence; hence, the country inherited the western system. The common law practiced and applied in Swaziland is mostly the Roman Dutch Common Law, which was adopted in 1907. This law is applied in so far as it is not inconsistent with the supreme law, that is, the Constitution of Swaziland or statutes. The Swazi customary law practiced applied in Swaziland is endorsed through the Constitution and is also applied and enforced in so far as it is not inconsistent with the Statutes. In these premise, the relevant civil courts are the ones that administer these laws for the application of both the Roman Dutch Common law and the Swazi Customary law, which is where lawyers undertake their Clients’ business.

The four regions have these different civil courts (Magistrate’s court, Swazi National Courts and Swazi National Appeal Courts). The Swazi National courts, which administer the Swazi Law and Custom, are also in all the four regions headed by Swazi Court Presidents. However, the highest court in the land (High Court of Swaziland) and the Supreme Court are found in the Hhohho region, hence, more lawyers are in this region than anywhere else in the country.

1.1.4 Sources of law in Swaziland

Swaziland draws laws from a variety of sources that include the Constitution, legislation, common law, judicial precedent, customary law, authoritative texts and decrees (Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi, 2016). These sources are a significant attribute for lawyers where their legal service delivery is concerned. The present study investigated the information behaviour of the lawyers in relation to the access of these important legal sources.
1.2 Statement of the problem

The lack of legal information access by lawyers through their professional organization negatively affects the provision of competent legal services. Consequently, there is need for professional organizations to meet information needs of their members for the delivery of good legal services. This study endeavoured and aimed to investigate the extent to which the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) support its membership who are in private practice.

The study investigated information needs, information seeking behaviour and access to legal information by lawyers in Swaziland; specifically in relation to the existing situation in terms of the availability of legal information services and sources, how their information needs are being met and the role played by the Law Society of Swaziland in meeting their needs.
Otike and Matthews (2000:251) in Kenya, recognised the challenges faced by lawyers in legal information access. These problems are not unique to Kenya, but other developing countries like Swaziland as well. Otike and Matthews (2000:251) concluded that since lawyers experience many problems in accessing legal information, the only useful way they could maximise access and availability of legal information was by setting up their own law library on a cooperative basis. Hence, the most reasonable expectation would be that their professional body could fill this need.

This study thus investigated how the Law Society of Swaziland assists in providing such service for its members. It has been observed that lawyers have unique ethical responsibilities in their profession (Komlodi and Lutters, 2008), thus need access to accurate, current and timeous information as it defines their legal service delivery in any judicial space (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010a:2).

Lawyers in private practice cover broader areas of the law therefore have varied information needs. They need to utilize complex legal information sources which necessitates timely access (Ahmed and Batcha, 2014). According to Kuhlthau and Tama (2001), lawyers expressed a need for user-oriented tools to meet their information needs. The present study assessed the availability and usage of legal information resources in Swaziland through the information seeking behaviour of lawyers. It further contributed knowledge to suggestions in earlier research on the importance of information retrieval systems to assist lawyers in locating information to satisfy their information needs in their duties and tasks (Wilkinson, 2001) especially in Swaziland.

In order to satisfy their information needs, lawyers need to access well-resourced legal information collections, something that is missing in the Swaziland context. The Law Society of Swaziland has a limited collection of information resources to fulfil its mandate of providing legal information resources for timeous access to legal information for its membership, thus the study investigated how the member’s information needs are met. Thwala and Mngomezulu (2016), pointed that the Law Society of Swaziland library is small, with a collection of just about 48 volumes donated by the International Bar Association (IBA). Further, that the library does not have any subscription legal databases thus far like other well-equipped law societies libraries, nor does it have a qualified librarian to manage the little that is available. The research thus investigated the extent to which access to legal information is provided to its members.
1.3 Objectives of the study

Broader issues investigated in the study were the following:

- To investigate the information seeking behaviour of private lawyers in Swaziland.
- To determine the information needs of the private lawyers in Swaziland.
- To establish how information needs of the private lawyers in Swaziland are met.
- To examine the role played by the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) in meeting the information needs of lawyers in the country.

1.4 Research questions

As mentioned earlier, the need for timeous access and accurate legal information resources is significant to promoting justice (Ahmed and Batcha, 2014) and it is necessary for lawyers’ legal service provision. Thus, the broader questions that were addressed in relation to this problem are “what are the information needs, and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland, and how are these needs being met by the available information resources and the Swaziland Law Society?”

The study investigated several aspects of their information seeking behaviour. These included information needs of the lawyers, information access, as well as the availability of the actual resources for timeous access. The study examined the existing situation regarding access to legal information in meeting the needs of lawyers in Swaziland.

In addressing the research problem, the following research questions guided the study:

- What are the information needs of the private lawyers in Swaziland?
- How do the private lawyers in Swaziland access and use legal information they need?
- What information resources do the private lawyers in Swaziland use?
- What are the challenges affecting private lawyers in satisfying their information needs in Swaziland?
- What strategies could be adopted to overcome any challenges faced in satisfying private lawyers’ information needs in Swaziland?

1.5 Significance and scope of the study

Even though several studies have been conducted about the information seeking behaviour, information needs and access to legal information of lawyers in different countries, it is of note,
that no empirical study has been conducted on the same topic in Swaziland. Furthermore, a study on the legal information services provided by the Law Society of Swaziland, which is the only professional body for lawyers, has not been conducted. Hence, this study helped in obtaining comprehensive findings thereof and filling a gap. Example of similar studies in different contexts include Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010); Otike and Matthews (2000); Bhardwaj (2016); Thanuskodi (2010); Lawal (2012) and Ahmed and Batcha (2014).

The significance is that the study examined the role played by the Swaziland Law Society in satisfying lawyers’ information needs through its library as well as other information services of Swaziland, like the Swaziland National Library Services (SNLS), which is a public library and the University of Swaziland. The study is also significant in that it holistically analysed key information service providers and their role in meeting and satisfying legal information needs of private practising lawyers in the country.

This study concentrated on the private lawyers’ information seeking and needs and how such needs are satisfied by the available information resources in terms of ensuring that the Swazi populace has access to quality legal services through access to quality and timeous legal information by the lawyers. This study did not delve into the detail of information searching and retrieval strategies used by lawyers, even though it was briefly mentioned.

The research considered what has been reported on information seeking behaviour and information needs of lawyers (nationally and internationally) and what has been reported on legal professional bodies’ information support to their members in terms of access (nationally and internationally). In addition, the specific information needs and seeking behaviour of the lawyers in Swaziland as well as legal information services currently offered by the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) were investigated. It further looked into how the LSS can fill the gaps in addressing the information needs and seeking behaviour of their members. Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi, (2016) pointed out that there are problems in terms of access to legal information in Swaziland, especially in the courts. According to Dube, Magagula and Nhlabatsi (2016) the high costs of the information such as legislation and government gazettes exacerbated this problem.

1.6 Limitations and delimitations

The study was conducted in Swaziland with private practising lawyers (members of the Law Society of Swaziland) in the four different regions, namely; Hhohho, Manzini, Lubombo and
Shiselweni who are practicing in the different courts of Swaziland; Swazi National Courts, Magistrate Court, High Court, Industrial court and the Court of Appeal. These private lawyers were preferred for this study because they are involved in directly serving the private citizens in the promotion of justice and protection of rights among themselves as citizens and between the state and citizens as opposed to those who work in the civil service and serve the state. Therefore, the study excluded lawyers that are working in the civil service and those in parastatals or private organizations that are not in legal practice per se.

The LSS as their main professional body was assessed in terms of its role in ensuring access to timely and relevant legal information resources to its membership. The study, as mentioned earlier, was delimited to Swaziland’s lawyers’ information seeking behaviour as no empirical study of this nature has been done on this aspect. The study’s limitations include the lack of timeous access to the research participants, as it is known that lawyers usually have busy schedules. Studies done in other countries have shown that lawyers are not easily available due to their busy schedules, as seen in Kenya where Otike and Matthews (2000: 241) ended up doing an in-depth study of a single lawyer.

1.7 Theoretical framework

A theoretical framework is significant in research. Understanding the theories relevant to each study assists in the gathering of facts as systematically relevant as possible (Creswell, 1994; Bless and Higson-Smith, 1995). Various theories of information behaviour are noted in the field of Library and Information Science (LIS) (Case, 2012). These theories include models of information behaviour, such as Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain’s information seeking behaviour model (1996), Wilson’s information seeking behaviour model, from 1981 to 1999 (Wilson, 1999); Kuhlthau’s ISP model (Kuhlthau, 1993; Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001), all which were briefly discussed in the following chapters.

Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain’s 1996 model of information seeking behaviour of professionals looks at the roles and related tasks resulting from information needs of professionals by outlining factors which affect professionals, for instance, sources available, intended use of sources, individual characteristics of the user as well as the environment they are in (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996).

Wilkinson (2001) applied this model in her study where she opined that the awareness and selection of sources for lawyers is characterized by demographics in their work roles, which
the current study investigated for the Swaziland context. Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain’s model was devised by examining the literature on professionals’ information seeking behaviour and highlighted that professionals play many distinct roles, not only those relating to providing specific expertise and knowledge related to their domains, but including other more general roles such as selecting and processing, counselling, supervising and planning. According to Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, (1996) these roles result in distinct types of activities, which in turn “shape the type of information needed, the way in which it is retrieved and the ultimate use of that information.” Though this model is applicable in the present study, Wilson’s more general model of information behaviour was preferred to underpin the study by the researcher because it updates parts of Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996)’s model and encompasses more aspects befitting the present study.

Of note is that Wilson’s model (1999) integrates information seeking, information need, information exchange and information use (in a flow diagram) based on two key points as noted in Figure 2.3 of Chapter Two. It looks at information need as a secondary need arising from a basic or primary need and secondly, while discovering information to satisfy the need, the seeker faces different barriers. These include among others environmental, personal and interpersonal barriers. This model is more applicable and comprehensive for the problem and population under study. This is because it enables a description and explanation of lawyers’ information behaviour. The model was also applied in other studies such as those of Lawal (2012), Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010), Majyambere (2015) and Otike and Matthews (2000). This is discussed in more detail in Chapter Two.

1.8 Research design and methods

The Pragmatism paradigm was adopted as it “applies to mixed methods research in that inquirers draw liberally from both quantitative and qualitative assumptions” (Creswell, 2003: 12). This is on the basis this is a problem-solving paradigm that identifies the problem through the use of multiple approaches.

This study used the mixed method approach whereby both qualitative and quantitative approaches are applied. It has been pointed out that this approach enables researchers to obtain a variety of information on the same issue to reduce the deficiencies that come with relying on one method (Majyambere and Hoskins, 2015). Creswell, Fetters and Ivankova (2004) pointed out that using a mixed method approach yields a better analysis and complements both the
quantitative and qualitative approaches. This is in line with the previous studies in information seeking behaviour that have used the mixed method approach (Otike and Matthews, 2000; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010; Wilkinson, 2001, Majyambere and Hoskins, 2015; Lawal, Stilwell, Kuhn, and Underwood, 2014). These studies employed interviews and questionnaires, which was also be adopted in this study.

Since the study focused on obtaining quantitative and qualitative information concerning the information seeking behaviour of lawyers, it will be based on survey methods. Surveys are usually concerned with collecting data directly from the participants (Babbie and Mouton, 2001), as will be done in this study. Babbie (2011: 277) pointed that surveys involve three main steps, which are questionnaire construction, sample selection, and data collection, through either self-administered questionnaires or interviewing. The present study followed these steps in using both interviews and self-administered questionnaires as data collection techniques.

1.8.1 Study population

The population of the study is explained in detail in Chapter four of this research. It is noted that the population sample of this study as mentioned above consisted of all the private practising lawyers of the Swaziland who by default are members of the LSS along with the Law Society Executive officers (LSE) and librarians in libraries that have a law collection in Swaziland where lawyers are believed to access information.

Therefore, the sampling technique was a census sampling which is normally used for small populations because the entire population was involved in the study (Sapsford, 2007). For this case a total of 170 private practicing lawyers who are members of the LSS were involved in the study. Further, all nine (9) members of the LSE and all seven (7) librarians operating law collections in the country were included.

1.8.2 Data collection methods

The qualitative and quantitative (called Mixed) methodology was adopted for collecting data from the population. Qualitative data collection was deemed most appropriate for the LSE officials and librarians, while largely quantitative data collection was deemed best for the lawyers in the study. In the data collection, the research instruments used were a self-
administered questionnaire for lawyers and face-to-face semi-structured interviews for the LSE and librarians.

The questionnaire for the lawyers comprised of both open-ended and closed questions, which yielded both qualitative and quantitative output. These questionnaires were hand delivered and administered to the participants in order to collect a large amount of data in a reasonably short time as the population was spread all over the country. It covered questions that addressed the lawyers’ information needs and information seeking behaviour in order to identify the challenges they face in accessing legal information and further provide suggestions of solutions to the same. This questionnaire is available in Appendix 2.

The semi structured interview with both the nine LSE officials and seven librarians (Appendices 3 and 4 respectively), was face to face and recorded through a voice recorder upon permission from interviewees. This assisted in supplementing and overcoming the limitations of the questionnaire administered to lawyers, and the work scope of the participants. The aim of these interviews was mainly to explore access to legal information in order to meet the needs of lawyers through the availability of information services in the organizations.

Majyambere (2014:22) posits that the literature review is another way of establishing a theoretical framework of a study as it systematically gathers information that guides the empirical element of a study. Hence, the literature review that is provided in detail in Chapter Three is taken as another data gathering method as it provided more insights into the information seeking behaviour and information needs of lawyers and their challenges in accessing legal information.

The recent study of information behaviour of law students in Nigerian Universities by Olorunfemi (2014) focused on similar aspects as covered in the present study though undertaken with students. It employed mixed methods research to collect data from the different populace just as is done in the present study. Otike (1997) in Kenya did a similar study where he used the mixed methods research. He administered a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview to the lawyers and librarians in Kenya. However, his study aimed at looking into and the establishment of the legal searching systems for lawyers whereas, the present study aims at examining the access without delving into the search strategies per se. The main research tools for all these studies were the questionnaire and semi structured interviews, which the present study employed.
1.8.3 Data analysis

The study was a survey research and it studied the whole population of a specific group, that is, private practising lawyers, and further combined two methodologies, being a mixed methods approach. Thus the data generated through the questionnaire was summarized, analysed in descriptive statistics and interpreted (Bertram and Christiansen 2015) using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists version (SPSS 24) method after capturing it in Census and Survey Processing System Software Version 7 (CSPro7).

A pretesting of the data collection instruments was done in the KwaZulu-Natal area, where four librarians were interviewed and three lawyers attempted the questionnaires after which ambiguities and corrections were identified and dealt with accordingly for validity and reliability.

Data generated from the interviews was recorded using a voice recorder, coded and transcribed to get analysable data upon securing the permission of the respondents. Thematic content analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data of the interviews and questionnaires. Scholars have pointed out that the integration of quantitative and qualitative data analysis of verbal data can provide the chance to interpret the results in a less subjective manner (Chi, 1997: 271). It is argued that content analysis can be used in both quantitative and qualitative research (Dahlberg and McCaig, 2010: 23) as was used in this study.

Since anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents’ information is important, it was observed and achieved using the written informed consent form given to them. In terms of securing anonymity and confidentiality of data collected, the study followed the ethics policy of the University of KwaZulu-Natal (2016).

1.9 Key terms of the study

This study used several significant terms, which are explained, in this section in relation to how they were used in this study.

1.9.1 Information needs

Information need has been described as a generic concept with subsets addressing information demands and information wants (Faibisoff and Ely, 1974). According to Kuhlthau (1993)
information needs has been understood to be evolving from a vague awareness of something used and as culminating in locating the information that contributes to understanding, clarifying the meaning and expanding the information obtained. In contrast, other scholars have intimated that information need is a factual situation in which an inseparable interconnection between ‘information’ and ‘need’ is present (Prasad, 2000).

Further, this term has been perceived as one that arises when a person recognizes a gap in their state of knowledge and wishes to solve that irregularity (Nicholas, 2000:20). The same was alluded to by Case, (2002: 69), who pointed out that an information need is when “a function of extrinsic uncertainty produced by a perceived discrepancy between the individual’s current level of certainty about important environmental objects and criterion state that he seeks to achieve”. Dervin concurred that an information need is “a compulsion to make sense of a current situation”, which can be solved by the use of communication of sorts to fill the gap of that current situation (Dervin, 1992: 62).

Wilson, just like Prasad (2000), further opined that the problem of studying information seeking behaviour which begins with an ‘information need’, has proved to be difficult due to the subjective nature of needs as they occur only in the mind of the individual person in need at a given time (Wilson, 1997: 552). This can only be evident through the behaviour or report of that person. It is known that “need” cannot be directly observed, and as such this subjective nature of ‘need’ was seen as "a cognitive representation of a future goal that is desired" (Wilson, 1997).

Further, it was proposed that needs emerge from the three motives; physiological motives (like hunger and thirst), unlearned motives (including curiosity and sensory stimulation) and social motives (the desire for affiliation, approval or status) (Wilson, 1997:552-553).

In this study, the concept of motive can be applied to the lawyers’ information needs and seeking attitudes. The assumption is that for cognitive, affective, or physiological reasons (Wilson, 2006a), they experience needs for information in order to perform well in their legal service provision. The present research will use information need to refer to the manner by which a person who recognizes a gap in their information and knowledge available finds answers to legal problems brought by the clients. Wilson (2006: 661) has pointed out that the concept of ‘information need’ is not easy to understand. It will be further discussed in Chapter Three.
1.9.2 Information behaviour

Information behaviour has become a term that is used in the description of the different ways people interact with information in terms of seeking and utilization (Bates, 2010: 2381). Information behaviour is seen as the totality of human behaviour in relation to sources and channels of information, including both active and passive information seeking, and information use (Wilson, 2001: 49). On one hand, Case (2007) saw information behaviour as information seeking as well as the totality of the other unintentional or passive behaviour. According to Manyerere (2015: 21) such behaviour would include face to face communication, and passive reception of information like watching TV adverts without the intention to use that information given at that time.

For the present study’s context, information behaviour will thus refer to the manner in which people search for and use information.

1.9.3 Information seeking behaviour

It can generally be said that ‘information seeking’ involves seeking for information through the active examination of information sources or information retrieval systems to satisfy an information need or to solve a problem by humans (Ingwersen and Järvelin, 2005:386). According to these writers, information seeking is “concerned with the detection of the appropriate information for tasks, research, everyday life, etc., regardless of the way that information is packaged” (Wilson, 2005). It suffices to point out that in order for one to acquire information; one has to select such information from a particular source, system, or service.

Information seeking behaviour is also described as “the purposive seeking for information as a consequence of a need to satisfy some goal. In the course of seeking, the individual may interact with manual information systems” (Wilson, 2006: 661). These could be the resource centres, books or newspapers, as well as computer-based systems like the World Wide Web or electronic databases. Bystrom (1999) also further concurred that it is the purposive process whereby the individual attempts to acquire the relevant information sources in order to satisfy his or her information need. Case (2007:5) opined that information seeking can be termed as “a conscious effort to acquire information in response to a need or gap in your knowledge”. On the same note, Marchionini, (2003) also defines it as “a process in which humans purposefully engage in order to change their state of knowledge.” As a result, it means there is a supposed
need for information or state of uncertainty before efforts are made to look for information in order to reduce the uncertainty and satisfy the need.

It is said that information seeking is a personal effort undertaken to find a solution to identified needs through sources (Ifejika, 2016). It is also said to be a premeditated attempt by the seeker to get information that will be operational to the given need, as well as useful and relevant to make informed decisions in solving issues. As a result it helps in the understanding of the pattern of information behaviour of a particular subject in order to facilitate the design of information access and dissemination; and this also enables one to obtain reliable information quickly and timeously (Solano, Leon , Perez, and Herrero, 2003).

This term can also be understood together with the term ‘information searching’, which is said to be the ‘micro-level’ of behaviour done by an individual in interacting with information systems of all kinds. It consists of all the interactions with the system, whether at the level of human computer interaction (for example, use of the mouse and clicks on links) or at the intellectual level (for example, adopting a Boolean search strategy or determining the criteria for deciding which of two books selected from adjacent places on a library shelf is most useful). The latter will also involve mental acts, such as judging the relevance of data or information retrieved. It is expected that a person looking for information will usually interact with different information sources (human, print or systems/electronic) and channels (internal or external) (Adewale and Mansor, 2014). However, it was suggested that this means that information seeking may be based on the assumption that the seekers of the information are information literate, and thus capable of recognizing their information needs, be able to retrieve, assess, and use the information effectively (Mavodza, 2011). This study will not delve into the detail of information searching and retrieval strategies used by lawyers, even though this part will briefly mention a bit of this.

For the purpose of this study the concept, information seeking behaviour will refer to the way people search, acquire and utilize information for use in the different services, (legal services).

1.9.4 Information use

Information use is seen as the ‘physical and mental actions involved in taking in the information found into the person’s existing knowledge base. According to Choo Furness, Paquette, Van den Berg, and Detlor (2006), information use is seen when a person selects and processes information that then changes his or her capacity to make sense of a particular situation. In
other words, information use is about selecting and processing the particular information in order to take action in terms of problem solution, decision making negotiation or even making sense of a situation (Choo, *et.al.*, 2006: 495).

Wilson (2000: 50) and Case (2002: 258) argued that information needs and uses have to be observed within the particular social settings, organizational and work environments of the relevant users. The present study will consider the particular setting where lawyers in Swaziland are concerned. The examining of information in the terms suggested by Case will “lead to a positive change in an individual’s capacity to act” (Choo, 2006: 65). It has been noted that information and communication go hand in hand, because “science is concerned with the use of information by humans” (McKenzie, 2003:29). On the other hand, the same information is a useful tool to share the same, a process which enables people to address some information needs in their day to day environments (Riouxi, 2005; Majyambere, 2015). Vakkari (1998) posits that the use of information has an impact on organizational decision making. Multiple sources of information are used to seek information which is then used in different ways. The term ‘information use’ in this study will be used to depict the act of locating and obtaining of information in whatever format to address information needs.

### 1.9.5 Information sources

An information source can be termed as a medium in which knowledge and/or information is stored (Bitso and Fourie, 2011). It has been pointed out that an information source should contain the relevant information (Byström and Järvelin, 1995).

It has been observed that people do not always use formal sources throughout their daily activities, but gather and use informal sources from friends, family, and colleagues. Lawyers have also been seen to overwhelmingly prefer informal sources as well (Wilkinson, 2001: 259).

An information source refers to where one gets the information used; which can be from a book or a Website, another person or even from the media. It is pointed out by other researchers that information sources can refer to the different ways in “which information is recorded for use by an individual or an organization” (Manyerere, 2015). Furthermore, an information source can be referred to as the means by which an individual, a group, or organization is availed the knowledge or the information it requires. Information sources are also the organizations themselves, actual documents, the people, observations, speeches, pictures, legal documents
like legislation, case law, government gazettes and other such documents in legal matters. These can be in different formats, for example, print, non-print and electronic media.

In this study, an information source is an item that has information relevant to lawyers in their day-to-day legal service activities. This can as well be termed legal information sources for the present study. Thus, a legal information source will mean any source that provides information of a legal nature that might inform a lawyer in providing legal services in their day-to-day practice.

1.9.6 Legal information

Many writers have agreed that information is a ‘valuable resource required in any society’ (Igbeka and Atinmo, 2002: 9), without which humanity would be in darkness (Olorunfemi and Mostert, 2012). It is also noted that information is a human basic right and has a pivotal role to play in all activities related to human behaviour (Mbangala and Samzugi, 2014). More so because it is said to be a resource that stimulates the socio-economic development of any society. Information is important to people in diverse settings as in the field of law. People in this field need information on how to resolve cases (judges), argue or represent a client before the law court or give legal advice (lawyers), and teach law for those in academia (Otike and Matthews, 2000; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). For the purpose of this study, information is taken to denote meaningful messages that are capable of being used by lawyers to serve their clients in the different legal issues.

This kind of information may be termed “legal information” as it deals with the discipline of law. Legal information is required for vital and rational decisions that are taken in day-to-day activities. Kuhn (2010: 13) has pointed that “legal information constantly changes”, thus it is necessary for legal scholars to have access and competency to find and use it. This is especially so for lawyers whose goal is to defend clients and be the voice of the others, and further assist judges in the administration of justice as a whole (Olorunfemi and Mostert, 2012).

The ethical requirements in legal practice demand for a lawyer who is well informed in legal information. Having a lawyer armed with good legal information to take care of one's legal affairs is important. As a result, since a lawyers’ roles include giving legal advice (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010), it follows that they must know where to find laws and further have access to them for a better society. Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010a) further argued that
legal information and its access to legal service providers like lawyers is an important requirement. Legal information could reside in electronic records and written print records. It consists of laws, rules and regulations, case law and legal literature.

Legal information in this study will refer to all the information that is used or needed by a lawyer in dealing with their day-to-day tasks in the profession, especially the information that will lead to resolving the issue being dealt with at a given time. Legal information can include customary law (written or unrecorded), printed and electronic legal materials and other court documents. Further, it is important to mention that legal information literacy is vital. This according to Kuhn (2010) involves the ability by the lawyers to find, use, analyse and critically evaluate the legal information in practice.

1.9.7 Legal information services

It has been shown that “law is essentially an information profession” (Wilkinson, 2001: 259) and this is evident in that every service lawyers provide, whether providing legal advice, representing a client in court, or drafting a legal document requires information (Otike and Matthews, 2000). Thus the importance of legal information services cannot be over emphasized as a tool of justice (Ahmed and Batcha, 2014: 28). Legal information is crucial to assist the high volume of legal cases in which people are expecting lawyers to defend them, as a form of service (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). A timely access to the right kind of legal information will thus determine the legal information services provided.

For the present study, this term will refer to the provision of legal information, for assisting clients in legal matters in civil cases as well as public matters.

1.9.8 Lawyer (s)

The definition of a lawyer as described in the Swaziland Lawyers Act, 1964 as mentioned earlier is: “any person duly admitted to practise as an advocate, attorney, notary or conveyancer in terms of this Act.” For the context of this study, this definition will apply. Other scholars have referred to lawyers as those who practice law, as advocates, barristers, attorneys, counsels, solicitors or chartered legal executives (Henry, 1979; Lawal, 2012). Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010a) have further pointed out that a lawyer primarily advises people about law, writes formal agreements, represents people in court or carries applications of legal theory and knowledge to solve problems brought by clients.
1.9.9 Law librarians

These are professionally trained information professionals with good legal knowledge and understanding of the legal sources of information and the broad approaches to solving legal problems, who assist legal researchers in various legal settings such as law schools, libraries, law firms, companies and courts.

1.10 Ethical considerations

The research received a full ethical clearance certificate from the Ethics Committee of the University of KwaZulu Natal (Appendix 17), which is a recommendation in the South African Universities’ context. The researcher acquired the ethical clearance certificate after a formal process, which involved request and consent letters from gatekeepers of the relevant institutions. These were the Swaziland Law Society (LSS) (Appendix 7 and Appendix 12); University of Swaziland Library (Appendix 9 and Appendix 14) and University of Swaziland Registrar’s Office (Appendix 8 and Appendix 13), Swaziland National Library Service (SNLS) (Appendix 10 and Appendix 15) as well as from the Ministry of Justice (Attorney General), (Appendix 11 and Appendix 16) respectively.

Further, the researcher also issued informed consent letters, which were attached to the questionnaires given to the respondents at the time of data collection. These covering letters attached to each data collection instrument helped to explain the purpose of the study with the intention of seeking voluntary informed consent as suggested by Fisher and Anushko (2008: 99) from the respondents. The respondents were intellectuals and not minors; therefore, they were able to make informed decisions by reading and signing the informed consent. Furthermore, they are also experts in the field since they work with legal information and sources respectively.

Since anonymity and confidentiality for the respondents’ information is fundamental in all research studies, codes were assigned to the respondents of the semi-structured interviews in the order that they were conducted, using a voice recorder and researcher’s lap top and passwords for protection of data were implemented. The questionnaire administered to the participants was also coded according to the order they were returned by the participants, and pseudonyms strategically used to show satisfactory information without revealing names of the respondents.
1.11 Structure of dissertation

The study will comprise of seven chapters, which are briefly summarized as the following:

Chapter 1

This chapter provides the background to the study and an outline of the research problem. It further gives the objective and research questions of the study; the scope and significance of the study; and limitations. A brief outline of the research methodology of the study, covering the data collection methods and population to be covered is provided. This is followed by definitions of the terms that are used in the context of the study. At the end of this chapter, a summary follows.

Chapter 2

This chapter discusses the theoretical framework used. Models such as Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain’s model of information seeking behaviour (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996) will be discussed as a background to information seeking behaviour models applied to different professional information seeking settings including that of lawyers. Kuhlthau’s ISP (Kuhlthau, 1993) model is also briefly discussed. Wilson’s (1999) model of information seeking behaviour, which is widely used by most scholars in information seeking behaviour, is discussed in detail as it was selected as the model that underpins the study and justified in those terms.

Chapter 3

This chapter covers the literature review, where related studies done in relation to the information seeking behaviour of lawyers in practice are discussed. The chapter further covers a review of the literature about the sources used by lawyers and the main problems lawyers are facing while acquiring legal information.

Chapter 4

The research design and methodology is dealt with in this chapter. The approach used, the data collection procedures, the validity and reliability of the instruments used to collect the data, and data analysis techniques, population and sampling are discussed further, as well as how the pre-test was done.
Chapter 5
This chapter covers the presentation of the data collected from the lawyers and librarians selected via a survey and questionnaire.

Chapter 6
This chapter covers the interpretation of the results from Chapter 5 in relation to the literature review and research questions of the study.

Chapter 7
This chapter will be providing conclusions and recommendations for further research and suggestions for policy making in Swaziland and the study’s contribution to knowledge on this issue in general.

1.12 Summary of the chapter
This chapter introduces the research and elucidates on the statement of the problem; establishes the research objectives as well as the research questions. The chapter further gives a brief description of the research methodology of the study, wherein the mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative) approach will be applied. An overview of the population of the study and data collection methods used is explained. The data collection methods include a semi-structured interview, and self-administered questionnaire which were captured in CSPro7, and to analyse the quantitative data both SPSS and Excel were used. The thematic content analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data. The significance of the study, scope and limitations as well as the key terms that are used in the study are defined and the structure of the thesis is then outlined.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the theoretical framework used in the study. A theoretical framework is generally a guide for a researcher, wherein the theoretical perspective for examining the given topic is seen. It is known to have a major influence overall to any research study as it provides the scientific ground and knowledge for studying objects, situations or phenomena and a base for the research studies (Mostert and Ocholla, 2006: 138). According to Malterud (2001) such a theoretical perspective is like a ‘lens’ that the researcher looks through at the research questions being investigated, which inspires and leads the practical research through to the achievement stage. This chapter discusses the information behaviour models that are relevant for this study. It further explains Wilson’s (1999) model of information behaviour as the main model.

A theoretical framework is significant for all studies. Hence, it is imperative for one to understand those theories or models relevant in each study as this helps in the gathering of facts that are systematically relevant for that particular study (Creswell, 2014; Bless and Higson-Smith, 1995). Majyambere and Hoskins (2015) opined that without a theoretical framework the research can be limited for various reasons. For instance, Bertram (2004: 143) emphasized that theoretical frameworks influence the design and analysis of collected data. Ocholla and Le Roux (2011) argue that a theoretical framework is said to hold and support the theory of a research work, serving as the lens used to examine the particular aspects of interest in the researcher’s subject field.

In that regard, a theory is said to be a collection of interrelated ideas that aims to explain a given phenomenon and further provide some form of support or model in the explanation of the phenomena (Bates, 2005; DeVilles, 2016). Bless and Higson-Smith (1995: 23) pointed out that theories serve as an angle for collecting facts since they lay down the kinds of facts to be analytically detected and identified in research. According to Babbie (2011: 33), theories further assist in the revelation of patterns that help one anticipate events with open room for improvements or way forward of whatever is under study, with the intention of giving abstract terms that are better understood by even lay persons than the terms used to describe those theories (Punch, 2005: 16).
Many studies have been done to reveal human behaviour in seeking information and models were developed (Case, 2007) for the Library and Information Science (LIS) discipline. However, Ocholla and Le Roux (2011: 1) argue that it is not correct to say that there is a theoretical framework that is “unique for the subject field of LIS, as such theoretical frameworks are derived from other disciplines”. As much as this is the case, it is a fact that among those disciplines, not all the theoretical frameworks and models can be used in the LIS field. Hence, there are those theoretical frameworks that can be said to be applicable in the field of LIS. Such models have assisted in ensuring that the information needs of the different users under this field are met in relevant ways.

Various researchers have tended to use the term ‘theoretical framework’ interchangeably with meta-theory, theory or models (Fisher and McKechnie, 2005). Meta-theory is said to concentrate on investigating, analysing or describing the theory while ‘theory’ itself is a coherent tested general proposition regarded as correct to be used as a principle for a class of phenomena (Collins English Dictionary- Complete and Unabridged, n.d). The model used in this study does not have a strong demarcation line from a theory in the LIS field (Fisher and McKechnie, 2005).

A model is said to be a proposed set of relationships that can be tested for validity, hence seen as a “collection of interrelated ideas that are based on theories that are meant to account or explain phenomena by clarifying things the way they are” (Olorunfemi, 2014: 62). It thus guides one to determine the measurable and the relationship between the items being measured (Kombo and Tromp, 2006).

Several models have been developed in the LIS field explaining how information needs arise, how these needs are addressed and how information is used. Some of these models have been seen as general and broad in nature (Bitso, 2011; Du Preez, 2008). Models according to Wilson (1999: 250) are those statements usually represented in the form of diagrams that endeavour to describe information seeking activities, causes and the consequences of such activities in the field of information behaviour.

Olorunfemi (2014:63) opined that information seeking behaviour studies are said to have emanated from concerns about individuals’ usage of information in their work environments. Further, Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert (2006:145) described such studies as the process requiring the application of personal knowledge, skills or information infrastructure to solve, or meet a
need by the person seeking that information. Marchionini (1995:1) also opined that information seeking is an important “human activity closely related to learning and problem solving”.

As such, it is stated by scholars that the significance of studying information seeking behaviour models in order to understand what particular information seekers need and search for in solving their problems (Kadli and Kumbar, 2013) cannot be over emphasized. Consequently, the present study purports to investigate the information seeking behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland with the view of a development and improvement of meeting their information needs in the profession through their professional body, the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS), and further influence policy.

An overview of information seeking behaviour models is a necessity in this study because they are a building block contributing to theories that support this study. This chapter systematically discusses models that have gained popularity in the field of LIS by being adopted by different researchers in similar studies. This is done with the intention of selecting the best suitable model (Bystrom and Jarvelin, 1995) for the present population under study. These models include, for example, that of Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s 1996 model of information seeking behaviour; Kuhlthau’s (1993) Information Seeking Process (ISP) model and Wilson’s general models of information behaviour (Kuhlthau, 1993).

Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s 1996 model is one of the models applied to different professionals’ information seeking behaviour like health workers, engineers, education professionals and lawyers in the work place (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996: 161). Kuhlthau’s ISP model (Kuhlthau, 1993) will be briefly discussed as it has also been applied to lawyers’ information behaviour in other studies. Wilson’s 1999 general information behaviour model is discussed in detail, as it is the one that has been viewed as the best for underpinning the present study, because of its application on a general level. This study purports to examine and investigate the information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in relation to the provision of effective legal information services, specifically in Swaziland through their professional organization.

Theories of information behaviour which are pinned in different models like that of Wilson (2006b) have been discussed by different experts in the LIS field and in the different professions, some of which are noted in Case (2012) as well as Case and Given (2016). As mentioned earlier, these theories include Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996) behaviour model Wilson’s information seeking behaviour model, developed between 1981 and 1999.
(Wilson, 1999); Kuhlthau’ ISP model (Kuhlthau, 1993; Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001) among others.

The aim of this study was to assess the factors that influence the information seeking behaviour of the study population particularly in terms of their needs in the day-to-day provision of legal information services with emphasis on the Swaziland Law Society (LSS)’s activities and mandate for its members, through the provision of legal resources. The researcher will not deal in detail on the information retrieval systems and the way lawyers engage these systems, but will rather consider the information behaviour as related to access to legal information in Swaziland.

2.2 Introduction to information seeking behaviour models

Different models have been proposed and used to study different user’s information seeking behaviour and information needs in order to understand how their needs can be satisfied (Case, 2016; Fisher, Erdelez and McKechnie, 2005), because they are usually “based on each researcher’s own work” (Robson, 2013; Foster, Urquhart, and Turner, 2008). Therefore, reviewing some of these information behaviour models that have played a role in the LIS field, under the subject of information behaviour is important as it assists in selecting the appropriate theoretical framework for any research (Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert, 2006: 154).

Savolainen (2007: 112) noted that these information behaviour models contribute much in understanding the way people look for appropriate information that can be used in different settings or contexts. The context as described by Case (2012: 13) can be the specific combination of a person and situation that ‘helps’ one to structure the research. Sonnewald and Pierce (2000) clarified that a context is a broad term linked to a situation; consequently, various contexts mirror multiple types of situations. As a result, Markless (2009: 30) stresses that context in the subject field of information behaviour can be noted as a ‘multi-dimensional term’ with diverse aspects showing the sort of tasks, characteristics of the person and types of system.

However, Talja, Keso, and Pietilainen (1999: 752-753) saw context as background for a phenomena one wishes to comprehend and explicate. Such can be any of the dynamics affecting a person’s information seeking behaviour, be it work roles, tasks, organizations or problem situations. In this regard, among several factors or variables, jobs and roles have been included in the characterisation of ‘context’ affecting lawyers in this study.
Case and Given (2016: 48) agreed with other scholars that context and situation are a significant part of the concepts of information behaviour, but he argued that they are not properly defined. According to Case and Given, these concepts have a historical, purposeful and influential existence in themselves, as they all depend on the existing environment in terms of barriers that may or may not support the particular type of information needs.

Consequently, it is worth noting that there are numerous information seeking models in the LIS field, and there are specific LIS scholars that use these models as pointed out by McKechnie, Pettigrew, and Joyce (2000: 57). This is in concurrence with what Ocholla and Le Roux (2011) argue in terms of the ‘unique models’ meant for only the LIS field as mentioned earlier. This may be due to the general understanding that those models are most useful in the description and prediction of a phenomenon (Bates, 2005: 3) which the LIS field is about.

Even though there are numerous information behaviour models which have been discussed by different scholars like Case, 2002, 2006, 2007, 2012; Case and Given, 2016; Jeong and Kim, 2005; Fisher and Julien, 2009; Fisher, Erdelez, and McKechnie, 2005; Pettigrew and McKechnie, 2001, it is imperative for the researcher to pick and apply the most relevant model for the study. Stilwell (2010) and Bystrom and Hansen (2005) noted that it is important to pick and apply the most relevant model for any study. This is because these models may not be applicable to all the groups of users in the different studies of information seeking behaviour (Du Preez, 2008: 29).

### 2.2.1 Review of some information seeking models

Different models that are found in the LIS field under information behaviour are noted and categorized by Majyambere and Hoskins (2015: 41). Their first category is of those models that are considered as ‘general information models’, like those of

- Wilson’s (1981-1999) models of information behaviour;
- Dervin’s (1983) Sense-making approach to information behaviour, and

In addition to this list, of note is Niedzwiedzka’s New Model of Information Behaviour (Niedzwiedzka, 2003) which was not included in Majyambere and Hoskins’ category.

The second category of Majyambere and Hoskins (2015: 41) comprises ‘information seeking models’ like:
• Krikelas’ (1983) model of information seeking;
• Ellis’s (1989 and 2005) model of information seeking behaviour; and
• Savolainen (1995) everyday life information seeking behaviour model.

Third, are those categorized as ‘information searching and retrieval’ models, which include:
• Ingwersen (1996, 1999) information retrieval process model.

The fourth category noted is that of ‘digital information related’ models, which include,
• Marchionni’s (1995) model of information seeking in electronic environments, and

These models specialise in the investigation of contextual and individual variances in the choice and use of information systems and sources (Case and Given, 2016: 49) which this study does not concentrate on.

The last category is the ‘discipline or task-related information behaviour’ models, which include:

• Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain’s (1996) general model of information seeking behaviour of professionals, and
• Bystrom and Jarvelin’s (1995) task complexity and information seeking and use model.

All these models have greatly influenced research in the LIS field. However, this study did not delve into all of them in detail, save for a few of those in the category of ‘general information’ models; category of ‘information searching and retrieval’ models and category of ‘discipline or task related information’ models. This is because the present study is related to these broad categories in relation to emphasis on lawyers specifically in Swaziland.

2.2.1.1 Kuhlthau’s ISP model

Kuhlthau first introduced the information search process (ISP) model in 1991. In 2001, Kuhlthau and Tama (2001) improved it in order to improve in the description of feelings, thoughts and actions in six stages of information seeking. This model indicates the information needs and sources in different domains and depicts a series of affective stages or behaviours through which people are thought to move about as they find and evaluate information. This
model incorporated three realms, which are affective (the feelings associated with the search process), cognitive (the development of thoughts about research topics), and physical (actions and strategies of seeking and using sources) (Kuhlthau, 1993). These realms are seen in all the six stages depicted (Olorunfemi, 2014).

The stages are the initiation, selection, exploration, formulation, collection and presentation of information. The different stages stress the progress of transferable mental skills that increase the user’s effective utilization of information (Kuhlthau, 1993). The three realms seen in the six stages are the same as those noted in Wilson’s model of information behaviour, which underpins the present study. As a result, the parts of Kuhlthau’s ISP models as included in Wilson’s models positively assist in the present research. Therefore, this model is applied only in so far as it forms part of Wilson’s ideal model, especially in terms of the selection and exploration stage of information related to information seeking behaviour of the lawyers or lawyers in Swaziland.

A study by Makri (2008) applied Kuhlthau’s ISP model in studying the lawyers’ information behaviour towards the development of methods of evaluating electronic sources. This was specifically situated in the electronic environment for its usability and functionality to this specific group. The present study did not go into detail in terms of functionality and usability of electronic resources, as it was more concerned with the availability of the resources in the first place for lawyers in Swaziland. The study was concerned with where the lawyers in Swaziland access the information needed for their professional legal services and whether their professional body serves their needs and the stance of the LSS in providing access.

Another study by Holliday and Li (2004) also used Kuhlthau’s and Wilson’s models when applying the mixed method approach in studying information behaviour of students. Other studies include Kuhn (2008) who looked into the importance of integrating information literacy and problem solving processes into the study of law. Most of the studies that applied this model were undertaken in the academic setting with students. For instance, Syvalahti and Katjihingua (2012); Toteng (2010); and Majyambere (2015) studied students’ information seeking behaviour.

Though the present study is not about students, these studies are significant in that they also used the mixed methods approach, which the present study employs for the same topic with lawyers. As mentioned earlier, no empirical study had been done in Swaziland with this premise, thus this study will add valuable new knowledge to this area.
Though Kuhlthau’s model has strengths, it has weaknesses in that as Case alluded, it does not take into account factors like the information need and use of available information resources, which this study is concerned about (Case, 2007: 122). This may be because it is a model that was mostly used in studying students rather than those already in the field with vast experience. Of course, there are students in the different fields, but they do not operate in the same environment as lawyers in the work place.

Some scholars have interpreted Kuhlthau’s information seeking behaviour as a sense making-process concentrating on the development of an individual’s understanding and emphasizing the shift from uncertainty to certainty (Oh, 2004: 1326). Another view of Kuhlthau’s ISP model is that is it seen as delving more into the mental process and transferable cognitive skills that increases effective utilization of information (Kuhlthau, 1993: 11). This is the case with Wilson’s 1981 and 1999 models (Ingwersen, 2005), hence there is no need to use it to underpin the study as it is already incorporated in Wilson’s general model (1999). Figure 2.1 below shows the stages and thinking of Kuhlthau in this model.

![Figure 2.1: Kuhlthau’s information seeking process model 1993](Source: Kuhlthau (1993))

Sonnewald and Pierce (2000: 464) also noted that information seeking is an ‘individual activity’, which according to Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain (1996) and Tidline (2005: 114) is because information seeking models concentrate on the individual looking for the information other than collaboration, and also the fact that there is an interaction between an individual user and the technology or system.
As regards the category of the ‘discipline or task-related information behaviour’ models mentioned in section 2.2.1 above, the model of Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain (1996) information seeking behaviour is also worth mentioning as it is one that specifically applies to professional groups just like the present study. It is significant to this study even through it was not be wholly applied as an underpinning model.

2.2.1.2 Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s 1996 model

Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s model of information seeking behaviour of professionals looks at the roles and related tasks resulting from information needs of professionals. It outlines factors that affect professionals, for instance, sources available, intended use of sources, individual characteristics of the user (like roles and tasks) as well as the environment they operate in (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996: 162)).

Wilkinson (2001) successfully applied this model in her study on the sources used by lawyers in problem solving, where she opined that the awareness and selection of sources by lawyers is characterized by demographics in their work roles, which the current study investigated in the Swaziland context. However, the more general model of Wilson in 1999 was preferred.

The model of Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain was devised by examining the literature on professionals' information seeking behaviour and highlighted that professionals play many distinct roles, including not only those relating to providing specific expertise and knowledge related to their domains, but other more general roles such as selecting and processing, counselling, supervising and planning.

According to this model, these roles result in distinct types of activities, which in turn “shape the type of information needed, the way in which it is retrieved and the ultimate use of that information” (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996: 161). It was observed that awareness of information sources, including accessibility, quality, timeliness, trustworthiness, familiarity and previous success, has a major impact on how information is sought. It has been concluded that lawyers are also in the habit of using informal sources of information, such as colleagues, especially those that have been in the field for longer periods (Fowler, 2007). Lawyers have roles, such as that of legal service provider, administrator, and researcher, which result in distinct tasks or activities, from which particular information needs arise. They tend to be influenced by personal knowledge, experience and perceptions when they choose information sources (Wilkinson, 2001).
However, in a study done on the information seeking behaviour of lawyers by Wilkinson, it was argued that the Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996) model covered fewer roles or activities of lawyers, thus there was a gap in terms of identifying all the roles of lawyers in the field (Wilkinson, 2001). This is one of the reasons why the Wilson model is preferred as the researcher believes that the Wilson model may be able to cover more of what was omitted in Leckie.

According to Wilkinson, (2001:270), only two roles of lawyers were identified in this model, yet there are many different roles played by professionals (2001:274). For this reason, this model was not wholly applied in the present study. Figure 2.2 below shows the Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain (1996) Information seeking behaviour model.

![Image of the Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain (1996) Information seeking behaviour model]

**Figure 2.2: Information seeking of professionals model 1996**

Source: Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996)

This diagram models the six interrelated and inter-dependent components. The complicated lives led by professionals makes them assume multiple roles in the course of their daily work, for instance as service provider, administrator, manager, educator, researcher and student (Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain, 1996: 180-181). These different roles have different tasks, which for lawyers includes provision of legal advice to clients as well as appearing in court to defend cases.
The impact of the roles they undertake at a particular time has a bearing on the required type of information and the way such is sought especially where time constraints are an issue (Leckie, 2005: 161). Leckie further points out that the status, experience and area of specialization also influence the specific information needs. Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) supports this. According to Makri, Blandford, and Cox (2008: 616), the shortcoming of Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s model is that, it is presented at a high level of abstraction, making it difficult to ascertain the identifiable roles that lawyers perform. Furthermore, the tasks related to those roles; the information-seeking behaviour that relates to each task and the mediations that can be drawn to support that behaviour was another shortcoming. Wilson’s model as a problem-solving framework overcomes this difficulty.

Upon failure to get information sought, the seeker may begin the process again which could be influenced by the different sources and awareness of the information needs. Even though this model is good for work related processes, its weakness is seen in the non-coverage of individual demographics as required in the present study, which the researcher believed to be variables that manipulate information needs.

2.3 Wilson’s general model of information behaviour

Wilson developed several models of information seeking behaviour between 1981 and 1999. Wilson’s 1981 model set precedent in terms of viewing feedback as significant in the information seeking process (Wilson, 1981: 2). This was later improved in Wilson’s subsequent models up to 1999. A need to focus on the human aspect of information use in the field of LIS was the main motivation for these models (Wilson, 2000) as opposed to only the information systems and sources themselves.

His initial model of 1981 changed over time and continues to change to accommodate new technology and information changes (Wilson, 2010). The models are depicted in diagrams that elaborate on one another and according to Wilson, none of the models can be said to be able to stand alone to guide the development of research, as such it is imperative to examine all of the models (Wilson, 2005). These models are discussed sequentially in this section. The present study intended to make a link between this gaps as has been observed in the field of information seeking behaviour (Wilson, 2010).
Wilson (1999: 250) observed that after the 1948 Royal Society Scientific Information Conference, there was a rise in the number of studies focusing on user needs, information needs and information seeking behaviour. Stillwell (2010) concurred that more studies on this aspect have appeared. Few seminal studies existed when Wilson presented his general model of information behaviour. Those noted by Majyambere (2015) include studies done on the ‘user’ needs by Westbrook (2001); information needs and uses by Dervin and Nilan (1986), Paisley (1968) and Wilson (1994); and information behaviour by Wilson (1981, 1997), and Wilson and Walsh (1996).

Information seeking behaviour is said to incorporate an extensive variety of information seeking patterns (Spink and Cole, 2004) and it was emphasized by Case (2007: 120) that information behaviour styles are depicted as models because they pay attention to particular problems. According to Majyambere (2015): 42), in order for the general objectives of a study to be achieved, and have the research questions effectively answered, models can be presented conceptually or theoretically (Wilson, 1999: 250).

Since all models have their own weaknesses and strengths, and not all of them are based on empirical tests (Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert, 2006: 154), it is imperative to pick the most relevant model which is appropriate for the current study (Stilwell, 2010). According to Clemens and Cushing (2010: 1), the theories of information behaviour usually deal with cognitive effects like “problem-solving, mental models and affect heuristics.”

Some of these theories of information behaviour were discussed by Fisher, Erdelez, and McKechnie (2005), who looked into Ellis’s (1989) model of information seeking behaviour, Krikels’(1983) model of information behaviour, together with Wilson’s (1999) general model of information seeking behaviour which underpins this study. This 1999 model was a development and improvement of Wilson’s 1981 models as updated in 1996 and 1999 respectively.

### 2.3.1 Wilson’s 1981 model

Wilson’s first model recognized factors that lead to information seeking and the barriers that bar the action. It was “based on an understanding of human information seeking behaviours that are better understood as three interwoven frameworks: The user, the information system, and the information resource” (Wilson, 2010 and Wilson, 1981).
Wilson’s (1981:5) information seeking behaviour model suggests first, that an information need is not necessarily a primary need, but it is a secondary need that develops out of a person’s simple needs. Secondly, Wilson argues that the person encounters different barriers while in the process of satisfying those needs (Wilson, 1999: 253). Wilson’s 1981 model thus points to the following ways of obtaining the information;

- Search by users who lack access to information systems of sort but use the environment they are in and their personal knowledge;
- Search paths that involve an intermediary or information system;
- Search strategies used by the intermediary to satisfy the user’s demands in order to accomplish the stated goal,
- Strategies employed using ICT by the user or intermediary.

This model explains how an information need arises and what barriers may curtail the actual search for information; hence, access may be difficult as noted in the present research. It considers the information process itself, defined the terms of user behaviour and further examined the transfer, retention and exchange of the information with other users. Below is Figure 2.3, showing the 1981 model as it originally was before the 1996 improvements.

![Figure 2.3: Wilson's 1981 model of information seeking behaviour](source: Wilson (2000))
Wilson’s model notes three views of information seeking, which are the context, the system and the information sources. Since the need perceived by the user is when the information seeking behaviour occurs, the model proposes that the needs of the user are satisfied when demands on either formal or informal sources take place (Wilson, 2006).

Wilson later incorporated Ellis’s stages of information seeking in this model so as to cover personal circumstances of users, their social role in the person’s work life and the environment (that is, political, economic and technological) in Wilson (1994). It further meant to show that information needs stem from psychological needs too. The Ellis stages incorporated were starting, browsing, differentiating, monitoring, extracting, verifying and ending. Wilson argued that an information need is generated by the interaction of personal conducts and political, economic, and technological factors in a person’s environment. By this incorporation, the model thus eventually recognized that an information need is not a need in and of itself, but rather one that branches from a previous psychological need. Wilson further observed that the factors that drive needs can also frustrate an individual’s search for relevant information.

### 2.3.2 Wilson’s 1996 model

Wilson’s 1996 Information Seeking Behaviour model, building on the 1981 model, successfully incorporated more elements that facilitated the stages experienced by an individual in the particular context when seeking information. These elements encompassed a midway stage between the recognition of a need and the instigation of an action to meet that information need (Wilson, 1997). In this model, ‘intervening variables’ were introduced to show that there can be helpful or hindering obstacles in the way of the user (Wilson, 2010). This was further seen to evolve for the better, and was improved in the 1999 model, since it captured research questions in a better way than the ones it preceded. It also encompassed parts of Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s 1996 model.

The 1996 model was said to arise from different fields of knowledge in decision making, psychology, health, innovation communication and information science (Wilson, 1999:256). Wilson has further argued that the stages of goal oriented problem-solving processes seen in this 1996 model can be identified as problem recognition, problem resolution and solution statement which are also encompassed in his model as a whole.
The context of the individual’s environment is concluded to contribute much to the
determination of the individual’s information behaviour. The individual or ‘person in context’
is the one making the decision about whether or not to search for information to close the gap
after experiencing feelings of inadequacy in the state of knowledge (Wilson, 2000: 49). Wilson
recommends that emphasis should be on information seeking to find out the particular
individual’s information needs and how the former relates to other tasks concerned with
behaviour.

Wilson’s 1996 model then recognizes the stages that stimulate or dishearten the individual from
searching for the information. In this regard, Wilson’s 1996 model has been explained as one
that has identified three aspects of information seeking behaviour that play a major role in
motivating or discouraging users to search for information, i.e., activating mechanisms
(Niedzwiedzka, 2003). Activating mechanisms according to Niedzwiedzka (2003) refer to the
drive that pushes the individual to want to seek information. This proposes the idea that not
every information need pushes one to start the information seeking process.

Wilson (1999:257) concludes that ‘stress and coping theory’ provide the opportunity to clarify
why some needs do not come into play in information seeking behaviour. This is because stress
is said to involve any situation that seems to threaten a person’s efforts to achieve something
while coping is the efforts exerted to prevent or manage the effects of stress (Weiten, 2001:
530; Louw and Edward, 1997: 646). On the other hand, Mostert (2004: 126) points out that
“stress and relief that may act as an activating mechanism prompting an individual to act with
a view to satisfy a perceived information need”.

The risk/reward theory explicates the motivators pushing people to search and others not to
search and why particular information sources are used more than others (Niedzwiedzka, 2003;
Wilson, 1999). According to Wilson, the extent and complexity of the possible risk is what
determines the risk/reward of searching for the information or using certain information
sources. The desire to get a reward is the one that brings forth the necessity of the information
search, which according to Niedzwiedzka (2003) is where the comfort or confidence overtakes
the feeling of uncertainty. The present study points to the need for good legal services to clients
as a reward for information seeking, for the group under study, that is, lawyers in Swaziland.

The social learning or self-efficacy theory explains that people learn through observing others,
for example, junior lawyers may learn through observing their seniors in the field on accessing
and searching useful legal sources. According to Bandura (2001: 12), social learning entails
attention to the person under observation. Ormrod (2006) describes social learning as the acquisition of skills for development within a social group, like that of lawyers in this case. This theory shows that individuals “learn from one another through observation, imitation and modelling” (Olorunfemi, 2014: 73). Wilson (1999) concurs that self-efficacy is embodied in social learning theory, and it is when individuals are persuaded to feel that they can accomplish the required behaviour to yield the desired result (Wilson, 1999: 257).

In Wilson’s model of 1996, the intervening variables as seen in Figure 2.4 below, which may be explained as the obstacles or situations that hamper or block one from achieving a particular purpose or objective in a given situation (Turnbull, 2011), can be applicable in the instance of the present study. There are events or conditions that discourage lawyers from seeking information, for example, inaccessibility or unavailability of information sources needed. These intervening variables according to Wilson are the psychological, demographic, environmental and types of sources (Wilson, 1999:256). These were examined in the present study.

This 1996 version of the model is relevant in the present study because the variables it provides reflect the research questions under investigation. It seems to be best able to provide a better understanding of the significant features of human behaviour including that of lawyers in this case. However, since the 1999 Wilson model incorporated all these relevant variables in information behaviour, it will not be used as the major model for the study because the later version covers more aspects for the present research. The 1996 model is inadequate in investigating issues such as channels of communication used to share information perceived to be useful; resources used to seek and satisfy information needs and skills that effectively help to identify and satisfy information needs of lawyers that fortunately is covered in the 1999 model.

Below is the diagram of Wilson’s 1996 model, which reveals the activating mechanisms, and intervening variables that influence information seeking behaviour. Figure 2.4 below shows Wilson’s 1996 Model of information behaviour.
2.3.3 Wilson’s 1999 model of information behaviour

Due to its ‘general’ nature among information behaviour models, (Wilson: 2005:31), Wilson’s 1999 model identifies three important aspects of information seeking which include the “context of the information seeker, the information channel (electronic or manual) and the information resource itself.” Case (2002:111-112) argues that a model gives a description of a relationship among the variables and is tied to the existing realm. The 1999 model better integrates the information need, information seeking, information exchange and information use. Wilson’s 1999 model regards information seeking as a problem-solving activity, and for this reason, it is better suited to the group under study.

Wilson’s 1999 model of information seeking behaviour integrates information seeking, information need, information exchange and information use in a flow diagram below, based on two key points (Figure 2.5). It looks at information need as a secondary need arising from a basic or primary need and secondly, while discovering information to satisfy the need, the seeker faces different barriers. These include among others environmental, personal and interpersonal barriers.
Wilson in the area of information behaviour articulated the model in 1999 evolving from the other previous models. It pointed out a series of nested fields, in which information behaviour was included as the general area of investigation, with information-seeking behaviour as its sub-set, and information searching behaviour as a further sub-set (Wilson, 1999).

The fact that this later update of the 1981 and 1996 models capture the research questions better than the earlier models and encompasses part of the Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996) and Kuhlthau’s ISP (1993) model makes it best suited to the current study. Different researchers have also successfully applied it with different groups of users in different subject areas, which made the researcher consider it to be the better option for the study.

These studies included those of Tunde (2016) who examined the information behaviour of medical faculty (which is a professional group) in a tertiary health institution and Manyerere (2015) who studied rural women involved in SME’s information behaviour. The various factors influencing specific information needs (like that of lawyers), information access, information seeking, information sources and information use, means this model addresses most of the research questions. Information needs have been proved to be influenced by demographic characteristics as well as the importance or frequency with which that particular information is required by the users (Laundry, 2006).

Figure 2.5 below is a diagram of Wilson’s 1999 general model of information behaviour, showing the updates of Wilson’s past models (1981 and 1996), and how these updates, together with other ideas from Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain of 1996 and Kuhlthau’s ISP models and other models in the field of LIS were applied in the model.
Another reason why Wilson’s 1999 model is best suited for the current study is that it suggests how information needs arise and further identifies the factors that thwart the actual search for information, which the present study examined in the case of lawyers in Swaziland. These include access in terms of the actual availability of information, awareness of availability of information as well as issues related to the ease of use of the information source (Kaniki, 2001). The present study concentrated more on the first two. Wilson’s 1999 model noted the two main factors that give rise to the barriers to accessing useful information as noted also by Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert (2006), as the internal (personal) and external (environmental) factors. However, there are other factors that pose such barriers, for instance, ‘information illiteracy’, lack of information access and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure (Aina, 2002).

As mentioned, Wilson’s 1999 model was helpful to examine the different approaches used by the population under study to obtain information, due to the fact that it emphasizes information use and informal information transfer, which is a positive aspect for this kind of research.

2.3.4 Related empirical studies on Wilson’s 1999 model of information behaviour

There are numerous studies available in the area of information behaviour, especially those that investigated professionals from different disciplines applying Wilson’s 1999 model of information behaviour. The present study also chose it because of its ease in the depiction and
elucidation of users’ information behaviour. It has been observed that some studies use a single model (DeCuir-Gunby, 2008: 127) in their quest to understand information behaviour of certain groups. A shift in research within specific theoretical contexts has shown a growth in studies that dwell on investigating information behaviour of small groups of people, which according to Wilson, (2010) does not close the gap of influencing changes to policy or practice. The present study used Wilson’s 1999 model of information behaviour to influence change in terms of lawyers’ information needs and behaviour in Swaziland.

This study used Wilson’s model (which encompasses changes from 1981 to 1999), that incorporates aspects taken from Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain 1996 and Kuhlthau’s ISP models and other models in the discipline. This model provides the framework for the analysis of the current research study.

Studies have been done investigating professionals and students from varied disciplines ranging from engineers, health professional, agricultural professional and others in different parts of the world that have used this model. Some were noted by Case (2006:293); Wilson (1997:551); Savolainen (2007:109). Other studies were done by Khan and Bhatti (2012); Folster (2005) as well as Kerins, Madden, and Fulton (2004). Thus, this model has been successfully applied in the LIS field in relation to students and other professionals. Critically, despite all these studies, none were found to cover information behaviour and needs of lawyers or law students in the context under study in Swaziland. Of the studies found, some were done on the information needs of students in the Department of Adult Education and Institute of Distance Education and Agriculture at the University of Swaziland (Ngcobo, 2012).

In the other subject areas, outside Swaziland, some studies that applied Wilson’s 1999 model successfully were Majyambere (2015) in investigating the Humanities/Arts international postgraduate students’ information seeking behaviour in public universities in KwaZulu-Natal. This study revealed the personal information needs of international post-graduate students. Another study is that of Seyama (2009) who studied the information behaviour of students with visual impairments. Another study is that by Du Preez (2008) who studied engineers’ information needs and information seeking behaviour. Mostert and Ocholla (2005) also used Wilson’s 1999 model successfully in studying information needs and information seeking behaviour of parliamentarians in South Africa while Lithebe (2005) used the same model for members of parliament in Lesotho. Tunde (2016) also used the same model in examining the information behaviour of medical faculty in tertiary health institutions in Nigeria. Khan, Bhatti,
and Khan (2011) applied this model in studying the information seeking behaviour of law practitioners in Bahawalpur, India. A similar study by Haruna and Mabawonku (2001) on lawyers in Nigeria also applied this model successfully in looking at the information needs of lawyers. Closer to home, the study by Olorunfemi (2014) on the information behaviour of law students in Nigerian universities, used parts of this model.

2.4 Applicability of Wilson’s model and gaps

Wilson’s 1996 model however has been criticized for not being able to demarcate the stages between the phase when a need arises and the point where a decision to seek information is taken even though the phases are distinguished (Niedzwiedzka, 2003). It is said that there is no integration of the context of the person and the intervening variable, and further, that some of the intervening variables like information sources, psychological and demographic variables are put into separate categories yet they could be put together (Olorunfemi, 2014). This may be one of the reasons Wilson then improved the model to accommodate some of these concerns.

Wilson’s model was used with confidence in this study because it has successfully been applied in other similar empirical studies. Its application, with awareness of its limitations and the criticism of other authors is noted and considered positively in this study. Furthermore, Wilson’s model of information seeking behaviour has been widely used and is one of the most developed models. It includes both information needs and information seeking and it was applied to professionals in the workplace. It is a nested model of the information seeking and information searching research areas, and offers a general information behaviour model that condenses the cycle of information activities, from the beginning of an information need to the time when information is used (Wilson, 2000). The applicability of this model is also based on the fact that it gives a better understanding of the factors that influence the information seeking process. The fact that lawyers have to search for legal information sources for the different roles they play in the profession serve to motivate their search. The conditions of their work place provide an invaluable insight into the reasons for the utilization and non-utilization of some information sources, thus providing an understanding of the factors that hinder or help lawyers to access information in their legal service provision.

The model further attempts to depict and explain behaviour sequence events by pointing to relevant variables as opposed to merely showing a chronology, which this study aimed to cover. It is a fact that lawyers work in an environment characterized by a constant influx of
information, with ongoing additions and amendments to legislation, cases and other sources of research (Otike and Matthews, 2000; Thanuskodi, 2010; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). The involvement of lawyers in the study and practice of law requires them to stay up to date with all legal materials relating to their area of specialty, which include court rulings, judgments, regulations and other secondary resources. The lawyers therefore have to access such information and further have the ability to source out and evaluate applicable information and use this same information for a specific purpose (Carroll, Johnston, and Thompson, 2001).

It is noted that no empirical studies have been done so far in Swaziland on the topic of information seeking behaviour for lawyers. This study will apply Wilson’s model in order to understand the information seeking behaviour of lawyers, seek answers to the research questions, and add valuable new knowledge to this area. The application of the model will take into account factors such as information need, access and use of available information resources in Swaziland. Some of the other models studied students in their academic context rather than those already in the practical field with more experience. This study will close that gap in the case of Swaziland.

Therefore, Wilson’s model is more applicable and comprehensive for the problem and population under study. This is because it enables a description and explanation of lawyers’ information behaviour in terms of accessing legal information to meet their professional information needs. As mentioned earlier, the model was also applied in other studies such as those of Lawal (2012), Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010), Majyambere (2015) and Otike and Matthews (2000). The environmental role and physiological, affective and cognitive needs are included in this model, which this study focused on in terms of lawyers in Swaziland.

This model was also the most suitable because of its general application across all professions since it is useful in investigating the different approaches, which different groups of respondents use to obtain information. The researcher saw this model as unbiased and without unwarranted influence to respondents in term of expressing their information behaviour and further suitable in addressing the challenges faced by lawyers in Swaziland when seeking information for their professional roles. The model encapsulates the main research question of the study as it acknowledges that the environment, in which a person works in, influences that person’s information seeking behaviour. Table 2.1 below shows a mapping of the theoretical framework of the study.
Table 2.1: Mapping of theoretical framework construct to the objectives, questions and data gathering tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes or core variables</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Sources/Tools and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information needs           | To determine the information needs of lawyers in Swaziland. | Q1. What are the information needs of the lawyers in Swaziland? | - Wilson’s model  
- Questionnaire (SPSS24)  
- Interview (Thematic Content analysis) |
| Information seeking behaviour | To investigate the information seeking behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland. | Q2. How do the lawyers in Swaziland access and use legal information they need?  
Q3. What are the information resources used by lawyers in Swaziland? | - Wilson’s model  
- Questionnaire (SPSS24)  
- Interview (Thematic Content analysis) |
| Information use and systems | To establish how information resources are meeting the information needs of the lawyers in Swaziland | Q4. What are the factors affecting lawyers meeting their information needs?  
Q5. What strategies could be adopted to overcome any challenges faced in satisfying their information needs in Swaziland? | - Wilson’s model  
- Questionnaire (SPSS24)  
- Interview (Thematic Content analysis) |

Source: Researcher (2017)

2.5 Summary of the chapter

The study aims to investigate the information needs, and seeking behaviour of private lawyers in Swaziland, with special reference to the Swaziland Law Society in assisting its members to access timely and accurate information for their day-to-day legal services provision. It is known that effective legal information services depend on fully understanding the users' information needs and information-seeking behaviour as pointed out by other scholars such as Agosto and Hughes-Hassell (2005) and Hepworth (2007). This research aimed at understanding lawyers’ information needs and seeking behaviour in the Swaziland context and further examined ways in which access to legal information for lawyers can be improved for the betterment of legal services provision.
This chapter provided an overview of the main models or theories of information behaviour, and briefly discussed the specific models of information behaviour by Kuhlthau, Leckie and Wilson, that have been influential in the field of LIS. These were selected to inform the study. These models showed user experiences in the process of information seeking within their environments. The three models discussed are relevant in the current study, however, Wilson’s 1999 model was selected as the one best suited for the study due to its general nature and its incorporation of most of the ideas found in other models.

The chapter concluded with a critique of and applicability of the Wilson models and explained the link between the theoretical frameworks and this particular model that answered the research questions. The next chapter provides an overview of the literature review of the study.
CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

After outlining the theoretical framework used in this study in Chapter Two, it is imperative to review the literature related to the research questions. The purpose of the literature review in research is to provide a context for the research and justify it. Stilwell (2000: 173) postulates that a good literature review has to show the diverse views, agreements, divergences and developments of thought on the subject of research, and be openly shown and accredited in the writing.

The use of accredited information sources even in the E-Resources age enables one to identify as many sources as possible for good research. Scholars like Kothari (2004), Kaniki (2001) and Stilwell (2004) have highlighted the benefits of conducting a good literature review. They point out that a review should include a range of books, chapters, published journals, unpublished theses, doctoral dissertations and online sources.

The present study investigated information needs, information seeking behaviour and access to legal information by lawyers in Swaziland. It specifically examined the existing situation in the provision of legal information services and sources, specifically, how the information needs of lawyers are met and the role played by the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) in meeting their needs.

While embarking on the literature review, it is necessary to provide a brief introduction to the system of law in Swaziland and the range of legal information sources and electronic legal resources available to lawyers in the country. The principal question in this study is “what are the information needs and information seeking behaviours of lawyers in Swaziland in regards to access to legal information and how can this guide the Law Society of Swaziland to improve or design and implement an effective legal information service for lawyers?” This question, together with the sub questions outlined in chapter one guided the literature review process. Das and Jadab (2017: 16) emphasized that proper understanding of information seeking behaviour as a user study for any particular group, like the present subjects, is crucial for development, planning, and establishing relevant up-to-date information services. This idea
prompted the researcher to investigate the information seeking behaviour of lawyers particularly in Swaziland.

After this overview, previous works on lawyers’ information behaviour and their attitudes towards legal resources is examined in the international setting, then narrowing it down to Africa and Swaziland. A review of a number of studies relating to lawyers’ information behaviour, followed by studies on lawyers’ information use, and information access using the different models of information behaviour are highlighted.

Empirical and conceptual literature reviewed in this chapter was attained from books, journals, theses, conference proceedings, databases, and other resources. Kothari (2004) points out two types of literature – the conceptual literature concerning the concepts and theories and the empirical literature which discusses studies related to the variables of the current study. Below, a discussion of the conceptual literature follows.

3.2 Information and information needs in general context

Information has been identified as a vital part of the lives of human beings in society (Devi and Dlamini, 2014; Case, 2007), without which functioning successfully would be compromised. Access to information is therefore crucial. It suffices to point out that professions, including the legal profession, which this study is concerned with, need to have access to information. The United Nations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Charter has declared that

“Everyone has the right to…and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers” (United Nations, 2015, Article 19).

For this reason, it is necessary to look into the provision of legal information for the law profession. Hence, their information needs, information behaviour and access to information are explored in this study.

‘Information’ as seen in Chapter one, section 1.9, is said to have no single general definition for all the fields at all times, but is explained according to the field and context in which it is being used (Wilson, 2006: 659; Zhang and Benjamin, 2007: 1935). For the current study, information is referred to as that which is practical, concrete and able to assist lawyers to solve (Kaniki, 2001) existing issues in their legal services. It denotes meaningful messages that are capable of being used by lawyers to serve their clients with their different legal issues.
Majyambere (2014: 70) argued that information is related to data and knowledge as suggested by Case (2012:47).

However, Olsen (2012) and O'Riordan (2005) feel that these concepts should not be taken to mean the same thing even though they are usually used interchangeably. Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert (2006: 146) pointed to data as “measurements and representations of the world around us”, and Case (2002:62) adds that the data gathered and processed provides what is called ‘information’, which becomes useful in the different fields, like that of lawyers in the present study. According to Case (2012: 73), information converts to knowledge as soon as people formulate acceptable and true beliefs about the world around them. Case (2012: 73) also proposes that “information mirrors three main ideas which are information-as-process, information-as-knowledge and information-as-thing” and these are meant for information needs relating to our daily lives and for all fields. For the present study, the lawyers engage the term ‘information’ in the context of decision-making and problem solving of legal issues.

The concept ‘information needs’ has been regarded as difficult to define and or understand (Wilson, 2006:661) because of it being considered ‘abstract’ and ‘intangible’ (Case, 2002). The concept was defined as the recognition that one’s knowledge is lacking to satisfy a specific objective (Case 2002:2). Other scholars who pointed this out, opined that an information need arises when an individual realizes a lack of a desired product (information), necessary to meet a certain need and that individual wishes to resolve that position (Belkin, 1978). Summarily, according to Case (2007); Ingwersen and Jarvelin (2005) and Dervin (1992), an information need is the recognition of the inadequacy of one’s knowledge to satisfy a specific goal, and the need to reduce that uncertainty is crucial.

Wilson (2006:663) argued that information needs could be referred to as secondary needs that result from the desire to satisfy primary needs of human beings; these being physiological needs, affective needs and cognitive needs. The ‘uncertainty’ in a human being leads him to seek information in order to satisfy the information need. For the purposes of this study, information need will refer to the state where the lawyers recognize a lack of information to address the issues related to the legal field and their roles.

3.2.1 Lawyers’ information needs

For development and progress, the delivery of legal information has necessitated legal information collections to provide changing content, and there is electronic publishing and
delivery of legal information in the profession (Winterton, 2011). According to scholars, lawyers’ professional environments are very information intensive and are characterized by extensive rules, regulations and procedures that require the correct kind of legal information (Fowler, 2007:6; Das and Jadab, 2017: 16). Consequently, Otike and Matthews (2000: 241) submitted that all the operations of lawyers ranging from representing clients in legal matters, drafting legal documents and providing legal advice in any form, requires extensive information.

It has been argued that lawyers are mostly involved in the practical use of legal information theories to bring solutions to individual problems so as to serve the interests of their particular clients (Doron, 2009: 147-148). Ahmed and Batcha, (2014), posited that lawyers assume various names and different responsibilities in the legal profession, and are also involved in the administration of justice in general. For this reason, lawyers need to be well versed with the law and administration of their countries as well as laws of other countries globally in order to meet these complex roles sufficiently in terms of application of legal reasoning (Olorunfemi, 2014: 10). Further, it is also crucial in terms of enabling the lawyers to uphold their duties in the administration of justice in the society.

According to Otike and Matthews (2000) and Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010), lawyers are referred to as attorneys, counsels, representation, solicitors, barristers, advocates, public defenders, and prosecutors to depict the particular responsibilities they may have. Consequently, it is inferred from this role that they will be faced with diverse and varied degrees of legal problems and issues to deal with, therefore, they have a significant need for relevant legal information.

Haruna and Mabawonku (2001:69), in their study of information behaviour of lawyers in Nigeria, point out that since lawyers have to serve a dynamic clientele, they are expected to deal with a variety of complex legal problems, hence, require access to good legal information. They further argue that in order for lawyers to do this professionally, they need to refer to different sources of information like court decisions, past cases, current legislation and legal policies. Otike, (1999: 19) concludes that lawyers need detailed research information, to positively face the duty of resolving legal problems for different situations and different clients.

Olorunfemi (2014: 10) in studying information needs and behaviour of law students in Nigerian universities, further pointed out that since lawyers also work in an information intensive environment, they need to apply various library and information communication technology
(ICT) search skills. This would be handy in assisting them in the searching of legal information sources available in the different formats and technology systems. The Association of College Research Libraries (ACRL) (2000) has pointed to the importance of information literacy competency for all persons such as lawyers in this case to cope with the changing information environment. Information literacy in the present study includes the ability to identify the legal information needed, locate, evaluate, organize and use it effectively for legal problem solving (Kuhn, 2008).

It was posited that for the maintenance of justice, it is vital to meet the need for useful legal information where lawyers are concerned (Olorunfemi, 2014: 10). Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010a), in their study of sources and means of access to legal information for lawyers in Uganda, found that lack of useful legal information results in poor submission in legal matters, which would lead to unfair judgments for decided cases. Swaziland lawyers’ information needs may not be different from these needs; hence, the present study looked at how they were accommodated in terms of access to meet their information needs.

The first research question is about the information needs of lawyers, which are considered in relation to the characteristics of the information needs component of Wilson’s 1999 model. This section presents the literature review on information needs and builds on the interpretation of the concepts of information and information needs that were discussed in Chapter One.

Lawyers are people learned in law and include people practicing law (Garner, 2014). Their roles vary across the different legal services as well as from one country to another. For example, United Kingdom (UK) lawyers are divided into solicitors or barristers, while in the United States (USA), lawyers differ by their area of specialization. In Swaziland they are known as lawyers or attorneys who have different tasks and roles to play in their work.

This chapter thus, in relation to lawyers, outlines the concept of information, clarifies information needs in the context of the reported studies and then reviews literature on lawyers’ information needs.

The chapter starts with information needs because the focus of this study is on information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers based on the principal research question as outlined in Chapter One (section 1.2). At a later stage, the chapter discusses Wilson’s 1999 model and its focus on work roles and associated tasks components. As Majyambere (2015) pointed out, scholars formally identified information needs and gathering in the 1948 Royal Science Conference as presented by Bernal (1960), and subsequently there has been a huge
growth in the study of information seeking. Wilson (2005:1) argued that “information seeking is concerned with the discovery of the appropriate information for tasks, research, and everyday life”.

A significant body of literature on information needs, information seeking behaviour and access to information has been produced focussing on the many different professional groups in the discipline of information studies. The legal profession has not been left out in this regard. Lawyers will face problems like other professionals in satisfying their information needs. Otike and Matthews (2000) opined that every legal professional, whether in government, parastatals or private practice; in providing legal advice, drafting or researching legal issues, will always require information.

It has been further observed that lawyers have unique ethical responsibilities in their profession (Komlodi and Lutters, 2008), as such, they need access to accurate, current and timeous information as it “will determine their performance as lawyers in any judicial space” (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). The need for timeous access and accurate legal information resources necessitates a significant consideration of the support offered to lawyers (Ahmed and Batcha, 2014). This gap has to be filled by the relevant bodies in any society. Since a lawyer operates in a “highly intensive information environments” (Otike and Matthews, 2000:248), he or she may need to provide two kinds of advice, that is, verbal or written. These kinds of advice need to be provided to clients personally or telephonically, through interviews and written legal documents. These help both the lawyer and client to determine and avoid useless litigation (Bhardwaj and Madhusudhan, 2013:314). As a result, proper access to legal information cannot be over emphasised.

Furthermore, lawyers are not always aware of all the pertinent rules that are passed on every single issue with updates occurring repeatedly; thus they have to adopt various legal research methods. While probing, they have to also meet statutory provisions that yield even more rules for some issues; hence, they have to have and know how to access the relevant legal resources.

The present study sought to investigate these issues in relation to Swaziland. Thus, the question that needed to be addressed in relation to the problem is what are the information needs, and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland, and how are these needs being met by the available information resources and the Swaziland Law Society as the main body? In considering whether legal information needs of lawyers in the Kansas District County could be
met through provision of a customized information centre for local needs, Fowler (2007) concluded that such a centre was necessary and required (Fowler, 2007).

Otike and Matthews (2000: 251) in a study in Kenya suggested that due to the difficulty of accessing legal information needs by lawyers, a cooperative shared library of a sort could be beneficial to them. According to Kuhlthau and Tama (2001), lawyers expressed a need for user-oriented tools to meet their needs. The present study assessed the availability and usage of legal information resources in Swaziland through the information seeking behaviour of lawyers. It further added knowledge to past suggestions in earlier research on the importance of finding systems to assist lawyers in their tasks (Wilkinson, 2001) especially in Swaziland.

Case (2012) looked into the nature of information, information needs and uses, sense-making, and models of information behaviour for different disciplines. He proposed that more research should be done in the different professions for more subjective and relevant information. The present study examined the needs that are specifically relevant for lawyers generally and in Swaziland in particular. Fisher, Erdelez, and McKechnie (2005); Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert (2006) and Stilwell (2010) reviewed key research conducted on the concepts of information behaviour, needs, seeking and use. In these studies, they proposed that information behaviour be considered as the foundation for any research in information studies. Ingwersen and Jarvelin (2005) further recommended that a cognitive framework that would consider the combination of information seeking and retrieval research should be made, which this current study briefly examined.

Haruna and Mabawonku (2001), in a similar study to the present research, examined the information needs of lawyers in Lagos, and concluded that the greatest professional information need for lawyers was to identify the latest court decisions, followed by the latest legislation. Since this is significant, as concurred by Tuhumwire (2010) and Otike and Matthews (2000:248), it is worth investigating where and how the professional associations assist in this regard as per their mandate. A study of such has not been done on any of the associations in the Southern part of Africa. Hence, this was undertaken in Swaziland to close the knowledge gap.

Otike and Matthews (2000: 243) focused on information needs of lawyers conducting legal research, (a task closely identified with their work role) and found that lawyers in smaller firms cover broader areas of the law, therefore have more varied information needs than those in larger better resourced firms. Fowler (2007) further noted this in his study on information needs
and seeking behaviour of lawyers in the Kansas District in the USA. The aim of Fowler’s study (2007) was to evaluate if lawyers’ needs were met in terms of access to information.

In meeting the information needs of lawyers, which are the latest court decision, legislations, acquisition and application of legal knowledge in the profession (Haruna and Mabawonku, 2001:71), efforts have been made by different countries in Africa to provide free access to countries’ laws. This is done via links from the African Legal Institute (AfricanLiIi) (African Legal Information Institute, 2017) which collaborates with and supports a grouping of the free and open access publishers in Africa. A connection between this and the country’s law association would be an advantage since the aim is to meet the needs of professionals in their quest for efficient local legal service provision. The Swaziland Legal Information Institute (SWAZILII) is part of this franchise, which is however not linked to the Swaziland Law Society.

3.2.2 Studies related to information needs and seeking behaviour of lawyers

Several studies have been conducted at the international level to examine the information needs of lawyers. One of these was a pilot study by Otike, on lawyers’ information seeking behaviour in England. This study alluded to the importance of legal information as a vital part of the work of the law professional. The study aimed to discover the types of information lawyers require in meeting their needs and the elements that influence these needs and seeking habits (Otike, 1999: 19).

Otike’s research pointed out that the experience of a lawyer in the field greatly influenced their needs. He observed that the more experienced lawyers’ needs may not be at the same level as those of less experienced lawyers. He intimated that being in the field for a long time allowed them to be more knowledgeable with information relevant and needed in the subject, whereas those less experienced were still to learn and have to consult information sources themselves to deliver better services. Hence, they will have information needs that will assist them to address the issues or problems they may be dealing with. Wilson observes that information needs do not completely address the question of why users seek information and why the users believe that such information will serve and what use it will actually have when received (Wilson, 2006: 661). However, it is believed that the information needs of new comers in the field will assist them to deal with the issues in their work through accessing relevant information.
The position of the different information behaviour and needs of the more experienced lawyers was further confirmed by Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996) and Kuhlthau and Tama (2001) in their studies of professional information seeking behaviours. The latter explored the lawyers’ information search process. This study revealed that the involvement of lawyers in complex tasks, in such an information intensive environment influenced their information needs. Both studies further noted that most legal professionals rely heavily on printed media and practicing lawyers count on their junior colleagues to actively do the relevant legal research.

Since lawyers have to accomplish these complex tasks they have to use computer databases which require higher skills and techniques. A study on knowledge management in Botswana law firms (Fombad, 2008), confirms that lawyers are burdened with the pressure to get on board with the advanced technology in electronic resources that comes with faster ways of delivering legal information and services. It is noted that few professionals can afford to keep on relying only on traditional print resources (Lawal, 2012; Fombad, 2008: 23) hence, they have to acquire new skills and competencies, especially computer literacy.

Other scholars reiterated that lawyers are regarded as ‘hard-core’ information users because of their multitasking skills (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010; Fowler, 2007). Spink and Park (2005) who noted that the multitasking skills of lawyers are seen from their need to utilize complex legal information sources also observed this. As such this necessitate timely access to legal information. For this reason, the need to apply various ICT search skills cannot be over emphasized for lawyers.

A similar study on judges in Kuwait was undertaken on their information needs and behaviour. The importance of good access to accurate and timeous information was seen as significant in order to avoid bad decisions (Mansour and Ghuloum, 2016) and hence miscarriage of justice which lawyers are also faced with. The present study looked at whether information needs of private lawyers were being met in Swaziland for them to be able contribute to good decision making in the legal field.

Makri, Blandford, and Cox (2008) in the USA did another international study on information behaviour and needs of lawyers in an academic setting. This study in a developed country with developed digital law libraries, concluded that knowledge of electronic information systems was important for lawyers to access legal information. Hence, the present study considered the availability of such electronic resources in Swaziland and the level of knowledge of the lawyers. It is observed that the internet has improved the productivity of lawyers in terms of
useful information to their profession (Hinson, Ofori, and Atuguba 2007), which however cannot be one hundred percent reliable in the work lawyers may face at particular times.

The provision of access to good legal information in order to meet information needs of lawyers in general has been researched in some of the developed countries. However, the same conditions in the developing or third world countries (Otike, 1999) like Swaziland have not been adequately researched. Otike contends that unless far-reaching empirical research is done in these places, the provision of legal information for legal professionals will continue to rely on ‘simple hypotheses’. This is more so because of the margin of development between the first world and the third world countries. The present study intended to close this knowledge gap.

The reviewed literature from some of the developed countries showed that information behaviour is generally influenced by the nature of the work people are involved in (Wilkinson, 2001). Of note is that the literature reviewed in these developed countries showed limited studies conducted in rural or less developed areas of those countries. Further, most of studies under this topic address information behaviour from academic perspectives as in higher institutions of learning rather than in the active service (Majyambere, 2015).

3.3 Information behaviour in general context

In general, a number of studies on information behaviour studies have been undertaken over the years. Examples are studies by Bates (2010); Case (2002, 2006, 2007, and 2012); Fisher, Erdelez, and McKechnie (2005), coupled with reviews by Spink (2000); Spink and Cole (2004 and 2006); Fisher and Julien (2009) and Fisher, Erdelez, and McKechnie (2005) in the field of LIS. The ever changing and growing information environment even in the legal field is a major influence. Devadason and Lingam (1997:41) corroborated this fact when they pointed out that the studies of information behaviour have risen due to the “turbulent and changing information environment”.

Writers have pointed out that information seeking behaviour studies have shifted towards different disciplines like social sciences since the 1980s (Case 2007). More publications in this specific discipline have risen. A content analysis by Heidi, Pecoskie, and Reed (2011), noted that information behaviour research between 1999 and 2008 showed continuous studies on particular user groups. However, it was argued that the research that has been done by many scholars showed different results on information behaviour and information needs of the
different fields in the social sciences (Case 2007; Krikelas, 1983; Haines, Light, O’Malley, and Delwiche, 2010 and Sheeja, 2010). Thus, the present study will look on the legal professional field since there is not much literature offered for the specific needs of Swaziland.

The understanding of information behaviour research in the current context is important as it “may help maximize the quality and effectiveness of the way information is presented, sought, discovered, evaluated and used” (Ford, 2015:3) by the lawyers. According to Pettigrew, Fidel, and Bruce (2001: 44), information behaviour can be referred to as “the study of how people need, seek, give and use information in different contexts, including the workplace …” This was the intention of the current study in terms of lawyers in Swaziland. Ford’s study also examined concepts, issues and themes of information behaviour, illustrating them by using key research studies, and providing a path through the various theories and models. It was pointed out by Liu (2013) that the working together or interrelation between the information seeker, information, and the information provider depicts the information seeking process and furthermore the information seeking can be divided into work related and non-work related types (Savolainen, 2010).

3.3.1 Information seeking behaviour of lawyers

Wilkinson (2001: 257) argued that the subject of “information seeking behaviour of lawyers has not been fully investigated empirically” as most studies tended to dwell more on legal research as the main task of lawyers in information seeking activities. This according to Wilkinson’s analysis should not be the case as there are other tasks such as those constituting problem solving and information seeking activities. The present research purports to close this gap. A study by Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996: 173) found that there were few studies addressing the information related needs of lawyers that had the element of demonstrating access to a wide range of information as vital in their work. Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996) noted that those studies done were mostly on information retrieval and use, which was commonly seen as ‘legal research.’

This was related to their perceived roles of drafting, advocacy, negotiating and counselling. According to Budd (1995:306) as quoted in Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain (1996), there was a lack of conceptualisation of the motivations for lawyers to seek the information. The present study aimed at considering access to legal information for lawyers as a solution to solving the problem of poor professional services in the field, especially the barriers thereof.
Information seeking behaviour is said to be strongly linked to roles associated with particular tasks (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996:181). Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain point out that the continuous nature of professionals’ work (like that of lawyers) requires one to keep up with the advancements in that field and therefore requires upgrading their skills. Hence, this implies that lawyers who have peculiar tasks and roles that may require information seeking on top of needing to be up-to-date with the latest developments in the legal field need to have skills in searching information.

It is important to note the importance of information literacy of lawyers at this point. Information literacy is described as “the adoption of appropriate information behaviour to identify, through whatever channel or medium, information well fitted to information needs, leading to wise and ethical use of information in society” (Webber and Johnston, 2013). On this note, it is imperative to investigate how lawyers in the case of Swaziland interact with information in order to keep abreast with the evolving information in their field. A study by Wilson, Ford, Ellis, Foster, and Spink, (2002) examined the concept of uncertainty as a useful aspect in understanding the information behaviour of users in their research, and confirmed that affective and cognitive dimensions were involved in information problem solving. For this study, information seeking may be said to involve the entirety of information products and services, to assist them in solving the legal issues they are involved with.

Even though there are several studies that have looked into the information seeking behaviour and information needs of lawyers in different countries, those related to Swaziland were limited. Studies for example include Haruna and Mabawonku (2001) in Ghana; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) in Uganda; Otike and Matthews (2000) in Kenya; Bhardwaj and Madhusudan (2016), Ahmed and Batcha (2014) and Thanuskodi (2010) in India; Wilkinson (2001) in Canada; Fowler (2007) in USA, as well as Otike (1999) in England. Few empirical studies have been documented about lawyers in Swaziland where information seeking behaviour is concerned. The studies that have been done in Swaziland include those done on Institute of Distance Education (IDE) students at the University of Swaziland (Ngcobo, 2012; Devi, 2013; Devi and Dlamini, 2014) with Agriculture students, which does not concern the present study.

3.3.2 Information access and use

Information access is “the freedom or ability to identify, obtain and make use of data or information effectively” (Information Access, 2017). It has been argued that access to
information and use is an essential development in the present day (Bayraktaroglu and Ozgen, 2008). This is true for the lawyers who have to provide good legal services to their society. It follows that the access to and provision of legal information is a vital factor in the delivery of legal information services in any society. It has been noted that legal information plays a vital role in any judicial efficiency, consequently, the organization and provision of legal information to the legal professionals and their clients could save time, and therefore be cost effective for clients (Broady-Preston, 2004; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010a).

According to Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010a), the means of access to legal information are the ways in which legal information is made available. These could include visiting libraries or resource centres, reading legal bulletins, listening to news broadcasts, emails, telephones, colleagues or other people. In an earlier study by Kidd (1978) it was concluded that lawyers wanted legal information mostly for solving cases and keeping up to date on the law. Later scholars further confirm this and point out that that indeed the environment lawyers work in is disposed to constant disruptions through the changing judgements and updates of decisions in cases from superior courts which they have to consider in their defence (Okello-Obura, 1998).

For this reason they thus need to access quality information as fast as possible. The type and quality of the means used to access this information has a significant impact on the quality of the information in terms of its trustworthiness and usability. Trusted channels of access should provide for accurate, timely and reasonable costed access to legal information. Access to good legal information results from an appropriate management of the conduit of information. As mentioned earlier, a study by Otike (1997) also opined that in the observance of other scholars, the premise that lawyers with less experience in a particular branch of law sought information more frequently than experienced lawyers as they are still in a learning curve was valid. Thus, there is a need to accommodate lawyers’ access to information through the availability of trusted resources.

Information use has been regarded as where a user incorporates the new information they have acquired into their existing knowledge base in order to solve the issue at hand or accomplish an objective (Spink and Cole, 2006). Accessing this information is from relevant channels or sources. The present study was concerned with establishing if the lawyers had a positive attitude/ towards their professional association in terms of provision of access to information resources.
3.4 Legal information

As mentioned in Chapter One, section 1.9.6, many scholars have pointed that legal information in general plays a vital role in all nations and professions, as without it, bad decisions based on poor and outdated information might fail in meeting the expectations of the people (Mansour and Alkhurainej, 2011: 671). This cannot be over emphasized for the legal profession, which has the burden of ensuring that the legal information used can enable them to uphold justice for the people they serve. It has been argued that information to the legal profession is so significant that lawyers cannot practice effectively without proper access to it (Adewale and Mansor, 2014).

As pointed out in the field of LIS, information is an important tool for the transformation of man and society towards attaining significant life goals in professions (Emasealu and Popoola, 2016). It assists them to be able to come to terms with their legal services environment and make informed decisions. Hence, acquisition of the same empowers one to plan and make projections towards the fulfilment of one’s objectives. It has been pointed out by many studies that information that is practical, concrete and able to assist one solve existing issues is important for all including lawyers in their legal services. Such information needs to be credible, relevant, accurate and timely (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010; Wilkinson, 2001; Otike and Matthews, 2000; Lawal, 2012) in order to add value to knowledge, decision processes and solutions sought.

3.4.1 The Swaziland law system and sources of law

The country of Swaziland is a kingdom, with a dual judicial system. It consists of courts based on the Western model and western law and the customary law (Nations Encyclopedia, 2017). This goes back since to when Swaziland was a British Protectorate, until 1968 when it gained its independence (Nations Encyclopedia, 2017). As a result, Swaziland has several sources of law derived from the Constitution; legislation, common law, judicial precedent; customary law; authoritative texts and decrees (Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi, 2016). This study concentrated on the provision of these sources to the legal fraternity and what is done or could be done by the Law Society of Swaziland to meet the needs of the membership.

Legal information according to Okello-Obura is all legal records in any format consisting of law materials, case law, legal literature and court rules (Okello-Obura, 1998). Legal
information is required for vital and rational decisions that are taken from day-to-day activities. Such information is paramount to the success of any judicial system (Olorunfemi, 2014: 11).

The United National Human Rights Charter (2015) states that information is a fundamental human right, therefore, access to legal information is also a fundamental issue in the lives of those in the legal profession. It is known that legal information access is limited by different factors like inadequate physical resources, physical access, legal literacy and infrastructure (Jones and Ilako, 2015) among many other factors.

As it has been pointed out, the availability of quality legal information plays a very important role in different ways (Langwenya, 2013) in efficient and effective legal services. Therefore, legal information has to be properly understood. Legal information is generally organized in a hierarchical structure consisting of two distinct categories, which are primary and secondary sources (Clinch, 2000).

Secondary sources of information serve the function of a ‘finding tool’, which helps one locate relevant primary sources of law, like indexes, digests, and so forth. It also acts as a commentary service as it provides interpretation of relevant sources, for example, textbooks, journals and encyclopaedias. In other words, secondary sources pertain to the law, but are not authoritative records of the law (that is, they are not official texts). Examples of secondary sources include books, reference materials such as legal dictionaries and encyclopaedias as well as journals in any format.

On the other hand, primary sources consist of authoritative statements of law as made by law-making bodies. These include primary legislation or statutes or Acts of Parliament, and King's Decrees. These are a commanding information source and take primacy over other legal sources.

Secondary legislation or delegated, that is, statutory instruments, rules, regulations and by-laws are also primary sources. Primary sources further consist of draft legislation like Bills of Parliament, and case law. Case law is developed when the details of court cases that are of legal importance are put together over time and published in law reports, which then develop into a body of case law. Judges will usually follow the precedents of previous cases when making a decision in court (Clinch and Hart, 2001).

Swaziland does not have one source of law as law is drawn from several primary sources. These include statutes, King’s order in Council or Decrees, and Acts of Parliament. The statutes are
passed by both Houses of Parliament and have to receive Royal Assent. Statutes may change over time, as they may be amended or repealed. Statutes in Swaziland are from the Ministry of Justice and Government Printers (Webster Print) at a price (Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi, 2016). Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi (2016) have pointed out that other sources of law in Swaziland include the Constitution of Swaziland enacted in 2005, common law, judicial precedent and authoritative text.

The type of work a lawyer is engaged in will have a great influence on the kind of legal information need. For instance, litigation lawyers may need different types of legal information sources such as current applicable laws and regulations, precedents and relevant case law while an office based lawyer who does drafting or even commercial lawyers may need relevant legal forms and other supporting documents (Fagbemi, 2017, Adewale and Mansor, 2014).

3.5 Legal information sources availability and accessibility

Information delivery services like libraries according to Ocholla (1999: 119) play a “pivotal role in information access” and need to be supported in any organization in order to ensure quality professional service delivery. Therefore, even lawyers such as those under study need well-supported information delivery services for improvement of and stimulation of productivity in their profession. This can be supported by their organization like the Law Society in Swaziland.

Law libraries are supposed to be the best facility to assist in legal information access as these acquire, process and organize these resources. Libraries according to Ajidahun (2010) provide legal professionals with quality information sources and services. Runyon (2009) posited that law libraries are an active and responsive part in education as they provide both the primary and secondary sources of law in different formats. Hence, this study investigated whether lawyers in Swaziland have access to these resources termed law libraries and especially if these are actually adequately available in Swaziland.

Legal information is also delivered electronically in the information-changing environment. Most countries have established online legal information sources for access. Even though that information is available online, it is however argued that the information is “not comprehensive” (Langwenya, 2013: 155) and is further outdated in the case of Swaziland. The SWAZILII that is supposed to provide free access to law in Swaziland (Swazi Legal Information Institute, 2017) is still in its teething stage, judging from the website. The present
study looked into this issue with the view to closing the gap on availability of legal information sources.

Bystrom (2002) discussed information channels for lawyers and noted that these are either internal or external. He opines that the internal ones are found in the law firms themselves, while the external ones which will be those outside the firm such as the resources centres, online sources like Swaziland Legal Information Institute (SWAZILII) and others.

The importance of information sources is now discussed. Information sources consist of formal and informal resources, human, resources, print format and electronic resources (Kaye, 1995). All these sources have a part to play in the lawyers ‘information needs and seeking behaviour. It has been pointed out that most researchers in the 90’s seemingly preferred printed sources of information (Brown, 1999) which however began to change with the evolution of information in electronic format (Tenopir, Mays, and Lei, 2011). Nel (2015: 54) opined that nowadays it is “impossible to imagine research without access to online or electronic resources.” Other studies that have pointed to this fact are those of Borrego and Urbano (2007); Tenopir, Mays and Lei (2011) and Mulligan and Mabe (2011). As a result, understanding the information needs of lawyers in the electronic environment (Rowlands, Nicholas, Williams, Huntington, and Fieldhouse, 2008) is important. This is especially in terms of access to and provision of legal electronic databases, journals, books, and interpersonal communications (Fisher and Julien, 2009).

It has been further observed that the growth of legal literature has to a large extent shifted from print to electronic (databases), hence there is need to consider this format for ease of access. Access refers to the right to use a resource (Reitz, 2014). Thus, legal access is the “right to obtain legal sources” (Shauhnnessy, 1991:2). Since legal information sources are very important to legal professionals in their different roles, especially those practicing law, Devadason and Lingam (1997:41) posit that such roles are affected by the availability of legal resources, characteristics and nature of the same as well as their intended use. The aim of this study was therefore to investigate ease of legal information access for lawyers in Swaziland.

Due to the rise of legal literature in relation to the influx of updates in laws and legal issues, the legal profession automatically experienced a great change where information services delivery is concerned. It has evolved more due to its need for intensive information, which requires them to locate, identify and access the correct and relevant sources for credibility and acceptance (Tearle, 2006; Bowes, 1995). Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010a) concurred
with this and pointed out that the issue of the information source’s credibility and past performance are significant. It was said that such legal information sources need to be trusted by their users while such trust will be influenced by the frequency of its usage (Moore, 2003).

An earlier study by Eisenschitz and Walsh (1995) looked into the attitudes users had towards such information sources. This study concluded that the way the study population (solicitors) treated their sources was in relation to their expertise, especially when they did not acquire the information sources themselves. Hainsworth (1992) earlier found this in his study on judges (through questionnaire and interviews as data gathering tools), who were found to be reluctant to trust information provided to them by others. They were further seen to rely more on hard copies than electronic sources. Time constraints affected their behaviour as well.

Another study by Wilkinson (2001) on information sources used by lawyers in problem solving, found that lawyers favoured informal sources when seeking information. This may also be as a result of challenges faced due to time constraints. Further reliance on internal information from their organizations rather than external sources was noted in this study. Consequently, the researcher in the present study proposed that the lawyers’ professional organization in Swaziland could improve access to information sources for its members as they would be able to trust such sources.

The scope of the legal practice a lawyer is involved in, may give lawyers different roles such as manager, counsellor, and adjudicator, (Otike, 1999; Makri, Blandford, and Cox 2008; Kerins, Madden, and Fulton, 2004; Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001), which are known to require various legal information sources. The currency of the information also affects timely access as pointed out by Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010).

The ‘influx of updates’ in different types of legal information sources, (Haruna and Mabawonku, 2001:62) like the latest court decisions, cases, statutes, law reports, precedents, forms, and commentaries under different legal topics and jurisdictions further points to the significance of easy access (Makri, Blandford, and Cox, 2008:614). Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) in their study in Uganda, and Otike and Matthews (2000) in his studies in Kenya as well as that in England (Otike, 1997) and Ahmed and Batcha (2014), examined the existing status of legal services and sources to meet the needs of legal professionals in their countries. These studies used questionnaires and interviews to collect data from lawyers just as in the present study. One of the challenges noted in these studies was that when the lawyers do not
have the information sources in their own collections or from colleagues near them, given their
time constraints, access through the professional organizations would come in handy.

These studies all pointed to the fact that legal information sources are the main lifeline in the
profession; however, there may be barriers that affect this ease of access to the sources. These
may include among many others, the fact that the lawyers have little time to seek out
information, and even where they do seek these out, the electronic sources available may not
be user friendly to them. The current study investigated the situation in Swaziland. A study by
Wilkinson (2001) on information sources used by lawyers in problem solving found that
lawyers preferred informal sources when seeking information, adding that they preferred
sources of information internal to their organizations rather than external sources.

A study by Adewale and Mansor (2014) looked into information sources consulted by lawyers
with a view to bettering provision. This study concluded that lawyers need to access authorised
legal publications and literature or legal sources for their different tasks and roles. Cohen,
Manion, Morrison, and Wyse (2004: 52) supported by Otike and Matthews (2000: 243) pointed
out the three different situations where lawyers sought legal information sources for tasks. One
situation, for example that of a counsellor, needed to determine law on a particular legal issue
and on how the court would deal with the issue should it come to trial. In this instance, the
lawyer stands to offer advice to his client on the needed action. Another purpose would be
seeking those legal sources as an advocate supporting an appeal to persuade the court on the
applicable law. Thirdly, an advisor who needs to support a client for a proposed action. As
such, this study looked into whether lawyers in Swaziland have this important access to the
legal sources required. Adewale and Mansor (2014) found that there is low use of e-databases
and e-journals by lawyers. There is a need to look into the reasons for this conclusion and the
current study therefore did so with the Swazi lawyers.

Otike (1999) pointed out that lawyers’ information needs were also swayed by the information
sources available. It was seen that most lawyers would rather stick to detailed information
gotten from review articles in law journals, judgments in law reports, or issues raised in
textbooks. Other lawyers used brief and factual information which did not require much time
to consult. This involved case summaries, statutes, or judgment citations.

Some lawyers were found to use both kinds of information sources. In addition, all lawyers
were found to have personal collections (loose leaf, textbooks, law reports, government reports,
among others) for their quick reference. The most frequent source consulted was their
colleagues, before consulting either printed or electronic resources. As for academic lawyers; their use of law journals was very high, while some practicing lawyers did not have enough time to visit a law library for journals. Since this is the case, the present study looked into the access provided by the Law Society of Swaziland to satisfy this need in terms of time constraints.

Other studies that alluded to the fact that lawyers prefer personal libraries first as the point of reference include Lawal, Stilwell, Kuhn, and Underwood (2014), Thanuskodi (2010) and Nelson, Isom, and Simek (2006). However, this may not be sufficient to cater for the complexity of legal practice, hence the present research looked into ways to fill this gap. As a result, Otike and Matthews (2000:247) pointed out that the lawyers then seek assistance from the High Court or collections of other law firms. Given their time constraints due to busy schedules, lawyers may find this cumbersome and an alternative could be useful for Swaziland’s lawyers.

An important observation by Bhardwaj and Madhusudhan (2013:315) in investigating open access information sources and their use was that available legal information in open access resources was not organized, and this was a challenge to use by the lawyers. Knowledge of the existence of these open access resources was investigated with the Swazi lawyers and what provision was there from the Law Society of Swaziland. Further, information seeking in the online age showed the importance of information literacy because lawyers also need to be able to search for such sources (Kuhn, 2008; Lawal, 2012).

Thanuskodi (2010), in investigating the information-seeking behaviour of academic lawyers in India found that academic lawyers used IT-based library sources and facilities less frequently than printed sources. The lawyers actually preferred using personal resources rather than the digital law library resources, the reason being that they were not aware of the e-resources. However, Hinson, Ofori, and Atuguba (2007) noted that internet services were helpful to those who were connected. It suffices to say that their information behaviour will be influenced by their knowledge of available information sources for information needs.

Legal information sources are divided into primary and legal sources (Clinch, 2000). Primary sources are those sources which legal principles emanate from, and are usually those declared by authoritative official bodies like the legislature, which has the power to make and amend laws. Secondary sources are those that describe or comment on the law. They explain the meaning of the law and provide reference to the relevant primary sources of law (Lawal,
Stilwell, Kuhn, and Underwood, 2012). As mentioned earlier, Clinch (2000) notes that primary legal sources consist of several categories: legislation (statutes and regulations), and case law (the decisions of courts and administrative tribunals) and customary law. Secondary legal sources include legal textbooks, legal journals, dictionaries and encyclopaedias and are regarded as the starting point for legal study as they give a broad overview of the law. Lawyers need these kinds of sources for their day-to-day legal services. These sources should be available in information resource centres and libraries. The present study investigated the availability of such resources for lawyers in Swaziland.

Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi (2016) have argued that in Swaziland the legal information sources like statutes are difficult to find, especially the old laws. Even though the legislation is found in the government printers and the national library, it is not always easy and convenient for lawyers to access these due to their busy schedules. Dube, Magagula, and Nhlabatsi argued that even the costs of buying these are exorbitant in such a way that these prices turn away the information seekers due to their high prices. It is for this reason that the present research investigated how the LSS assists lawyers in accessing legal sources or could assist in such a function.

Langwenya (2013:13) argued that the state of affairs in the publication of legal information in Swaziland leaves a lot to be desired. Langwenya noted that there was poor production of published legal information from the courts and Ministry of Justice, including online information management systems for ease of access. It was concluded by Langwenya (2013) that there was a need to improve information management systems where resources can be invested in online publishing of legal information that can be easily accessible. The present study looked into how the Law Society of Swaziland could assist in this regard.

Haruna and Mabawonku (2001) investigated information needs and seeking behaviour of 361 Nigerian lawyers by administering a questionnaire with questions focusing on their information needs, the type of information sought and the type of sources used. They concluded that the type of resources such as law reports, journals, internet and factors affecting the utilization of these sources played a major role in the professional roles and legal service delivery by lawyers. The use of pre-defined categories for selecting these sources restricted the participants’ responses, thus the present study noted this and provided options for adding more sources as the lawyers deemed fit.
3.6 Professional organizations and legal information access

The legal profession worldwide has professional representative bodies of lawyers called law societies or associations. For instance, the Law Society of South Africa (Law Society of South Africa (LSSA), 2015) for South African lawyers and the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) (Law Society of Swaziland, 2012) for Swazi lawyers. These law societies further affiliate to higher professional law bodies regionally or internationally. For example, these societies are members of the International Bar Association (International Bar Association, 2016). They are also members regionally in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Lawyers Association (SADC Lawyers’ Association, 2017) and the African Bar Association (African Bar Association, 2017) in Africa.

Their main purpose is promoting justice through the legal profession, bringing together the professionals for support, and sharing of ideas. Since these legal professional organizations or law societies have a mandate to promote and support their membership in legal service provision, it follows therefore that they consequently need to promote access to quality legal information on all aspects of the legal field, more so in terms of assisting their membership with current and timeous access to legal information. As most have intimated, access to timely and appropriate information support is the foundation of every discipline and the legal profession is no exception (Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996; Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001; Jones, 2006).

However, some of these organizations have not developed fully-fledged provision of legal information centers to meet this mandate judging from what the researcher noted from their web sites. It is evident though that some have visible links and actual libraries to provide legal information access to their members. For example, the Law Society of England and Wales aims to “promote and support all solicitors, so they in turn can help their clients” (Wales, 2017). It has done this by establishing a private library that is available to all its members. Further, the KwaZulu-Natal Law Society in South Africa has a library website that “acts as an interface between the information needs of lawyers or the public and the legal resources” (KwaZulu-Natal Law Society, 2017). This is supported via a physical office, which lawyers have access to any time. A similar situation does not seem to be evident in Swaziland, hence the present study.
3.7 Information behaviour models

Models of information behaviour enable researchers to consider all probable variables when studying information behaviour (Case, 2007:334). According to Wilson (1981: 5), a model is “a framework for thinking about a problem and may evolve into a statement of relationships among theoretical propositions”. Bates (2005:3) pointed out that such models are useful in the “description and prediction stages” of problem solving, especially providing a logical overview of processes involved in particular actions (Nel, 2015: 37).

3.7.1 Wilson’s information behaviour models

This study uses Wilson’s general information seeking behaviour model. Wilson’s first model was published in 1981 and revised in 1996 and 1999. This modified model was used as the major framework underpinning the investigation of the information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland. However, other models that are of interest include those of Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain (1996) and Kuhlthau and Tama (2001) which were briefly discussed with the framework of this study.

What is useful about Wilson’s later models is that they emphasize the need to discover information seeking in context. This allows for conceptualization as an individual and social entity, which is more appropriate for lawyers in this case. The influence of the environment and work roles of the users are also acknowledged. Users are investigated from the perspective of their information needs, information seeking and information behaviour which allows for a description and explanation of user behaviour. Figure 2.5 in Chapter Two showed Wilson’s 1999 general model of information behaviour (Wilson, 1999: 251) which shows that information seeking behaviour can include other people through information exchange. The information that is seen as relevant may then be passed to others or used by that person. The present study has emphasised the need to explore information seeking behaviour in the setting of a specific group of information explorers.

The second graphical presentation of Wilson’s second model in Figure 2.3 in Chapter Two is a modification of Wilson’s 1981 model of information seeking behaviour (Wilson, 2005: 32) and depicts more of the environmental factors and barriers. It is used together with the later model above to complement and accommodate the aspects that were left out in the initial model. This model was seen as more appropriate by the researcher, more so because it has been argued that none of the models give a complete application without being complemented by the other.
Hence all were represented in this study. The 1981 second model of information seeking behaviour, which is also one of the most cited models in the field, focuses on information needs and information seeking, searching and use. These were combined within the goal directed problem solving process. The environment, role and physiological affective and cognitive needs of an information user were included in information seeking behaviour.

In 1996 a nonlinear model of information behaviour that focused on uncertainty as a motivation or information need was published by Wilson, Ford, Ellis, Foster, and later by Spink (2002) and then Spink and Cole (2006). It defines four stages: problem identification, problem definition, problem resolution and problem solution (Wilson, 2000:53). The information user is viewed in the context of the particular environment. This revised model proposed a cycle of information activities rising from the information need up to the information use phase. The various intervening conditions had a notable impact on information behaviour, and the mechanisms that were activated (Niedzwiedzka, 2003). Since Wilson’s models acknowledge the influence of the environment and work roles on one’s information seeking behaviour, it was best suited for this study. According to this model, a person’s role positions that person in a particular place in that social system. Such conditions create certain opportunities and barriers in terms of access to information (Niedzwiedzka, 2003). This was examined in terms of lawyers in the Swaziland legal environment.

Later, information seeking behaviour was considered to start with a perceived need, leading to formal or informal determination to approach information sources or services to find the needed information to address that need. In this instance, the user may consult other people through information exchange or may want to communicate the information with others. This is what lawyers are said to do as observed by Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) and Wilkinson (2001).

Prabha, Connaway, Olszewski, and Jenkins (2007) did a study addressing the satisfaction of information needs of users. It pointed out that the factors that influenced satisfied information needs include the objective or motivations of seeking the information; the features of the information needs, external variables that may influence the need (setting, context and situation); searching skills and the stage of the issue at hand (Prabha, Connaway, Olszewski, and Jenkins 2007:85). This was applied in the lawyer’s setting. Prabha, Connaway, Olszewski, and Jenkins’ study looked at the needs of faculty researchers and students of all disciplines.
using the role theory and rational choice in human information behaviour and found that users stopped looking for information when they found the information required.

The time constraint and human sources also contributed as factors. Weiler (2007) added that convenience is another important attribute when looking for information. Lawyers need much of this attribute. In the end, the information seeking process may come to completion either negatively or positively (Wilson, 1981, 1996) which may determine the next action of the information seeker. This may be either to start over again with a different approach if the outcome was negative or to solve the issue with the relevant information acquired.

3.7.2 Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain information seeking behaviour model (1996)

As mentioned in Chapter One, Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s model of 1996 is briefly discussed in this study. This is because of its relationship to some parts of the study as it was developed around the effects of work roles and tasks on the information behaviour of engineers, health care professionals and lawyers. A number of researchers used this model in studying other professionals, for instance, Bitso and Fourie (2011) with teachers and Du Preez (2007) with engineers.

This model acknowledged the effect of work roles and tasks on the information needs of the professional (Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain, 1996: 180), which included among others, the role of the service provider, administrator, manager, researcher and advisor as this study looked at with lawyers in Swaziland. This model shows the influence of demographics and frequency with which information is required for information needs (Landry, 2006: 1897). The present study investigated this stance in the study population. According to Case (2007), beliefs and attitudes of the professionals are not significant. It is pointed out that the sources of information can be formal or informal, internal or external and in any format (print or electronic).

This model also recognizes the significance of knowledge and personal experience of the professionals. Factors that were seen to affect professionals’ information awareness include accessibility of the source (in this study in Swaziland), costs involved, ease of using the source, quality and accuracy of the information, timeliness and trustworthiness and reliability of the source. The model uses feedback loops to accommodate opportunities to make use of other means of finding the needed information through other sources or channels. The most important component of this model in the present study is its acknowledgement of work roles and task, awareness of information needs and the sources of information, which are noted in
the data analysis of this study. A graphical presentation of Leckie’s model can be seen in Chapter Two, Figure 2.2.

3.7.3 Kuhlthau’s ISP model

Another significant model worth mentioning in this study is Kuhlthau’s ISP model of 1993, (2004:44) which has been applied to other information seeking research studies. This model incorporates the affective (feelings), cognitive (thoughts) and physical realms that involve the action taken by the information seeker (Kuhlthau, 1999, 1993). This model has been said to be universally applicable to any field and any user group (Weiler, 2007:47). However, its disadvantage is that it excludes factors involved in information seeking like information need and the use of the available resources of information. Kuhlthau and Tama (2001) developed this model when they tried to understand lawyers’ work in their study in order to inform design of a system for lawyers in different sized firms. It investigated the role mediators in legal information seeking and use play especially in terms of experience. It further identified information actions to address information needs such as initiation, selection, exploration, formulation, collection, presentation and assessment. Though the current study did not apply the model in it its entirety, it is discussed in terms of the selection and exploration stage of information related to information seeking behaviour of the lawyers in Swaziland.

Other studies that applied Wilson’s and Kuhlthau’s models with the mixed method approach, and questionnaire and interviews as data gathering tools, which the current study used, included Kuhn (2008) who looked into the importance of integrating information literacy and problem solving processes in studying law. Syvalahti and Katjihingua, (2012), Toteng (2010) and Majyambere (2015) studied students’ information seeking behaviour in different disciplines at academic institutions. As mentioned in Chapter One, earlier, no empirical study has been done on Swaziland, thus this study added valuable new knowledge to this area. Kuhlthau’s ISP model is presented in Chapter Two, Figure 2.1.

From the discussion of the different models above, the study selected more aspects of Wilson’s information behaviour models (1981-1999), while taking some additional parts of the Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain model (1996) and Kuhlthau’s ISP model into consideration to develop a theoretical framework to guide this study, which was discussed in Chapter Two.
3.8 Summary of the chapter

This chapter presented the literature review to reflect on similar studies conducted by scholars on information needs and seeking behaviour, especially that of lawyers. It is specifically intended to narrow down the discussion to legal information needs in Swaziland through the key research question underpinning this study as mentioned in Chapter One.

The literature review in this study discussed studies relating to information behaviour of the legal fraternity and highlighted the importance of efficient access to legal information by lawyers for legal service provision to their clients. Furthermore, gaps, challenges, and barriers lawyers face in accessing legal information were noted in terms of satisfying their information needs. The next chapter will outline the research methodology adopted by the study to investigate the research problem.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction
This chapter is a discussion of the research design and methods followed in order to obtain evidence to address the research question and sub-questions of this study. It outlines the philosophical underpinnings of different research methods, research paradigm, and research design. It further identifies the target population of the study, sampling and data collection procedures, data analysis strategies, validity and reliability of data collection instruments, ethical considerations as well as the pre-test of the study. The chapter ends with the techniques of analysis and validation of the empirical data and a summary of the chapter.

It has been pointed out that a research design offers a clear statement of the research methodology and the reasoning behind it (De Vos, 1998: 99; Pickard, 2012: 15; Schencul, 2012: 71). Sapsford and Jupp (2006) opine that a research design is a philosophical standpoint of a worldview that motivates and informs the style of any research. From another view, Creswell (2009); Collis and Hussey (2003); Leedy and Ormrod (2005: 12) assert that research methodology aims to drive the whole research project and general approach followed by the researcher. According to Blaikie (2010: 8), it is directed at showing the methods or procedures that are systematically used to produce new knowledge through gathering data and analysing to obtain a solution to solve a particular problem. Kothari (2004: 2) saw it as a “science of studying how a study would be carried out”. In accord with Ihuah and Eaton (2013: 935) it can be construed from this that the philosophical world view is very important to the meaning of research methodology.

It is asserted further that research methodology is the procedure by which one goes about their work of describing, explaining and predicting incidences in the particular field (Walliman, 2011: 7). Adam and Schraveldt (1995) and Fombad (2008: 152) pointed out that methodology can be termed as “the application of scientific procedures towards acquiring answers to a wide variety of research questions.” Also, Greene, Kreider and Mayer (2004) concur that this process is more about a researcher’s outlook to and understanding of research and the strategy he or she decides on using to answer the research questions. This can be dubbed as developing a work plan of the researcher to deal with research methods and consider the logic behind the particular methods chosen in the context of the research study (Manyerere, 2015: 136). This further explains why a particular method and technique is used as opposed to another, so that
the researcher and other scholars in the same field (Gupta and Gupta, 2011) can evaluate the results acquired.

On another note, Silverman (2013: 123) opined that research methods can be said to refer to data collection tools and techniques which are used in the whole exercise of researching a particular problem. In gathering such data Kumar (2011) asserts that it is done in a way of systematically questioning and observing information in order to find answers that would assist in more effective professional services, such results then give a solution.

Kumar (2009: 2) further pointed out that all professions embark on research, which can be depicted as not only a set of skills, but also a way of thinking through examining the different aspects of the work done in a critical way. Creswell (2009: 233) also concurred that research is a “systematic inquiry into a particular problem used to describe, explain, predict or control some observed phenomenon - the research topic” with the intention of finding a solution through collection of data, analysis of the same and further interpreting that relevant data. Creswell, just like Silverman (2013) also further posits that research methodology involves the technique used in the data collection, analysis and interpretation proposed by the researcher in their study. From these explanations, it can be concluded that research can be termed as a “systematic way of finding answers to questions and a scientific way of attaining the accuracy of a given situation” (Olorunfemi, 2014: 89). Consequently, research methodologies according to Kothari (2004:5) can be categorised into two major approaches, which are quantitative and qualitative approaches. These can be used together in the same research and given a new term called ‘mixed methods approach’ Creswell (2003), which this study employed.

Earlier studies with similar issues motivated the development of this research with Swaziland in particular. The purpose of this study is to investigate lawyers’ information needs, information seeking behaviour and access to legal information in Swaziland. In designing the questionnaire, the ideas for the questions considered earlier studies. The intention was specifically to examine the existing situation in legal information services and sources, how their information needs are being met and the role played by the Law Society of Swaziland in meeting their needs.

Stilwell (2010) submits that there has been a significant increase in empirical studies conducted about the subject of information seeking behaviour and information needs between the 1980s and 2010. These studies discussed the theoretical frameworks and methods used in the research of this topic. It is however of note that most were done on groups of users in the different
subject fields with none of them done in Swaziland on the legal information services for lawyers. The studies reviewed by Stilwell in her research are articles in journals and excluding theses and dissertations. According to Wilson (2005a), information seeking concern the seeking and identification of the relevant information for a particular task or research in a daily life situation in any package. The present study concentrated on access in meeting the needs of the lawyers under study.

It ought to address the following specific research questions:

- What were the information needs of the lawyers in Swaziland?
- How did the lawyers in Swaziland access and use legal information they need?
- What information resources did the lawyers in Swaziland use?
- What were the factors affecting lawyers’ information needs in Swaziland?
- What strategies could be adopted to overcome any challenges faced in satisfying lawyers’ information needs in Swaziland?

4.2 Research paradigm

Major types of research paradigms are noted, and these are: positivism (quantitative), interpretive social research (qualitative), and critical social research and pragmatism. Critical social research focuses on the contest, conflict and contradictions in society, for example, issues of gender relations, inequality or women emancipation; racism; class; cultural and religious values; political issues; definition of intelligence (Maree, 2011:62). Of these, the first two are related more to quantitative and qualitative social research, while pragmatism is more related to the practical experience of the researcher, hence these are used in the research.

A research paradigm is crucial in the selection of a research topic at any given time (Creswell, 2003). It is said to be a fixed rationale of assumptions about fundamental aspects of actuality that give rise to a particular worldview (Maree, 2011: 47); Creswell, 2009: 6). According to Kuhn (1970), a paradigm helps a researcher to understand the expectations of people in a social world in terms of identifying what makes real problems and investigates solutions as well as measures those solutions to the problems. It refers to the knowledge claims of scholars that embark on a project with certain expectations on how and what will be confirmed from a study in the course of answering the questions (Creswell, 2003: 6).

Paradigms identified include post positivism, constructivism, transformative and pragmatism (Ryan, 2006); and these are briefly discussed below. From these paradigms, the pragmatism
paradigm was proposed as the best for the present research. This is in spite of the fact that it is perceived as lacking in terms of providing an adequate rationale for mixed methods research (Hall, 2013). The researcher considered and examined the debates over the “rationale for combining previously incompatible methodologies” and paradigms involved (Hall, 2013: 1).

Amidst this uncertainty in terms of using the paradigms under the different methodologies, studies have emerged using this route. Traditionally a single paradigm was used for each of the methods. It has been suggested that using one paradigm with two methods at the same time to yield both qualitative and quantitative data (Greene, 2006) is possible through using the ‘single paradigm approach’. According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) approaches to solving the issue of the application of a single paradigm for incompatible methodology was dealt with through the introduction of three categories. These are a paradigmatic stance, multiple paradigm approach and single paradigm approach (Hall, 2013).

From among these, the latter was adopted for the present study as it allows the integration of the research findings and nullifies the conflict in social research (Hall, 2013, 3). It was noted that mixed methods under a single paradigm is and can be adequate to provide a justification for mixed methods research (Hall, 2013), hence the present study adopted this paradigm. This paradigm is concerned with what works best. Others have opined that paradigms represent the thoughts one has about the world and that the activities that happen and are embarked on, cannot occur without a paradigm (Creswell, 2009:48). Creswell (1994) summed it up, when he argued that a paradigm is “a whole framework of beliefs, values or methods within which [a] researcher’s work takes place.”

A research paradigm therefore, expresses the significant expectations about major aspects of reality that give rise to a particular worldview (Olorunfemi, 2014). Dash (2005) offered that a research paradigm is a “theoretical assemblage of beliefs that bring about an approach to data collection”. Neumann (2011: 91) is of the view that the pattern, or model, shared assumptions, or an entire system of thinking about some aspect of the world is what a paradigm is about. Hall (2013: 5) concluded that the issue of paradigms in mixed method research is a great concern for researchers, and the importance of justifying the use of mixed method research is determined by the appropriate paradigm. From the three approaches to paradigm choice that were coined under social research, (paradigmatic, multiple and single approaches), the latter is the one that is said to be defensible for the mixed methods research as it is seen to be more supportive as it solves practical problems in the real world.
4.2.1 Dominant research paradigms

The dominant paradigm in information behaviour is qualitative and interpretive, while the dominant paradigm for information retrieval is positivist (Case, 2012). Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert (2006) in their review of major studies that focus on the concepts of information behaviour, needs, seeking and use argue for taking the context of information behaviour into account as the foundation for any research in this field. The positivist paradigm is applied mostly to quantitative research rather than qualitative; while the interpretivism paradigm is more applicable in qualitative research (Stilwell, 2010). The present study used both methodologies, hence the need for a paradigm that applies both.

Pragmatism is the one associated more with the combination of the two as it is said to “side step the contentious issues of truth and reality” (Feizler, 2010: 8). Ihuah and Eaton (2013: 941) adds that it does away with engaging in insignificant issues instead of truth and reality which make it ‘intuitively appealing’ (Creswell, 2009; Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003). Since pragmatism is said to reject the distinction between realism and anti-realism, which has been the core of debates about positivism versus interpretivism in the social sciences, it fits well with the present study as it is multi-purpose in nature. As such it allowed questions to be addressed within both the quantitative and qualitative approach to the research design and methodology (Ihuah and Eaton, 2013). Additionally, the pragmatic approach accommodates the different perceptions of issues for the different scenarios so as to allow different views and interpretations of the situations. The present study was aligned to this paradigm, with the view of investigating access to legal information for lawyers in Swaziland to meet their information needs.

Ikoja-Odongo and Mostert (2006), in their review of major studies that focus on the concepts of information behaviour, needs, seeking and use, reiterated the importance of taking the context of information behaviour into account as the foundation of the relevant paradigm. According to Wilson (2005:1) information seeking is:

“is concerned with the discovery of the appropriate information for tasks, research, everyday life, etc., regardless of the way information is packaged – for example, more information is communicated by word of mouth than is ever retrieved from databases”(Wilson, 2005: 1).

Epistemologically, the pragmatic research approach gives a better justification and rationale for combining methods and the awareness of getting tentative answers to research questions.
for mixing approaches and methods in a single study (Johnson, Onwuegbuezie, and Turner, 2007). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) posited that qualitative research’s focus is multi-methodological. It involves an interpretative, realistic approach to its subject. This means that a qualitative research approach studies things in their natural settings or environment, attempting to make sense of or interpret occurrences in terms of the ‘meanings’ people bring to them. It is noted that qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of experiential or pragmatic materials, case study, personal experience, introspective, life story interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts that describe routine and problematic moments and meaning in individuals’ lives.

On the other hand, Creswell (1994) posits that it is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions that explore a social or human problem.” The scholar constructs a composite, whole picture, analyses the words, reports thorough insights of informants, and conducts the study in a natural situation.

For these reasons, the pragmatism paradigm was adopted as it “applies to mixed methods research in that inquirers draw liberally from both quantitative and qualitative assumptions” (Creswell, 2003: 12). Pragmatism was also adopted on the basis that it is a problem-solving paradigm that identifies the problem by the use of multiple approaches. It is also not a rigid ideology, but changes to apply and accommodate what works best in research to give the truthful and understandable solution to a problem.

4.3 Research methods

Research methods are the actual tools that are used in answering specific questions in the quest to solve different scientific problems (Creswell, 2009). According to Nkomo (2009: 41), these should not be taken to be the same as research methodology. Davies (2007: 85) and Sarantakos (1997: 34) have argued that these two concepts seem to be confused by some researchers. Neumann (2006) explains the contrast between the two when he posits that though these seem the same, methodology is actually broader and covers method within it. Leedy and Ormrod (2014:4) concur that research methodology, though covering the broader aspect of research, gives direction to a study through guiding the decisions on the collection of data, processes of analysing the same and consequently, good findings. According to Sonnewald (2007), the final goal of a research method lies in providing a valid and reliable way of collecting the data that contributes best in answering the research questions or providing an understanding of issues of interest (Wilson and Allen, 1999; Vakkari, Savolainen, and Dervin, 1997).
Consequently, the present study used the interview and questionnaire survey methods to collect the data about the information needs and behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland. Using these two data gathering tools was advantageous because, as it has been pointed out, they help generate quantitative data useable in the analysis of statistical data (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011). At the same time, interviews enabled the researcher to ask additional questions from the participants and further obtain the perspectives from the population of lawyers.

It is a given fact that though the data provided from the survey are analysable, it does not properly explain or capture the complexity of particular situations (Sapsford, 2007). Furthermore, the administering of semi structured interviews may encounter problems in gaining access to the participants for one reason or another. The fact that it is time consuming does not encourage positive participation by the study participants because of their busy schedules (Sonnewald and Wildemuth, 2001: 2). However, using both the questionnaire and interviews was advantageous for this study because these helped in the confirmation of responses from each group of participants. Furthermore, it helped in terms of objective ways of comparing responses over different groups, times and places thus permitting theoretical propositions to be tested in an objective manner (Blaikie, 2010).

Research methodology falls into two broad fundamental categories of quantitative and qualitative research (Leedy and Ormrod, 2014:76; Pickard 2012:13). The combination of these two research methodologies makes for a mixed methods research (Pickard: 2012:12) which is getting more popular with scholars who seek more comprehensive approaches to deal with different aspects of research (Cresswell, 2014 ; Leedy and Ormrod, 2014). Yin (2013) concurred and argued that indeed using mixed methods research is actually better in addressing the more complicated questions for aspects under investigation. A mixed method approach was reported by different scholars on studies on information needs which include a study by Al-Suqri (2011); Connaway, Dickey, and Radford (2011) and Wilson and Tenopir (2008).

The present study followed the mixed methods approach in this exploratory study. It used the quantitative approach to collect information on the background of the lawyers in connection with their information seeking behaviour, information needs and the way in which they access legal information in meeting the demands of their roles in the legal profession. A qualitative approach was used to get in-depth truths and compare the responses obtained from the population in connection with their information needs, information access and behaviour.
4.4 Research design

Generally, a research design denotes the complete plan that one elects to integrate the different components of a study in an articulate and coherent manner, thereby, ensuring that the research problem will be effectively addressed (De Vaus, 2001). According to Pickard (2012: 15), research designs usually provide a distinct statement of the research methodology and the basis for it. It constitutes the outline for the collection, methodology, measurement, and analysis of data as well as decisions about the problem under study (Hofstee, 2006). It can be referred to as the logical sequence connecting the empirical data to the research questions and research conclusion (Olorunfemi, 2014). Consequently, the research design actually shapes and guides the decisions in all aspects of the study (Nel, 2015: 74). Johnson and Christensen (2012: 593) also concurred that the aims and objectives of the research will be achieved and seen through the research design.

The present study was meant to provide an understanding of the information needs and information behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland and further investigated how these needs are met in terms of access through their professional organization, the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS). In order to address these issues, the first step was to decide on the best theoretical perspective or research methodology. This is because the latter provides direction to the whole study (Leedy and Ormrod, 2014: 4). It helps in acquiring the data, the method, and the analysing processes in order to reach acceptable findings to resolve the research problem. Leedy and Ormrod (2014: 13) and Pickard, (2007) have also pointed out that the two broad significant categories involved here are quantitative and qualitative research. Further, that a third one resulting from the combination of these two is the mixed method research, which allows for an exploratory description and explanation of each method so as to obtain accurate results (Creswell, 2013). This study therefore adopted mixed methods.

A rise in the use of the mixed method research according to Creswell (2013) and Leedy and Ormrod (2014: 268) has been witnessed in studies that needed more wide-ranging approaches to deal with different facets. As a result, the same was used in the collection of data and data analysis in this study. Since the study focused on obtaining quantitative and qualitative information concerning the information seeking behaviour of lawyers, it adopted a survey method with interviews and self-administered questionnaire.

Surveys are usually concerned with collecting data directly from the participants (Babbie and Mouton, 2001), as was done in this study. Survey research can be said to be an environmental
scan, since it is a research strategy where data is collected from all or part of the population to assess the relative incidence, distribution and interrelation of naturally occurring variables (Hafner, 1998; Powell and Connaway, 2004). Further, Babbie (2011: 277) also pointed out that surveys involve three main steps, which are questionnaire production, sample selection, and data assemblage through either self-administered questionnaires or interviewing. The present study followed these steps in both the interviews and self-administered questionnaires as data collection techniques.

In survey research, a sample of respondents from the population is selected and a standardized questionnaire is administered to them. Such a questionnaire or survey can be a written document meant to be completed by the respondent under survey, manual questionnaire, face-to-face interview or telephonic interview (Creswell, 2013). The present study used a survey research questionnaire to obtain data from lawyers who were the main focus of the study and a face-to-face interview with the Law Society of Swaziland executive officials (LSE) as well as librarians from four libraries that were known to offer legal materials in their collections.

Surveys, as a data gathering technique, are widely used in the field and Barbour (2008: 158) recommends that a proper research design based upon the nature of the study should be selected. In this case, survey design was seen as most suitable and useful in that this study was not experimental (Maree and Pietersen, 2010: 152). According to Majyambere (2014) experimental studies are said to formulate hypotheses as opined by Walliman (2011: 11), and a hypothesis is what is expected should a theory under study be true (Kalof, Dan, and Dietz, 2008: 16). The present study had no intention of proving a hypotheses or predicting a theory. Instead, it intended to identify and describe the information needs and information behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland and how the needs were met in terms of access. Blaikie (2010:5) pointed out that experimental research collects data at different times, which this study did not, as it collected data at a single point in time.

Survey research was used as a single method combining quantitative and qualitative methods to reflect a descriptive approach (Edmonds and Kennedy, 2013: 107). According to Best and Kahn (2006) survey research is one mechanism that combines these two methods even though studies under survey are believed to be quantitative research in design. In spite of this premise, it is concluded that they can be successfully used in qualitative research as well, just like in the present study. This is so that the researcher could gain an in-depth understanding of the
lawyers’ information needs, information sources and the use of acquired information in addition to their information behaviour from the perspective of the Law Society.

McNeill and Chapman (2005: 28) expressed the fact that descriptive studies collectively employ questionnaires and recorded interviews, which the present study employed to provide data to answer the research questions. Survey research has further been described as the valuation of the status of something, beliefs and opinions and attitudes through a questionnaire or interview from an identified population (McMillan and Schumacher, 2001: 601). The present study adopted the same as it used both a questionnaire and interviews to obtain an in-depth understanding of the information behaviour of a population group (Maxwell, 2012: 64), which in this case were the lawyers.

4.4.1 Justification of the survey research method

The present study opted for the survey research method because of its fitness for the purpose mainly. In addition, it was seen as an advanced tool that provided an opportunity to use the mixed method approach for data collection (Wooley, 2009). It is said to be one of the most common types of quantitative methods in social research. According to Olorunfemi (2014: 94), using the survey research design presents advantages in terms of the provision of a wide range of data collection, as it requires the use of different forms of data collection. Examples are case studies, observation and surveys. A survey method is used in collecting information from a large population that could not be easily be done through other methods and it illustrates people’s experience like the lawyers in this case.

The survey method was used for the present study because it is relatively less costly for the researcher to administer. In fact, the survey research design is considered the most appropriate in this study because it is fast, straight forward and less expensive than other methods as the data tool was self-administered to the research participants. It further enables one to generalize from a small group to a large group from which the sub-group was selected. It also allowed a description of the characteristics of the large population (lawyers in this case) and consequently, the large sample makes the results statistically significant for analysis of multiple variables. A survey also allows for flexibility of the questions asked as well as in terms of the face-to-face interviews conducted.

A survey according to Polit and Hungler (1999) is used to obtain information from groups of people on the prevalence, the distribution, and/or the interrelationships between variables
within these groups. Even though survey research was chosen for the present study for its benefits, Wooley (2009) argued that its weakness in terms of the truthfulness of respondents during the interview is not guaranteed. It is said respondents usually tell the researcher what they think the researcher wants to hear, and further, some participants may refuse to give answers from a personal perspective.

A summary of some of the disadvantages according to Fowler (2014) are that the standardization forces the questions to be generally phrased such that it is possible to exclude the most suitable questions for respondents and further that at times there can be inflexibility during data collection where a need to change arises. Fowler also points out that a large sample of the selected respondents also has to be acquired, which could be a disadvantage for the researcher if there is a poor response rate for example. However, despite such disadvantages, the survey research method remains the best suited due to the nature of this study.

4.5 Research approaches

Creswell (2014: 31) simplified the meaning of research approaches by defining it as “the plans and procedure that span steps from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection, analysis and interpretation”. He points out that the plan requires decisions to be taken by the researcher involving the research design (that is, the philosophical assumptions of the researcher and procedures), and the specific research methods of the data collection, analysis and interpretation. Further, he asserts that the researcher should remember that the approach also depends on the nature of the research problem, personal experience and the audience of the study.

As mentioned earlier, there are three research approaches in social research, and these are qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches (Du Plooy-Cilliers and Bezuidenhout, 2014; Stangor, 2015). Apparently, these approaches should not be taken as discreet as they appear because according to Creswell, “they are not as that rigid, distinct, polar or dichotomies” but embody diverse ends of a scope (Creswell, 2014: 32). It is said that the mixed method is the middleman or intermediary of the two as it incorporates both approaches. Generally, the qualitative approach is framed in words as opposed to numbers used in quantitative approach. This section will therefore provide a more detailed discussion of these approaches.

The present study applied both the quantitative and qualitative research methods to acquire data from the population in order to improve accuracy of collected data. This helped in ensuring
that the findings on lawyers from Swaziland were generalizable. Scholars like Sapsford (2007) and Sarantakos (1997) classified research into different forms based on specific purposes, which include basic research, a descriptive form meant to understand and explain a phenomenon with the intention of increasing and advancing a knowledge base. Another is applied research, which is meant to provide information that could be applied in order to help people understand and control their environment. The latter is more prescriptive as it seeks to offer potential solutions to given problems. The present study straddles the two forms as it intended to add to the knowledge base on information needs of lawyers in Swaziland and further offer possible solutions to deal with the needs of lawyers through their professional organization.

4.5.1 Qualitative research approach

Qualitative research is concerned with exploring and understanding the meaning that people put to a certain social or human problem (Creswell, 2014) and is said to be inductive and covers interpretive practices (Creswell, 2009; Silverman, 2000; Braun and Clarke, 2013). Silverman (2000: 1) reiterates that qualitative research has a way of avoiding or downplaying statistical techniques and mechanics of quantitative methods as it is meant to “understand social life and the meaning people attach to everyday life” (Poggenpoel, Myburg, and Van der Linde, 2001: 409). Consequently, the emphasis is on the worldview of the participants (Du Plooy-Cilliers and Bezuidenhout, 2014).

According to Patton (1982: 5) qualitative research consist of detailed descriptions of situations, events, people, interactions and observed behaviours from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs and thoughts, excerpts or entire passages from documents. Stangor (2011:15) adds that this data can be collected through audio or video recordings and field notes. It is pointed out further that such data is collected through open-ended narrative, which rejects attempts to fit activities of organizations, or standardised categories as questionnaires or tests do (Otike, 1997: 70). Its advantages include the fact that it allows an in-depth exploration. It allows one to provide more details that result to rich information from a smaller number of people. It also increases the understanding of situations under study and reduces generalization.

According to Barbour (2008), it is flexible, accessible and revealing concerning significant aspects of human behaviour. Its disadvantage is the fact that it is time consuming and may have traits of bias and subjectivity, and thus may not be completely reliable (Cresswell, 2014). Given
the nature of the information being sought and the positive aspects of the qualitative method, interviews were used to collect data from the librarians and Law Society executive.

4.5.2 Quantitative research approach

Quantitative research is seen as one approach that tests the objective theories by examining the relationships among variables, which can be measured with particular instruments resulting in data that is analysed using statistical procedures (Creswell, 2014, 32). According to Connaway and Powell (2010: 3), this approach involves a fairly structured data collection procedure and the quantification and measurement of the concepts being studied. The purpose for this approach is mostly to explain, predict, control or conform human behaviour or even to validate a hypothesis (Leedy and Ormrod, 2014), for example experimental, quasi-experimental and statistical-analytical studies.

One of the main major differences between qualitative and quantitative research is the approach used during the data collection stage (Ingwersen and Jarvelin, 2005: 250). For instance, quantitative research measures the cause and effect as well as tests the theories, while the qualitative method is richer, deeper and more dynamic with a more holistic focus (Du Plooy-Cilliers and Bezuidenhout, 2014; Connaway and Powell, 2010; Leedy and Ormrod, 2014).

Case (2012) posits that earlier studies in the human information behaviour field were quantitative which however have shifted in favour of the qualitative approach with the view to address human behaviour that is more complex. Wang (1999: 90) submitted that the use of more than one research approach in the same study enhances the inclusion of complex issues for triangulation or addressing exploratory issues. Tenopir (2003: 16) who argued that mixed methods enable researchers to form dependable understandings of information behaviour further asserted this idea. Below, Table 4.1 gives a summary of the differences between qualitative and quantitative research comparatively.

Even though quantitative research appears to be more structured, objective and clear-cut than qualitative research, it was seen as less flexible with less room to allow the researcher to look into issues in an in-depth and detailed manner, which was necessary for this study. On the other hand, the interaction with the participants in qualitative research yielded more context and rich descriptions, as well as allowed a more flexible approach. In addition, the data that was numerical in nature was summarized and interpreted statistically; hence using both was beneficial. According to De Vos (1998), this approach is the mixed methodology design mode,
which is discussed below. The present study used one aspect of the quantitative approach which is the self-administered questionnaire as a data collection tool to get data from the lawyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative research</th>
<th>Qualitative research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collects data in the form of numbers</td>
<td>Collects data in the form of written and spoken language and observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data portrayed as objective, precise and reliable</td>
<td>Data portrayed as rich, deep, valid and subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses statistical types of data analysis</td>
<td>Analyses data by identifying and categorising themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided by theories and prior research findings</td>
<td>Not all qualitative research is theory-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins with a series of predetermined categories, embodied in standardised quantitative measures to make broad and general comparisons</td>
<td>Allows the researcher to study selected issues in depth, in detail and with openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose is to explain, predict or control phenomena</td>
<td>Purpose is to describe and understand phenomena from the perspective of the participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible contact between researcher and participant – therefore more impersonal and objective</td>
<td>Researcher part of the reality – therefore not completely objective and value-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More structured</td>
<td>More flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes a more nomothetic approach (investigating large groups and making general conclusions regarding the whole group)</td>
<td>Takes a more idiographic approach (investigating individuals in person to achieve a unique understanding of them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses heavily on reliability</td>
<td>Focuses heavily on validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested when the research question is more confirmatory or predictive</td>
<td>Suggested when the research question is more exploratory and interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also called the traditional, experimental or positivist approach</td>
<td>Also called the interpretative, constructivist or post-positivist approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nel (2015: 76)

4.5.3 Mixed method research approach

The mixed methods research approach is said to have emerged in the 1980’s (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003: 657), and combines both qualitative and quantitative traits which was best for this study premised on what works (pragmatist approach). In a mixed methods approach, the inquiry is based upon the assumption that collecting diverse types of data is better in providing a more complete understanding of a research problem than either qualitative or quantitative
data alone (Creswell, 2014: 48). Such studies usually begin with a broad survey as this present study did, in order to generalize the results to the population. This was then followed by qualitative semi-structured or open ended interviews to collect views from the participants so as to assist in explaining the initial quantitative survey (Creswell, 2014).

In short, this study used the mixed method approach incorporating both qualitative and quantitative approaches. It has been pointed out that this approach enables researchers to obtain a variety of information on the same issue so as to do away with the deficiencies that come with one method (Majyambere and Hoskins, 2015), through closing the gaps in the data collected and ensuring the reduction of pre-existing assumptions of the researcher (Bulsara, 2014). Creswell, Fetters, and Ivankova (2004) pointed out that using a mixed method approach yields a better analysis and complements both the quantitative and qualitative approaches. This is in line with the previous studies in information seeking behaviour that have used the mixed method approach (Otike and Matthews 2000; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura 2010; Wilkinson, 2001; Majyambere and Hoskins 2015; Lawal, Stilwell, Kuhn, and Underwood 2014; Al-Suqri 2011, Wilson and Tenopir 2008). These studies employed in-depth interviews and questionnaires. Babbie (2011: 243-4) noted that surveys employ the use of questionnaire and or interviews which assist in eliciting useful information for analysis.

As mentioned earlier, the mixed method approach involves having both a quantitative design and qualitative design or methods (Pickard, 2012: 14). According to Creswell (2013); Leedy and Ormrod (2014: 268) the use of mixed methods research has increased as it has been applied in more and more studies that require more comprehensive approaches in addressing different aspects. A mixed design is the best approach if the study requires both quantitative and qualitative data to address the problem statement. However, it is argued that mixed design studies take significantly more time, more resources, and require the researcher to develop expertise in qualitative analysis techniques and quantitative analysis techniques (Wooley, 2009). As known, qualitative studies can use numbers, counts and even descriptive statistics, but using these numbers does not mean the study has to be quantitative or use mixed methods (Collis and Hussey, 2003).

It is posited that a research problem is supposed to define the research approach and methods adopted. Quantitative research is said to be more structured, objective, and reliable than qualitative research, however, it is not flexible enough to allow the researcher to look into all issues of human behaviour in much detail and as in-depth as necessary for a study. This is
covered in qualitative research. In interaction with the participants qualitatively in research, the data collected has more value and a richer context (Du Plooy-Cilliers and Bezuidenhout, 2014; Sapsford, 2007). As a result, some of the data collected in this research employed this approach while employing the quantitative approach to make up for the aspect lacking with the qualitative approach. Since this study anticipated data that was also numerical in nature in order to make better sense from it, the data needed to be interpreted by means of statistics and graphs; hence, the quantitative approach was adopted as well.

It has been argued that a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches may be necessary in a single study (Poggenpoel, Myburg, and Van der Linde, 2001) which may need sophisticated knowledge of both perspectives, so adds complexity to a design. This is because it utilizes the positive aspects of both the qualitative and quantitative approaches (De Vos (1998: 361). As a result, Leedy and Ormrod (2014:100), Conaway, and Powell (2010) concur that, this premise gives a clearer picture of a particular phenomenon in the changing environment of the LIS field. Fidel (2008: 265) concluded that the value of a study is enhanced when there is a counterbalance or compensation for the limitations of two approaches through mixing the methods from each approach.

It is further propounded that using both research approaches and the mixed method approach in the same study assists in addressing the same research question and helps in dealing with unanticipated outcomes (Leedy and Ormrod, 2014). Scholars like Creswell (2013), Pickard (2012) and Yin (2013) agree that the use of a mixed methods approach addresses the more complicated questions. According to Morgan, (1996; 129) quoted in Olorunfemi (2014) who also used mixed methods research in her study of lawyers, said that research that is conducted through using only one method in studying human behaviour is likely to be unable to “achieve more comprehensive results.” Johnson and Christensen (2012; 428) alluded to the same sentiments.

4.5.3.1 Justification of mixed methods research approach

The mixed method approach was applied in the present study in order to address different facets of the research study. A quantitative approach was used to collect information on the background of the search participants in terms of aspects regarding their information seeking behaviour, information use and information sources. This data is more general and measurable and involve frequencies, trends and numbers. It can be organized into categories, summarised
and interpreted through graphical presentation and descriptive statistics to allow for the drawing of patterns, interrelationship and meaning of the data. In addition, the qualitative approach was used to obtain a more in-depth understanding of the participants and their information needs and the successes and shortcomings in accessing legal information in Swaziland.

The study applied the mixed method approach even though it is said to create challenges in terms of the triangulation process as requires knowledge and skills of qualitative and quantitative approaches; ample time and resources to ensure correct data collection and truthful data analysis (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011:14). Good listening and interpreting of data from the interviews (Terre Blanche, Kelly, and Durrheim, 2006: 276) was undertaken as the researcher undertook the interviews herself.

Through the mixed research approach, the study applied methodological triangulation where both the qualitative and quantitative techniques were employed. This helped in the sense that the weaknesses of a single method are compensated through the counter-balancing strength of the other (Yin, 2013) as it provides a bridge between the two methods. Therefore, triangulation achieves both depth and generalization.

4.6 Population of study

Electing the actual source of the data is important in all quantitative and qualitative studies. This is called sampling and it is alleged that sampling is indispensable in instigating the process of selecting actual data sources from a large set of possibilities, which in this case is the population of lawyers (Antwi, 2015: 28). Population according to Babbie and Mouton (2001: 173) in Du Plooy-Cilliers and Bezuidenhout (2014) is “the theoretically specified aggregation of study elements.” It was asserted that a population in a study refers to any group of persons, objects, institutions, or even units, which may be collective or have at least one common characteristic (Busha and Harter, 1980: 57; Biemer and Lyberg, 2003: 29; Fink, 2010: 63). It is further pointed out that a population consists of all possible persons, objects or even events that constitutes a known whole (Antwi, 2015: 28).

It is rightly posited that it is generally not feasible or naturally practical to study a whole population in any given study (Kadam and Bhalerao, 2010). Therefore, there is need to select a portion of that population that can adequately represent the population from which it is drawn. For this reason, sampling cannot be over emphasised.
Sampling population in a study is a significant part of a research in that it assists in the identification of a representative fragment of the population under study (Sapsford, 2007). The sample consequently is about the section of the population from which the data is collected (Otike, 1997: 77). In the present case, the population were the private lawyers in law firms – as opposed to government or parastatals or companies -in Swaziland.

The other branches of the legal profession in Swaziland such as judges and magistrates, legal academics at the University of Swaziland, lawyers in the Ministry of Justice, and lawyers in parastatals did not constitute part of the target population. This is because including all of them would have been too big a sample for the study, yet a smaller sample could be generalizable to apply to them as well. Further, one of the objectives of the study was to determine how the Law Society of Swaziland serves private lawyers in terms of legal information access, thus the excluded ones did not need much of the legal information as they do not practice.

4.7 Sampling technique

As mentioned earlier, the sampling technique for the present study was the census sampling which is normally used for smaller populations because all the units are involved in the study (Sapsford R., 2007). In this case all the private practicing lawyers who are members of the LSE were included in the study. The target population was identified from a list provided by the Law Society of Swaziland consisting of registered private lawyers in law firms as at April 2017.

In the present study, attempts were made to involve all members of the LSE (who are generally all lawyers of Swaziland duly admitted to practice at the High Court of Swaziland as per the Legal Practitioners’ Act of 1964 (Swaziland Government, 1964) (see Chapter 1, section 1.1). Also included were members of the Law Society of Swaziland executive (LSE) as officials of this professional group, and librarians or library staff responsible for law collections as information providers in law libraries where lawyers were likely to obtain legal information sources in the country.

It was visualized that the involvement of these categories of the population would assist in providing a variety of data, or balanced information pertaining to the lawyers’ information needs, information behaviours and challenges they face in their quest for legal information. Since members of each category or specialty are found almost countrywide, their representation was bound to provide a variety of contributions reflecting the situation in the respective areas.
4.7.1 Sample size and composition

Sample size is an important aspect because of its role in assisting in securing reliability of the resultant study (Sapsford, 2007). It is common cause that the larger the population size, the more representative it will be, which helps in “limiting the influence of outliers or extreme observations” (Unite for Sight, 2015). The study was conducted in Swaziland. Private lawyers in the different regions, namely; Hhohho, Manzini, Lubombo and Shiselweni who were practicing in the all courts of Swaziland were investigated in the study as members of the Law Society of Swaziland.

These private lawyers were chosen for this study because they are involved in directly serving the private citizens in the promotion of justice and protection of rights among themselves as citizens and between the state and citizens as opposed to those who work in the civil service and serve the state or even those working for non-governmental organizations or parastatals. Thus the Law Society of Swaziland as their main professional body was also assessed in terms of ensuring access to timely and accurate legal information resources.

The main reason for selecting lawyers from the whole country for the study was to obtain as ideal a community as possible in order to reflect the differences in information needs and behaviour. A study covering the whole country was necessary for this study; hence, the survey design was used.

As mentioned earlier, the list of private practicing lawyers from the Law Society of Swaziland was used as the sampling framework. It should be noted that the distribution of lawyers in the four regions is not static as a high concentration of lawyers was found in the country’s two main industrial regions, that is, Hhohho and Manzini where the major businesses are located. In order for a good representation for representivity, the researcher opted to ensure that all regions were included in the sample, thus the number of lawyers from each region was considered. The LSE and librarians from relevant libraries were another part of the population for this study, and were identified from the four regions respectively.

Consequently, the sample size for this survey was 170 private lawyers registered with the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS). For the interviews, nine (9) executive officials from the LSS and seven (7) librarians participated.

Table 4.2 below shows the distribution of the population for the study. From the librarians included, four (4) who were responsible for the law collections in the Swaziland National
Library Services (SNLS) (referred to as the public library in this study) in the four regions of Swaziland, were selected. It should be noted that the SNLS has four main branches in the four regions and one librarian responsible for the law collection in each region. The only librarian responsible for the law collection of the LSS library and the only one responsible for the law collection of the University of Swaziland (UNISWA) as well as one from the Ministry of Justice library joined these. Overall, the census population in this regard was seven librarians responsible for law collections in the libraries in Swaziland.

From Table 4.2 below, it can be noted that there was a high concentration of lawyers in Manzini and Hhohho regions compared to the other parts of the country. The table further shows that three librarians were from the Hhohho region and two from the Manzini region. This is because the LSS offices and its library as well as the Ministry of Justice library are based in the Hhohho region, while the University of Swaziland library is based in the Manzini region. There are no other law libraries that can be used by the lawyers in the country beside these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Lawyers</th>
<th>Executive Officials</th>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzini</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiselweni</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubombo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Law Society of Swaziland (April 2017) and Field data (2017)

The general rule of thumb in the determination of sample size in quantitative studies is the larger the better. Babbie (2001) and Hafner (1998) confirm that samples of less than 100 are usually unlikely to represent the entire population. However, it suffices to say that an unnecessarily large sample size may be expensive and a waste of time. For qualitative studies, the most critical thing is the depth of richness and complexity of the data and there is no particular formula for correct sample size (Fombad, 2008: 162). Further, for both qualitative and quantitative studies, one cannot be sure that a particular sample will produce replicated results in a population. By applying the triangulation technique and opening the avenue for all lawyers in the country to partake in the study, a census of the total population was preferred
for the questionnaire survey. According to Powell and Connaway (2004: 93), a census is “a count of all the elements in the population”. A census provides a good representation of the population to assist in the objective of the study.

4.8 Data collection tools

The main research instrument for the present study was the self-administered questionnaire, which was supported by two different semi-structured interviews for librarians and LSE as data collection tools. The researcher chose to administer the semi-structured interviews to all the executive members of the LSS as well as the librarians. Wertz, et al. (2011) posit that the use of multiple methods is also appropriate for various purposes in studies. It is argued that survey-based studies usually encompass asking the subjects to respond to questions through questionnaires or interviews with the aim of getting primary data, which is advantageous in research (Trochim, 2001; Majyambere, 2014).

Mustaffa, Ahmad, and Salah (2012) used a questionnaire-based survey design for data collection in their study. This technique was preferred because it was less time consuming and affordable for a scattered population like the present one. Further, it offers convenience in terms of contacting the research participants. Creswell (1994) opines that using survey designs in research helps in the acquisition of quantitative or numeric descriptions of some segment of the population and further allows the researcher to determine the values and relation of variables and constructs. This also provides generalizable responses for the members of the populations studied to similar populations. Majyambere (2015) also used semi-structured interviews for data collection from particular officials in order to gain an in-depth understanding in his study of the information needs and information behaviour of international students in KwaZulu-Natal Universities in South Africa. Section 4.8.1 below will discuss the data gathering instruments used in the study in more detail.

4.8.1 Questionnaires

A questionnaire is a written form of a list of questions where answers are recorded from a large number of participants (Olorunfemi, 2014: 103) after explaining what is expected from them. Kumar (2011: 138) and Maree (2011: 157) add that it is a data collection instrument given to a large group and the researcher waits for the respondents complete the questions. Johnson and Christensen (2012) and Olorunfemi (2014) assert that the information obtained from this type of instrument is mostly about the feelings, thoughts, attitudes, values, perceptions, beliefs and
behavioural intentions of the research participants. The present study is about the same. As a result, it is argued that the questions asked should be clear and easy to understand, as there may be no one to explain them to the respondent if they answer them in their own time (Kumar, 2011: 138). Kumar also emphasises the importance of making sure that the questions are developed in an interactive way to keep the respondents interested in answering.

Questionnaires have the advantage of being able to be administered to a wider audience even though they may not be easily customizable to each participant (Thomas, 2010). There are several types of questionnaires used in research namely, personally administered, sent through mail, and online questionnaires or as part of an interview process, all of which can be effective. However, this study opted for the self-administered survey questionnaire due to it enabling the researcher to contact a large number of participants for ease of collection of the responses within a relatively short period (Taylor-Powell and Hermann, 2000: 3).

In addition, the fact that the respondents were dispersed over a wide geographical area meant this route of distributing the survey questionnaire advantageous as it would be impractical to use interviews for such a large population scattered this way. The questionnaire was also adopted because they are less expensive and offer a degree of anonymity to the respondents; therefore, there is a higher degree of obtaining accurate answers and improved reliability of the conclusions (Anderson, 2011).

Kumar (2011:143) points that the main disadvantage of this tool is that it is meant for a literate population. However, this was not an issue in the current study since the population is specifically for professionals in the legal field. Even though the response rate of a questionnaire is notorious for being low (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009), it is believed that the researcher had encouraged a higher response rate from the population through visits to the different courts where most lawyers go for their day to day business as well as to their offices in the law firms. The questionnaires were administered and hand delivered to the respondents by the researcher and collected as soon as they were completed.

The questionnaire was constructed with advice and input sought from the researcher’s supervisor and other similar studies, as well as colleagues who were knowledgeable in this area. The questions were constructed bearing in mind that the subjects under study were lawyers who are always pressed for time and usually very sensitive to issues of confidentiality and the security of information. Thus, the questions were designed in a way that ensured
anonymity and confidentiality. Section 4.8.1.1 discussed the lay out of the questionnaire scheduled.

### 4.8.1.1 Questionnaire layout schedule

The questionnaire comprised of both closed-ended and open-ended questions. The latter were those that required a free response (as it is unstructured), while the former is structured and required a fixed response from a list provided. This kind is said to be the most suitable in large scale surveys due to it being quick and easy for the respondents to complete (Neumann, 2011: 323). Using both types of questions was advantageous in this research as it reduced the disadvantage of using one kind, and according to Neumann (2011), it helps in the variation of pace for the researcher and promoted. The questionnaire consisted of the following parts:

- **Section A** - Biographical data and background of the lawyers, which inquired information about the lawyers’ organization, geographical place, gender, age, position and experience in the field;
- **Section B** – Information needs and sources sought as well as available resources and places where these were accessed;
- **Section C** - How the sources were accessed by the lawyers, in terms of format and purpose of the sources;
- **Section D** - The kind of legal information resources used;
- **Section E** - The factors that affected the information needs of the lawyers and challenges encountered during attempts to access the resources; and,
- **Section F** - Strategies that could be used to overcome challenges in order to satisfy the needs.

Haruna and Mabawonku (2001) administered a questionnaire to 361 Nigerian lawyers with questions focusing on information needs of lawyers, the type of information sought by lawyers, the type of sources used (law reports, journals, internet) and factors affecting the utilization of these sources. Otike (1997a) dared the use of pre-defined categories in the selection of these sources which he argued restricted the participants’ responses. To close that gap in the present study, the questionnaire provided options for adding more sources as the lawyers deemed fit. This way, the study ensured a fair and unbiased response from the participants.
4.8.2 Semi-structured interviews

Interviews are said to be the predominant research instrument in questioning as a data collection method in qualitative research as it enables the researcher to get answers from the data collected (Greeff, 2005: 287 and Du Preez, 2008: 152). It was further asserted that interviews are clear attempts at understanding the world from the participant’s point of view and expose the meaning of their experience. According to Green and Brown (2005), interviews encourage the interviewees to highlight issues they regard as significant through using open-ended questions. The live interaction during the interview also allows the discussion to flow easily to new and unexpected directions, hence providing room for expansion in the understanding of the issues involved (Gorman and Clayton 2005: 41). There are several kinds of interviews, namely structured and semi structured interviews, timeline interviews and focus groups interviews (Du Plooy-Cilliers and Bezuidenhout, 2014).

The semi-structured interviews have features of both structured and unstructured questions and uses both closed and open questions (Thomas, 2010). It thus also has the positive aspects of both methods of (structured and unstructured) interviews. For consistency with all the participants, a pre-planned set of core questions around a list of themes to be covered (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009: 320) was used for guidance so as to cover the same areas with each interviewee. Through this plan, the interviewee has the opportunity to elaborate and give more information if needed. The participants were interviewed to assess the needs, accessibility of and information sources for lawyers in Swaziland.

As pointed out by other scholars (Greeff, 2005; Cresswell, 2014; Kothari, 2004), in collecting quantitative data the semi-structured open-ended interviews is best as it helped the researcher to obtain more responses from participants; ask additional questions for clarification from participants and further ask about participant’s perceptions. The shortcomings of this kind of interview is the fact that it might be time consuming for the researcher and participants. In addition, the participants would be asked to recall events or processes in the service of legal information provision. However, this was minimal in the study because participants did not need to recall too many past events but were to talk about the current factual issues in the Society.

The researcher personally visited the interviewees in their private offices to carry out the interviews based on the letter of request for permission to carry out the interview with the
prospective participants. Section 4.8.2.1 below is a brief overview the layout of the interview schedules administered to the participants of the study.

Table 4.3: Mapping of the research questions to sources of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. What were the information needs of the lawyers in Swaziland?</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law Society Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. How did the lawyers in Swaziland access and use legal information they need?</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law Society Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. What were the information resources used by lawyers in Swaziland?</td>
<td>Questionnaire;</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law Society Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. What were the factors affecting lawyers meeting their information needs?</td>
<td>Questionnaire;</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law Society Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. What strategies could be adopted to overcome any challenges faced in satisfying their information needs in Swaziland?</td>
<td>Questionnaire;</td>
<td>Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law Society Officials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2017)

4.8.2.1 Interview schedules

There were two versions of the interview schedule. One was prepared for the LSE and the other for the librarians in the chosen law resource centres. An overview of the schedules are in section 4.8.2.1.1 and section 4.8.2.1.2 below.

4.8.2.1.1 Law Society Executive interview schedule

The LSE interview schedule sought the position of the LSS in terms of legal information provision and access for its members as the main professional organization in Swaziland. The LSE as the responsible officials were asked to give their views on what the Society does for its membership regarding meeting their information needs. The semi-structured interview was made up of the following sections:
Section A – elicited demographic details of the participants, which consisted of position held in the executive, age, gender, qualification, number of years as a Law Society member, roles in the executive and tasks and goals. Further, information on services provided by the Society and personal perception on usage of services provided, especially those relating to legal information services.

Section B – solicited information on the information needs of the lawyers.

Section C- solicited information on access and use of resources by lawyers.

Section D- attempted to obtain the factors affecting the provision of legal information sources by the Society and strategies to overcome them with suggestions on the solutions for the challenges provided.

4.8.2.1.2 Librarians’ interview schedule

The interview schedule for law librarians sought the views of the librarians in relation to the information behaviour of lawyers, including, whether their collections were available for access by lawyers. It meant specifically to find out if the libraries are equipped with resources to meet the lawyers’ information needs. This semi-structured interview was made up of the following sections:

- Section A- covered demographic details of the participant, age, gender and experience as well as role in the library and highest qualification in the field.
- Section B- this section covered the needs and information provision of the lawyers through the library, in addition to highlighting information services offered by law libraries, the researcher endeavoured to find out how well these services were carried out to serve the needs of lawyers.
- Section C- examined access and use of legal information by lawyers.
- Section D- examined the information resources used by the lawyers; and
- Section E- covered the challenges faced in the provision of legal information to lawyers.

4.9 Data analysis strategies and procedure

Data analysis starts with categorizing and organizing the data in patterns, critical themes and meanings that emerge, which is termed coding (Thomas, 2010). The aim of this is to create descriptive, multi-dimensional categories that provide a preliminary framework for analysis.
Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. The researcher used one-on-one interviews with the LSE and librarians and a questionnaire as data collection instruments. Data generated through the questionnaires was summarized, captured on CSPro7, analysed in descriptive statistics and interpreted (Bertram and Christiansen, 2015) using the SPSS24 version.

It is argued that using combined approaches points to triangulation (Babbie, 2011; Creswell 2009) as the best technique in understanding the social world (Elliott, 2005: 177). Bryman and Bell (2011) concurred that using triangulation allows one to attain a range of information for the same concerns. According to Bryman and Bell, it is also advantageous as the multiple methods help to negate the shortages of each other and achieve a greater degree of validity and reliability. McNeill and Chapman (2005: 23) reiterated that triangulation goes a long way in the verification of reliability of a research design and validity of the data collected.

In the present study, the data was collected in two simultaneous phases. The first phase involved the distribution and collection of the questionnaire from the lawyers who were either found at the courts or visited in their different law firms’ offices. The researcher collected the questionnaires immediately upon completion by the participants.

The second phase involved face-to-face semi-structured interviews with librarians visited by the researcher in their libraries, as well as the face-to-face semi-structured interviews of the Law Society executive officials who were also visited in their offices. In conducting the interviews, the researcher ensured suitable venues that enabled the respondents to be more likely to answer openly and honestly, which was in their respective offices. Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2012) argue that the time and place for conducting interviews is crucial to the outcome of responses.

Members of the Law Society were informed of the research being conducted by the researcher at a meeting for lawyers held in September 2016 at the Mbabane Theatre Club and a further reminder and encouragement for lawyers to partake was given again at another meeting held in June 2017 at the Mbabane Theatre Club. The researcher’s letter of introduction from the Law Society to the participants included an explanation of the purpose of the study and was carried by the researcher for reference to those lawyers who were not aware.

A covering letter describing the objectives of the survey, assurance of the participants’ anonymity and confidentiality of the information solicited accompanied the questionnaire. The
researcher further requested to collect the questionnaires immediately after completion. The informed consent of the lawyers was solicited. Before collecting the questionnaires, the researcher conducted the interviews with the librarians and LSS executives.

The distribution and collection of questionnaires and interviews took place over a period of three months from 1st May 2017 to 8th July 2017. After the collection, cleaning of the data with the aim of eliminating problems that may arise during analysis (Powell and Connaway, 2004) was done wherein the data was checked for completeness, comprehensibility, consistency and reliability. This was done through reading the results, looking out for surprise responses and verifying the coding of data, after which data analysis was undertaken.

For the qualitative data derived from the open-ended questions and interviews, codes were used through thematic content analyses. This is a systematic and objective qualitative analysis of the occurrence of phrases or words in different literatures (Powell and Connaway, 2004).

Data generated from the in-depth interviews was recorded, coded and transcribed. This was done in order to get analysable data upon securing the permission from respondents. Thematic content analysis was used to analyse. Scholars have pointed out that the integration of quantitative and qualitative data analysis of verbal data can provide the chance to interpret the results in a less subjective manner (Chi, 1997: 271). It is argued that content analysis can be used in both quantitative and qualitative research (Dahlberg and McCaig, 2010:23) as was used in this study. Appropriate statistical test such as the Cronbach co-efficiency test was used to address the questions in quantitative data analysis (Creswell and Clark, 2011: 207).

In capturing the responses from the questionnaires that would provide answers to the research questions, the researcher used Census and Survey Processing System (CSPro7) and exported the data to SPSS version 24 for data analysis. The former was preferred by the researcher because of its robustness in capturing survey data and its ease of exporting the data files to other statistical packages like SPSS, SAS, STATA and Excel. As mentioned, the analysis was done in SPSS and Excel after exporting it from CSPro7 depending on the reporting variables for ease of presentation. In presenting the data, range, mean, frequencies and percentages were expended for the analysis through graphs, charts and tables. According to Powell and Connaway (2004), SPSS offers a comprehensive solution for reporting, modelling and analysing data as it has a variety of data formats and programs that are editable and easily transferable to other programs. This software was also seen as user friendly and easily
accessible via the University of KwaZulu-Natal website. Descriptive statistics were used to represent quantitative data.

In trying to avoid bias and omissions that usually emanate from closed-ended questions, the questionnaire included the open-ended questions and ‘other’ category. Through this category in both the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, many of the participants were able to provide useful answers to reveal valuable insights into the needs of lawyers in Swaziland.

The semi-structured interview schedule of librarians (Appendix 4) as well as the semi-structured interview schedule for the Law Society Executive (Appendix 6) each consisted of six (6) sections that complemented the findings from the lawyers’ survey questionnaire. The qualitative data from open-ended questions and semi-structured interviews were recorded, coded, analysed and utilised in this research. As mentioned earlier, all the quantitative data was also coded and analysed using the CSPro7 and SPSS version 24, which provided the most comprehensive solution for reporting, modelling and analysis of data. The results from the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were pragmatically presented in a triangulation manner.

4.10 Validity and reliability

Research is taken as valid when the conclusions that emanate from the answers provided from the research are true. Reliability is the extent to which a procedure gives similar results under constant conditions via a repetition of the procedure (Powell and Connaway, 2004). Validity is said to be the extent of “how well a test measures what it is supposed to measure” (Bosire, 2011: 105), whereas reliability has been described as the extent to “which a measurement procedure yields the same answer in whichever way and whenever it is carried out” (Otike, 1997: 74). It deals with consistency of results in order to minimise errors and biases. It has been said “what you see is what you get” (Fay, 2017: 121), which could be taken to reflect that there is not much obstruction between the action in the field and the recording of the same as it will yield a highly reliable result. The interviews of this study were recorded and thus can be said to be reliable as they were accurate. Validity according to Walonick (2010) is the accuracy of the measurement itself based on the judgment of the researcher. These concepts are used in the application of both quantitative and qualitative methods where data collection is carried out using different tools.
Since the researcher used the mixed method through interviews and questionnaires, a strategy used to ensure the degree of reliability and validity of the study was through data triangulation. In the interviews, the questions raised and issues recorded were specified in the interview schedules in order to ensure consistency.

In order to identify ambiguities and have a clear and understandable wording of the questionnaire and semi-structured interview schedules, pretesting was done on the 23rd May 2017 in the KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg area with three practising lawyers found at the Pietermaritzburg magistrate courts. Further, three in-depth interviews with one librarian from the University of KwaZulu-Natal Law Library; one from the KwaZulu-Natal Law Society and one from the Msunduzi Municipal Public Library (Bessie Head) who were not part of the study population were conducted. This increased the validity and reliability of the data collection tools as it tested consistency. According to Silverman (2013), the use of pre-testing as a preventive measure against irregularities and ambiguities in research is very important.

4.10.1 The lawyers’ questionnaire pre-test

The three lawyers approached were able to answer most of the questions except those that specifically were for Swaziland and the library collections that are in Swaziland. They all felt that another entry of ‘representing clients’ should be inserted under Question 8, which was duly done. They were able to mention the databases they use in most of the questions. Apart from that, the lawyers felt that the questions were clear and detailed, with the disadvantage of them being too many. However, in order to answer the research questions, all the questions needed to be retained.

4.10.2 Semi-structured interview guide for librarians’ pre-test

For the semi-structured interviews for law librarians, Question 2 and Question 5 in section A were seen as requiring the same answer, hence there was redundancy. It was suggested that one of the two be removed. The researcher settled on removing Question 5.

Secondly, wrong numbering was noted for section D, which was supposed to be number ‘15’ but was numbered as ‘13’ hence the whole numbering below was wrong. This was duly rectified. Furthermore, the librarians felt that Question 10 on information needs of lawyers required the same answers as the question on information sources needed under section D. The removal of one of the two was suggested. The researcher settled on removing the one in section
Don information sources as it was Question 10. With these reviews and corrections, the researcher finalized the instruments and proceeded to collect data.

English is the official language of Swaziland used by the lawyers; therefore, it was used throughout the study with the population and both tools were in English. The researcher collected the questionnaires from the participants immediately after they were completed. The distribution and collection of the questionnaires and interviews was done over a period of two months.

4.11 Reliability of the results using the Cronbach Alpha co-efficiency test

Validity and reliability rates were analysed when the researcher started the data capturing and coding in CSPRO and SPSS. According to Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2012) and Saunders and Rojon (2014), good quality data are measured by the extent to which they meet the demands of validity and reliability, especially if the method used measures what the researcher intended to measure. A Cronbach Alpha co-efficiency test was done in order to find the consistency of the answers given by the participants (Nieswandt, 2015) for the present research. This was done to establish how well the answers from the instruments positively correlated to each other. It is said that measuring the construct for a correlation degree between the various items is essential in internal consistency (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010: 162).

The Cronbach’s Alpha computes the ‘average inter-correlations among the items measuring the items’ (Hee, 2014: 773). Sekaran and Bougie (2010) posit that the closer to 1 the Cronbach’s Alpha scale is, the higher the reliability of the instrument and its answers. If the scale is 0.6 it is considered poor, while if it is closer to 0.8 it is considered as good and acceptable. The reliability test was run on Question 11 and Question 16, which were based on a 5 point likert scale question captured as ordinal data. This was to assess if they were measuring the same construct. Inter-item correlation was used to measure if each item in the methods used for consultation was measuring the overall frequency of consultations. Question 11 showed negative results, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 6, section 6.6. However, Question 16 gave a positive reliability outcome for variables measuring how often lawyers use the legal resources. Table 4.4 gives the reliability statistics which show the alpha score that was obtained ($\alpha = .871$).
Table 4.4: Cronbach Alpha reliability statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

All the items as shown in the column Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted (Table 4.5) had an α < .871 score hence there was no need to delete any of them as the coefficient score would not improve.

Table 4.5: Item-total statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Text / Practice</td>
<td>40.43</td>
<td>65.501</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>66.649</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>40.42</td>
<td>65.626</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>64.460</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>60.831</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported Decisions</td>
<td>39.61</td>
<td>57.874</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt Publications</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>59.804</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Proceeding</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>60.499</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Journals, Magazines</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td>57.252</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>61.091</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Indexes</td>
<td>39.17</td>
<td>60.520</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Materials</td>
<td>39.50</td>
<td>59.157</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Databases</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>61.563</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM</td>
<td>38.79</td>
<td>60.931</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Legal Databases</td>
<td>38.68</td>
<td>60.030</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>63.853</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td>61.096</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>60.332</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>61.271</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>60.864</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
4.12 Ethical considerations

For any research, Du Plooy-Cilliers and Bezuidenhout (2014) and Sarantakos (1997) assert that ethical principles should be upheld. These include the autonomy, dignity, respect of the participants, voluntary informed consent, prevention of likely harm, direct benefits of the study, and fair and just selection of participants (Wassener, 2006: 67). For anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents’ information the use of a written informed consent form was employed as advised by (Mertens, 2012: 19) and affirmed by Majyambere (2015: 177-178) in his study of international students, that following the ethical guides and principles from official institutions is important. As a result, the researcher employed the ethics policy of the University of KwaZulu-Natal as required.

In this way, in securing anonymity and confidentiality of data collected, the study applied the provision of the ethics policy (University of KwaZulu-Natal, 2017), which provides for voluntary participation in the study and explanation to participants to be free to withdraw at any time of the study. Silverman (2013: 162) also pointed out the standards for ethics in research where he mentioned the importance of voluntary participation; protection of participants from harm and potentially undue benefits and risks as well as informed consent. Further, all audio and written data as provided by the policy are securely stored for at least five years and kept at the programme.

In the present study, all these were covered as codes were assigned to the respondents of the semi-structured interviews in the order that they were conducted and the questionnaire coded according to the order submitted from the participants. The duty to guarantee anonymity of respondents and secure confidentiality of the research information are said to be the best motivators of the validity of any research, especially where these assure true responses from the research participants (Kumar, 2011; Walliman, 2011; McNeill and Chapman, 2005; Kalof, Dan and Dietz, 2008). The Swaziland Law Society, the University of Swaziland, the Swaziland National Library Services and the Ministry of Justice gave the researcher permission to conduct the research with their organizations.

4.13 Problems encountered during data collection

The researcher faced some difficulty during administering the questionnaire as there lack of cooperation from some lawyers in terms of completing the questionnaires due to their busy schedules. Some felt that completing the questionnaires was a waste of time as they were under
pressure due to heavy workloads. Some also felt that the questionnaire was rather long. For those visited in offices, the researcher faced the challenge where questionnaires were found to have been misplaced at the time of collection, hence another had to be issued and completed while the researcher waited. In spite of these mishaps, the researcher managed to obtain useful information from the willing participants.

4.14 Summary of the chapter

This chapter provided a detailed discussion of the methodology that was employed for the study. It discussed the research approach, the paradigm and research design that underpin the study and further pointed out the selected survey design in relation to the problem under investigation.

This study displayed its exploratory survey design nature with elements of both a descriptive and explanatory survey. It advanced the use of triangulation in information behaviour and information needs of lawyers whereby the mixed method research approach was used in a complementary way to a dominantly quantitative and less dominantly qualitative emphasis. The nature of data concerned and the research questions influenced the choice of this research method.

The population of the study consisted mainly of private lawyers in Swaziland and the sampling frame consisted of 170 private lawyers obtained from the Law Society of Swaziland. A census of the sampling frame was adopted as the survey sample. Interviews were limited to the Law Society executive (LSE) members and librarians responsible for law collections in the libraries around the country.

The data collection instruments and analysis were comprehensively discussed in line with the research. These were the literature review, open and close-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. It pointed out the advantages and disadvantages of the different research methods and designs, collection instruments used and suitability of the same for the study.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the study, expert advice, triangulation and interactive questioning during interviews with the use of probes was used as a measure. The chapter also illustrates how the study research instruments were pretested and triangulated and how validity and reliability were met for the findings. Ethical principles were observed through the assurance of anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents and the soliciting of consent.
from the interviewees. The CSPro7 and SPSS were used for data analysis of qualitative data and interviews were coded using the thematic content analyses through the pattern matching logic technique. The findings of the mixed data from the lawyers and librarians were analysed and summarised to form the basis of the discussions that follows in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS OF THE STUDY

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and analysis of the empirical data collected with a self-administered questionnaire and semi-structured interviews in order to explore the current situation concerning the information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland.

Data is presented for each of the data gathering instruments according to the research questions. These were the lawyers’ questionnaire, followed by semi-structured interviews for librarians and Law Society of Swaziland executive officials (LSE). Data was captured and analysed using CSPro7 and SPSS version 24 respectively as discussed in section 4.9. In addition, the semi-structured interview analysis employed a thematic approach to search for themes and patterns (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 79) that emerged from the data after which codes as explained in section 4.8 and section 4.9 and section 4.12 were assigned for ease of analysis before being triangulated with the questionnaire results. These interviews solicited similar data from the respondents with specific attention to what the organizations did in terms of providing legal information to private lawyers in Swaziland. Thematic content analysis was used to search the themes that emerged from the various responses and tie them together with those from the survey questionnaire.

In each section, the data presentation is based upon the research questions of the study as outlined in Chapter One (section 1.4). These are:

- What were the information needs of private lawyers in Swaziland?
- How did private lawyers in Swaziland access and use the legal information they need?
- What information resources were used by private lawyers in Swaziland
- What were the challenges affecting them in satisfying their information needs, and
  lastly;
- What strategies could be adopted to overcome any challenges faced by private lawyers in satisfying their information needs?
Interpretation of the data is presented in Chapter Six. The collected data are attached as Appendices 4, 5 and 6 respectively. The researcher alone collected the data from all the participants without employing assistants. The benefits of this are discussed in Chapter Four (section 4.8). Quantitative data and data describing the demographics of all the participants are presented in tables using frequencies and percentages as well as charts. Details of the techniques and strategies employed were provided in section 4.9.

5.2 Response rate

As explained in Chapter Four, section 4.7.1, the primary participants in this study were the members of the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS), that is, private practicing lawyers in Swaziland. A list of these lawyers was secured from the Law Society offices and their law firms were identified. The other participants of the study were the LSE officials and librarians of collections that have legal information. Table 5.1 shows a summary of the response rate of all the study participants.

Out of 186 possible participants for the study, there were 142 participants, a response rate of 76.3%. This overall rate comprises of the 75.3% who answered the questionnaire, and 77.8% who were interviewed. This response rate is above the expectation of the rate recommended by scholars (Nulty, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection tools</th>
<th>Expected respondents</th>
<th>Actual respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers’ questionnaire</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians’ interviews</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Society Executive interviews</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>N=186</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

There were 170 questionnaires distributed to 102 law firms around Swaziland. Only 128 private lawyers from these firms completed questionnaires, yielding a return rate of 75.3%. Seven (7) librarians in the four regions of Swaziland taken from the Swaziland National Library Services
(SNLS), the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS), the Ministry of Justice and the University of Swaziland (UNISWA) libraries participated in the semi-structured interviews, which yielded a response rate of 100%. As mentioned, these libraries provide legal information resources in their collections. Furthermore, seven (7) out of nine (9) LSE officials of the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) were interviewed yielding a response rate of 77.8%. This response rate is above the expectation of the rate recommended by scholars (Nulty, 2008).

Other members could not participate due to their absence from the country at the time. All the survey tools, that is, the self-administered questionnaire (Appendix 2), the semi-structured interviews of librarians (Appendix 4) and Law Society executive interviews (Appendix 6) consisted of seven sections. These were: Section (A) Demographic details; (B) Information needs of lawyers in Swaziland; (C) Access to and use of legal information resources by lawyers in Swaziland; (D) Information resources used by lawyers in Swaziland; (E) Challenges affecting lawyers' information seeking; and, (F) Strategies to overcome the challenges faced in satisfying lawyers’ information needs.

5.3 Demographic details of participants in the study (Section A)

The data presented in this sub-section presents responses from the questionnaire and interviews with the lawyers, librarians and LSE officials. The purpose of this section was to analyse the personal profiles or demographic information of all the participants in the study and their roles. This includes the geographic location of the participant, positions held, length of service, highest academic qualification, gender, age group, as well as the role or activities they perform. This information was covered in Questions 1 to 8 of the lawyers’ questionnaire (see Appendix 2); questions 1 to 4 of the interview schedule for librarians (See Appendix 4); and question 1 to 4 of the Law Society executive interview schedule (See Appendix 6).

5.3.1 Lawyer’s geographic location and position

As mentioned in Chapter Two (section 2.4), this study was guided by Wilson’s general model as its theoretical framework. This model is nested with different aspects that include the context of the work environment of lawyers in this case and is therefore worthy to be highlighted. Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain (1996), Bitso (2011) and Wilson (1999) opine that it is important to consider the socio-political and economic environment of an information seeker in terms of the information user’s local and organizational space as it stimulates or hinders information access.
Hence, Figures 5.1 presents the geographical location of participants. From the responses, the frequency of distribution of participants per region revealed that a majority, 52.3% were based in the Hhohho region and 43.1% were in the Manzini region while Shiselweni and Lubombo regions had about 2.3% each.

![Lawyers per region](chart)

**Figure 5.1: Distribution of lawyers per Region**

Source: Field data (2017)

As a follow up, Table 5.2 gives a cross-tabulation that summarizes the distribution of participants in the regions per their current position held in the law firms. It shows that a larger proportion of the participants, 51 (40%) were attorneys, followed by managing partners at 17 (13%), 14 were senior attorneys (11%) while 13 (10%) were professional assistants and 11 (9%) were principal attorneys. Those who responded as being partners were nine (7%) followed by six associates (5%). In the lower range were two lawyers (2%) which can be said to be attorneys in terms of the terminology; and two directors (2%), sole practitioner, senior partner and litigation supervisors respectively who can be regarded as being senior positions.

From the overall results as depicted in Table 5.2, it shows that from the 51 (40%) attorneys, 29 (22.7%) were in the Hhohho region, 21 (16.4%) in the Manzini region and one (0.8%) in the Shiselweni and none were in the Lubombo region.

This was followed by 17 (13%) managing partners, of which 10 (7.8%) of them were in Hhohho, four (3.1%) in Manzini and three (2.3%) in Lubombo, with none in Shiselweni region. There were 14 (11%) senior attorneys of which, 10 of them (7.8%) were based in Hhohho, four (3.1%) in Manzini and none were in Shiselweni and Lubombo regions. In terms of the 13
Professional assistants, six (4.6%) of them were in Hhohho and seven (5.5%) were in Manzini. There was none in the other two regions. There were 11 (8.6%) principal attorneys, of which four (3.1%) were in Hhohho and six (4.5%) in Manzini, one (0.8%) in Shiselweni with none in the Lubombo region. Of the nine (7.0%) partners, it is noted that eight (6.3%) were in Manzini and one (0.8%) in Shiselweni.

This was followed by six (5%) associates, of which three (2.3%) were in Hhohho and three (2.3%) in Manzini respectively. The results also show there were two (1.6%) who called themselves lawyers, who were based in the Hhohho region. There were two (1.8%) directors of which, one (0.8%) in Hhohho and one (1.6%) in Manzini respectively; also there were two (1.68%) senior partners in Hhohho and Shiselweni respectively. There was one (0.8%) sole practitioner based in Hhohho as well as one (0.8%) litigation supervisor found in the Manzini region. From these results, it is seen that a majority of the participants were concentrated in the Hhohho Manzini corridor.
Table 5.2: Cross-tabulation of position by region (lawyers) 
(N=128)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Hhohho</th>
<th>Manzini</th>
<th>Shiselweni</th>
<th>Lubombo</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Assistant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Partner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Attorney</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Practitioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Attorney</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation Supervisor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Practitioner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

5.3.2 Level of qualification of lawyers

Participants in the survey questionnaire (Appendix 2) were required to indicate their highest qualification. This is depicted in Figure 5.2, which shows that out of 128 participants, a majority of 111 (86.7%) participants had a Bachelor of Laws (LLB) degree, followed by 11 (8.69%) with a Master of Laws (LLM), while three (3) (2.3%) had a postgraduate diploma. Two (1.6%) had an Master of Business Administration (MBA) while only one (0.8%) has a Bachelor of Arts, Law degree.
5.3.3 Librarians’ demographic details

All of the seven librarians were available to be interviewed (100% return rate). Table 5.3 below gives a summary of their demographic details. The librarians’ interview schedule was divided into six sections with 30 questions. Section A covered demographic information. This section focused on the background information including designation, gender, qualification, age and longevity of service as well as responsibilities in the position. For anonymity, and confidentiality as per Appendix 3 (Ethical consideration) the seven respondents were assigned codes, namely LL1 up to LL7 as mentioned in section 4.12.

As presented in the table, three (43%) were based in the Hhohho region; two (29%) were based in the Manzini region, with one (14%) based in each of the other two regions. This is because Hhohho and Manzini are the administrative regions of Swaziland and house many businesses, institutions and government facilities. The table further shows that the a bigger proportion or 3 (43%) were assistant librarians, two (29%) were librarians, one (14%) was a senior library assistant (these are LIS professional positions) and one (14%) an administrative clerk who doubles as a librarian.
The Librarian’s interview schedule (as shown in Table 5.3) shows that a majority of the librarians interviewed held a professional degree in LIS except for one. From the table it shows that three (43%) of those interviewed had a Bachelor’s degree, while two (29%) had a Master’s degree; one (14%) had a Diploma, and only one (14%) had no professional LIS qualification. This latter librarian is the one based in the Law Society library. From these results, it can be inferred that these librarians are qualified to serve as professionals that can provide information services to the population under study.

5.3.4 Law Society executive official’s demographic details

The Law Society of Swaziland is the governing professional body of lawyers with a nine-member committee of officials that are responsible for the running of the office. From these, seven were available to be interviewed, yielding a response rate of 77.8% as mentioned earlier. The interviewees were given codes LSE1 to LSE7 to cater for the ethical considerations of anonymity as mentioned in section 4.12.

Their interview schedule was also divided into four sections, with 33 questions. Section A (see Appendix 6), focused on the demographic details of the officials. This included the background information such as their designation, gender, qualification, age and longevity of service as well as responsibilities in the position. Table 5.4 summarises the demographic details and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian interviewees</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of service (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LL1</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>BA LIS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL2</td>
<td>Manzini</td>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>BA LIS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL3</td>
<td>Shiselweni</td>
<td>Snr Library Assist.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dip LIS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL4</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>MLIS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL5</td>
<td>Lubombo</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>BA LIS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL6</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Admin. Clerk</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Dip Bus Studies</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL7</td>
<td>Manzini</td>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>MLIS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
profiles where it is noted that a majority of five (71%) of the interviewees were based in the Hhohho region, while two (29%) were in the Manzini region, there were none in the other two regions. A majority of six (86%) were males with one female and all but one were in their 40’s.

Table 5.4: Cross tabulation of Law Society officials’ demographic details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of service (yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSE1</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PGDip</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE2</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE3</td>
<td>Manzini</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE4</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE5</td>
<td>Manzini</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE6</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE7</td>
<td>Hhohho</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Dip, Law</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

The LSE interview schedule also (Appendix 6) solicited the qualifications of the LSE officials and it was noted that a larger proportion, three (43%) had an LLB, while two had a Masters qualification, with one (14%) having a Post graduate diploma and one (14%) with a Diploma (See Table 5.4). From these results, it can be inferred that the participants were knowledgeable in serving the population under study as they have a legal qualification.

5.3.5 Length of service of participants

The survey questionnaire intended to establish the length of service of the participants in legal practice. A cross-tabulation of length of service and position of lawyers is presented in Table 5.5. It shows that 61 (48%) were in the 0 to 5 years’ service range; 30 (23%) were in the service range of 6 to10 years; 22 (17%) in the service range of 11 to 15 years; three (2%) in the service range of 16 to 20 years while 12 (9%) were in the service range of 21 years and above.
The results show that all 13 professional assistants (100%) had between 0 and 5 years’ service. Of the 51 attorneys, 33 (65%) were in the 0 to 5 year service range followed by 12 (24%) in 6 to 10 year service range and six (12%) in 11 to 15 year service range.

Table 5.5: Length of service (experience) and position held by lawyers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Held</th>
<th>Count Total</th>
<th>Count 0-5 years</th>
<th>Count 6-10 years</th>
<th>Count 11-15 years</th>
<th>Count 16-20 years</th>
<th>Count 21+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Assistant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Partner</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Attorney</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Practitioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Attorney</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

The length of service of the librarians and LSE participants in the study are summarized in Table 5.6. The table shows that a larger proportion, three (42.9%) of the librarians had served for 6 to 10 years, followed by two (28.6%) of those with over 21 years in service. Only one (14.3%) librarian indicated a length of service within the 0 to 5 year range while another one librarian indicated a length of service within 15 to 20 year range.

In terms of the LSE officials, a majority, four (57.1%) had served in the Society for 0 to 5 years while two (28.6%) had served for 6 to 10 years with only one (14%) in the 11 to 15 year range.
Table 5.6: Summary of interviewees’ years of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of services</th>
<th>Law society Executive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

5.3.6 Gender of participants

From the lawyers’ questionnaire, question 6 and 7 sought to understand the gender distribution and the age range of participants. Out of 128 participants, 104 (81.3%) were males while 24 (18.8%) were females. Table 5.7 below shows such distribution by gender and age.

Table 5.7: Gender and age range of lawyers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age ranges</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total count</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

The age ranges were categorised into eight groups with the youngest range being 21 to 25 years and oldest being 56 years and above. Out of 128 participants, 35 (27.3%) were in the age group of 31 to 35 years. Of these, 28 (21.9%) were males and seven (5.5%) were females. An equal number, 28 (21.9%) were in the age group of 41 to 45, of which 23 (18%) were males and five
(4%) were females. There were 26 (20.3%) participants in the age group of 36 to 40, and of these 20 (15.6%) were males and six (4.7%) were females. In the age group of 26 to 30, there were also 20 (15.6%) participants, of which 15 (11.7%) were males and five (3.9%) were females. In the age group of 46 to 50, all the 10 (7.81%) participants were males. In the age group of 51 to 55, there were five (3.90%) participants, of which four (3.1%) were males and one (0.8%) was a female. While the age ranges of 21 to 25 and 56 reflected the lowest with two (1.6%) of participants, who were all males respectively. From these results, it shows that the a larger proportion of the participants were in the age range of 31 to 45 and males.

The gender distribution of librarians as shown in Table 5.3 (See Appendix 4, question 2), shows that there were four males, (57.1%) and three (42.8% females. One (14.3%) was in the age range of 25 to 30; two (28.6%) were in the age range 31 to 40; two (28.6%) were in the age range 41 to 50; and one (14.3%) librarian was in the range of 51 and above.

Gender distribution of the LSE also showed that males dominated the committee as six (85.7%) out of the seven interviewees were males as shown in Table 5.4. The most common age range for the LSE was that of 40 years and above as there were six (85.7%) in that range, with one (14.3%) in the 31 to 39 years range. All of them have served on the committee for at least two years or more, hence it can be inferred that they were in a suitable position to understand the issues under investigation in the current study.

5.4 Work roles of participants

The survey questionnaire (See Appendix 2, question 8) solicited the work roles of the participants. Work roles of lawyers are known to be complex and timorous (Adewale and Mansor, 2014; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). The time aspect in executing the roles and tasks in all professions is one of the factors that impinges upon information seeking (Gardiner, McMeneny, and Chowdhury, 2006), consequently, the study endeavoured to establish the roles of the lawyers in order to determine the relevant information needs. The question elicited multiple responses from the participants.

The results as presented in Figure 5.3 show the distribution of the roles mentioned. All 128 (100%) of participants responded that their work roles comprised legal advice, disputes and negotiations, drafting legal documents, and representing clients. These roles were followed by legal research, by 112 (88%); the administration of estates by 108 (84%); followed by administrative duties by 85 (66%); and management of law firm duties by 75 (59%); while
conveyancing and lecturing were undertaken by 19 (15%) and 15 (12%) were lesser roles performed respectively.

Figure 5.3: Roles in legal practice

The roles or responsibilities of librarians was also garnered in their various positions held as presented in Figure 5.4. More of them are involved in reference services to readers through attending their queries and help users locate information than other tasks. It can be inferred that these participants are more knowledgeable in the serving of lawyers’ information needs. Other duties like staff supervision, classification, collection management and marketing the library (12.5%) follow.
The LSE interview schedule also sought to find out the roles of the officials in the Law Society. Table 5.8 summarises the main tasks of the participants, which shows that they mainly deal with activities that support the interests of the members, ranging from ensuring compliance and proper legal practice and representing members in different committees.

Table 5.8: Tasks / goals of the LSE officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks and goals in your position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General duties</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of LS admin activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with Legal Practitioners Act</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance to proper legal practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the president’s functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent Law Society in conferences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

5.5 Information needs (Section B)

This section addresses research question 1, which sought to identify the information needs of lawyers in Swaziland. This section presents the responses for this research question. Section
5.5.1 presents results on the identification of these needs as per the population. The survey questionnaire, Section B (Appendix 2), Librarian’s interview schedule, section B (Appendix 4) and LSE interview schedule, Section B (Appendix 6) focused on the information needs and provision to lawyers.

5.5.1 Information needs of lawyers and purpose of information

The survey questionnaire, in question 9, intended to identify the information needs of the lawyers in relation to their roles in their firms as shown in section 5.4 above. This question offered multiple response options from which participants ticked all that applied. Table 5.9 below presents the results. Wilson’s general model of information behaviours looks at information seeking behaviour of subjects in finding the individual’s information needs and how the behaviour relates to the tasks concerned with needs (Wilson, 2000: 49).

The results show that all but one, 127 (99.2%) needed information to defend and represent clients, to advise clients and for keeping up to date professionally. This was followed by 122 (95.3%) who needed case law, then 119 (93%) needed information for reference and 116 (90.6%) needed statutes. Further, 102 (79.7%) needed information to answer clients’ queries. The need for Foreign external laws was required by 93 (72.7%), information for administrative activities by 81 (63.3%), for research by 79 (61.7%), for conferences and workshops by 65 (50.8%) and furthering education by 50 (39.5%).
Table 5.9: Purpose of information needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information needed for</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defend and presentation</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional update</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case law</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Reference</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer queries</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External (foreign) laws</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin activities</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing, workshops</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further education</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (part time Lecturing)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

The librarians and Law Society executives’ interviews validated these results as all indicated that lawyers needed information for legal research purposes. The required resources according to librarians were statutes, law textbooks, cases and constitution booklets, government gazettes, and other reference material to support their legal practice. Figure 5.5 below shows librarian’s interviews' responses as regards lawyers’ information needs. In this figure, a majority of five (85.7%) librarians mentioned that lawyers need legal information like textbooks, cases and statutes respectively from their libraries. Four (71.4%) librarians mentioned that lawyers needed government publications and research materials respectively. A few, 2 (42.9%) mentioned that lawyers needed newspapers and journals from their libraries, while 28.6% seek databases.
All the Law Society officials pointed out that the lawyers usually need law textbooks, statutes, cases and constitution booklets, government gazettes, newspapers and other reference material. These responses confirmed the results of the survey questionnaire in terms of the tasks they did which required this kind of information. In the exact words of some of the interviewees:

“Lawyers need research materials mostly, in the form of journals, law reports and law textbooks, statues and other helpful materials in the profession” (LSE1),

Meanwhile LSE2 was of the view that,

“...the very nature, of the profession requires you to have free access to information or material...Eh, law reports, decide cases locally, books...”.

LSE3 reiterated that,

“they need research materials mostly, in the form of journals, law reports and law textbooks, statues and other helpful materials in the profession.”.

5.6 Access and use of information sources (Section C)

This section, section C covers research question 2, which intended to investigate how lawyers in Swaziland access and use the legal information. The purpose of this question was to establish the places of access as well as the frequency of access of legal information by lawyers. Participants were further asked to rate themselves on their ability to seek and find information. Section 5.6.1 presents the results.
5.6.1 Access and use by lawyers

On the lawyers’ survey questionnaire, question 10 was a multiple response question, requiring participants to tick all the places that they use for accessing legal information to meet their needs. Figure 5.6 shows that a majority, 124 (97%) accessed legal information needed from other colleagues, followed by 121 (94%) who said from their personal collection. Figure 5.6 shows that 111 (87%) accessed resources from online databases and 100 (81%) from the internet. About 106 (83%) accessed resources from the law firm library. A few of the participants, 61 (48%), accessed the resources through their assistants who were sent to find it while 55 (43%) accessed information from the University of Swaziland Library. Four (3%) asked for assistance from librarians; six (5%) used Public libraries or the court library. Only two (2%) accessed the Law Society Library. One participant mentioned community customary meetings as the other place of access to legal resources.

![Figure 5.6: Point of access by lawyers](image)

Source: Field data (2017)

From the librarians’ interview schedule (Appendix 4, question 10 and 11), interviewees were asked whether their libraries were open to lawyers and if so, what fees were charged. Environmental, economical, psychological and physiological barriers (Wilson and Walsh 1996) can influence access to legal resources. From the librarians’ interviews, a majority, six (85.7%) of the libraries were open to lawyers without any fees, while one (14.3%) was open but at a fee. These responses from librarians support the results of the survey questionnaire.
shown in Figure 5.6 above, which showed a very low usage of the public library, Law Society library, court library and UNISWA library. According to Wilson (1999), there are barriers that can affect access to information for any users.

The LSE interview schedule (Appendix 6) showed that there was a library at the Law Society offices that is open to all member lawyers, however it was not offering much in the way of legal information sources and thus was not being utilized. LSE1 pointed that:

“They don’t use the library much because of its lack of resources and fully functional staff...”.

Table 5.10 below summarises the LSEs’ responses. All seven (100%) of the interviewees pointed out that lawyers usually fend for themselves. Five (71.4%) of the responses indicated that lawyers rely on other libraries like UNISWA, which confirms the lawyers’ responses on the questionnaire that UNISWA was one of the points of access. Four (57%) of the interviewees pointed out that most lawyers rely on their colleagues, with six (86 %) responses intimating that they used the law firm libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How needs are met</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Provision/fend for themselves</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law firm library</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Society library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

In terms of the provision of service to lawyers, librarians indicated that five libraries (71%) provided reading spaces, while six (85.7%) provide circulation services. All of them, 100%, provided reference services with two (28.6%) providing inter library loan services. Table 5.11 summarises the type of services provided by the libraries. It was noted from the responses that library tours to familiarize the users with the facilities are offered only on request by the private lawyers.
Table 5.11: Type of services provided in libraries

N=7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Information and Services</th>
<th>Reading space</th>
<th>Reference services</th>
<th>Circulation desk services</th>
<th>Inter Library Loan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

In terms of policies, most of the libraries had no policy specifically meant for legal information services. Six (85.7%) libraries said that they had a general policy that guides acquisition of material for the whole library as opposed to one for legal information to lawyers. From the responses, LL3 pointed out that:

“Any policy on legal information is non-existent.”

LL6 also pointed out that:

“No there is no policy. The library is not yet functioning much, thus, there is not much to manage entities, just a donation of about 48 volumes”.

Three (43%) have a general acquisition policy for the whole library, while four (57%) had none at all.

From the LSE interview schedule, in terms of the availability of a policy that supported library services provision, the interviewees said that the Law Society has no library policy. The responses from the officials in terms of policy availability were:-

“No. we don’t have a policy”. –LSE3

And LSE4, LSE7, while LSE5 ‘s response was

“NO, not at all”.

LSE6 and LSE1 said that:

“No. Not that I’m aware of any”.
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They further pointed that there was no qualified library staff and the facilities were not well equipped for legal information provision. LSE7 noted:

“The Law Society is more concerned with the ‘bread and butter’ issues” as opposed to offering information services.

5.6.2 Access to use of the Law Society library by lawyers

The researcher sought to establish how frequently lawyers were using the different libraries. The survey questionnaire, question 11 (Appendix 2), was a Likert scale question where the participants were asked to indicate how often they used the resources. The answers included “Very Often, Often, Not Often, Rarely and Never”. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, where five was ‘Very Often’ and one was ‘Not sure’ it was noted that libraries and especially the Law Society Library’s mean of usage was a low 2.2. The most used resources were the internet with a mean of 4.8 and personal collection with 4.7. The scale showed a mean of 2.3 for the use of the court library and the public library or ask a librarian respectively. These responses confirm that a majority of lawyers did not use the Law Society library for any of the legal information resources. Figure 5.7 below provides the mean for the Likert scale answers in the use of these legal information sources.
Figure 5.7: Frequency of use of legal resources collections or facilities

Source: Field data (2017)

In terms of usage of the legal information sources or collection (frequency mean) by the lawyers show that lawyers do not use the Law Society collection, or ask librarians for any assistance. Nor do they use the court library. These results confirm that the usage of the Law Society library is limited confirmed by the LSE officials. The responses from interview schedule of LSE, in terms of the utilization of the law society library confirms that the Law Society library was hardly utilised by the lawyers. LSE 6 pointed out that:

“Unfortunately, it has old dated information and books that are no longer relevant to members as they should”.

The following quotes serve to show the poor state of the Law Society library:

“There is a library, which is quite old and small. The law society will do better in improving though through working on getting more resources and recent journals, textbooks for most of the lawyers who do not have these resources in their own offices” (LSE2).

“There is a limited library but the existence of this is unknown so I would say there is no such service” (LSE5).
“Yes the Law Society has a library. Unfortunately, its old dated information and books that are no longer relevant to members, as they should (LSE6).

“Our library is not properly functional” (LSE7).

“We basically do not have a fully-fledged library but we do have a small library. I think we actually need a bigger one that we can actually make sure that all lawyers can use and access that information anytime” (LSE1).

Furthermore, the following quotes from the Librarians’ interview schedule present the view that the lawyers rarely visited the libraries for access to legal information;

“Yes, we do have legal practitioners coming to the library occasionally, but they are not frequent- uh, the most users we have probably are the pupils” (LL1).

“Uhm, they do not frequent much but there is one particular person that comes every once in a week or sometimes tries” (LL2).

“In fact, the one’s we have in Nhlangano, just come about three times a week” (LL3).

“The frequency differs, but weekly they do come” (LL4).

“They rarely use the library because it does not have many resources except for donation” (LL6).

Table 5.12 below is a cross-tabulation of the point of access by years of experience. Of the 128 participants, 124 (97%) consult other colleagues in all the age groups; 120 (94%) personal collection, and 106 (83%) law firm libraries across the board.

The internet and online data bases were used by 104 (81%) across the board. It is noted from the table that a majority of those who send assistants to get information for them are those with 21 years and over who are 10 (83%) followed by those with 11 to 15 years 17 (77%) and 16 to 20 years 2 (67%). The Law Society library was not used in all the range except for a 5% of the 0 to 5 years’ experience. From this is can be inferred that the 0 to 5 years group may want to use the law society library due to lack of resources. Their personal collections or law firms were less used if they were in the early career stage. In terms of years of experience in practice the table further shows all (100%) of the senior lawyers with 16 to 20 years and 21 years or more experience, did not use libraries, but asked other colleagues, used personal collections, the law firm libraries or the internet 118 (92%). Thanuskodi (2010) perceived that lawyers
preferred to consult their personal collections first. Furthermore, 106 (83%) of the lawyers with 21 years or more experience sent their assistants to get information for them.
Table 5.12: Cross tabulation of points of access and use by years of experience for lawyers

N=128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of access</th>
<th>0-5 years</th>
<th></th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th></th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th></th>
<th>16-20 years</th>
<th></th>
<th>21+ years</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Colleagues</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Librarian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS Library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal collection</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISWA library</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court library</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law firm library</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Assistant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online databases</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
Table 5.13 shows results of the point of access by region and gender. It shows that all lawyers, both males and females in all the regions use their colleagues. Shiselweni and Lubombo lead with 100% for males, while Hhohho and Lubombo leads with 100% for females.

Furthermore, both males and females show a high rate of use of online databases and internet in all the regions. Shiselweni and Lubombo lead with 100% for males while Lubombo leads with 100% for females. The usage of personal collections and law firm libraries is also high in all the regions for both male and female lawyers. Shiselweni and Lubombo lead with 100% for males while Lubombo and Manzini have 100% for females.

The Table does not reflect Shiselweni region because there were no female lawyers found in this region.

Table 5.13: Cross tabulation of access and use by region and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hhohho</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manzini</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Colleagues</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Librarian</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS library</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Collection</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISWA library</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court library</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law firm library</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Assistant</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Databases</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

5.6.3 Ability to find information by participants

Question 12 of the questionnaire, required the lawyers to rate themselves with regard to their ability with seeking and finding the legal information they need from the different access points they use. A scale was provided for answers reflecting ‘Very good’, ‘Good’, ‘Fair’, ‘Poor’ and ‘Very Poor’ and the lawyers were to tick the most appropriate response.
Out of the 128 participants, only one (0.78%) ticked ‘poor’. About 15 (12%) rated themselves as fair, while a majority 89 (70%) rated themselves as good and 22 (17%) as very good at seeking and finding legal information. One did not answer the question. Table 5.14 presents these responses.

Table 5.14: Ability to search by lawyers (ratings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking of skill</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

Librarians were asked if lawyers were given information searching and use skills training in the libraries. A majority of the responses was that none were given except for library tours upon request. This is a confirmation that the libraries did not offer these skills to the lawyers. LL1 and LL2 said that:

“Yes, we do coach them at first and tell them that next time even if they don’t see anyone, they can go try locate but if they fail, they can then come to someone to actually assist and guide them to the shelves” (LL1).

“Most of them do not come for training. It is only a few individuals who just come and ask to be showed resources” (LL2).

“If the person is still new, maybe. But when they are used to it, they do it themselves because we show them first” (LL4).

LL6 said there were no training skills offered since the Law Society library was not functional.
5.7 Information resources used by participants (Section D)

Section D sought to answer research question 3, which was to find out which information resources were used by lawyers in Swaziland. Access to relevant legal information resources are an integral part of the work of every legal practitioner because failure to access and know the right context, “detail and authority of a source of information can constitute professional negligence of the highest order” (Bates, 2013: 172) with dire consequences in the administration of justice. Section 5.7.1 presents the responses from the lawyers’ survey questionnaire which covered information resources used by lawyers. The librarians’ interview schedule covered the same issue in section D.

5.7.1 Use of legal information by participants

Question 13 and question 16, which were multiple response questions on the questionnaire, required the participants to tick all the resources they used and the frequency of usage. Table 5.15 presents the usage of the listed different resources. It shows that all the 128 (100%) lawyers used law textbooks, while 127 (99%) used cases, statutes, and 125 (98%) used the constitution. It is also noted that 119 (93%) used unreported decisions of superior courts followed by 110 (86%) who used the internet, with 112 (88%) who used reference materials. Haruna and Mabawonku (2001: 72) found that lawyers mostly use the latest judgements of superior courts. About 104 (81%) used government publications law indexes and discussions with colleagues respectively. Further, 104 (81%) also used Law indexes, law databases and newspapers respectively. Question 16 in support of question 13 was the Likert scale question, with possible answer options being “very often”, “often”, “not often”, “never” and “not sure”.
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Table 5.15: Legal information resources used

N=128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal information resource</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law text books</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported cases</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference material</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law journals</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Publications</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law databases</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Indexes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Papers</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROMs</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non legal database</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Customary community meetings)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

The librarian’s interview schedule also asked about the resources used by lawyers in the library and the frequency thereof. A majority of the interviewees pointed out that the visits to the libraries by lawyers were not frequent. However, from the instances where the lawyers visited the libraries, responses from the interviewees were that;

“Most of the time they come here they look for law textbooks, some look for case studies and they come ask for statutes and then the constitution booklets” (LL1).

“Mainly they use statutes, as well as textbooks because we don’t have electronic databases at the moment” (LL2).

“They come and then they mostly use the reference section because most of our legal books are found at the reference section” (LSE3).
“They normally want to get newspapers, both current and past issues. They also want textbooks, case laws, statutes sometimes they want a specific gazette which we provide” (LSE4).

“It’s gazettes, statutes, general orders and some law books, and other judgements that were made in other countries for verification and all that” (LSE5).

“The library is not used much. It is not yet functioning, thus, there is not much to manage entities, just a donation of about 48 volunteers” (LL6).

5.7.1.1 Search engines used to access legal information

Question 14 of the questionnaire for lawyers solicited the search engines used by the participants to search for legal information through a multiple response question. They had to tick all the search engines used. Table 5.16 shows that a majority 122 (95%) used Google, while 20 (16%) used Yahoo. Other search engines such as Ask and Bing less used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Engines</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

A closer look on the usage of these search engines by age of respondents shows that all (100%) of those in the age groups of 21 to 35 and those over 56, used Google as shown in Table 5.17 below. Makri (2008: 108-109) argued that academic and practising lawyers are increasingly turning to Google to find information.
Table 5.17: Usage of search engine by age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age-Group</th>
<th>Google</th>
<th>Yahoo</th>
<th>Ask</th>
<th>Bing</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

5.7.1.2 Websites and databases used by participants

Question 15 of the questionnaire was an open-ended, multiple response question, requiring the participants to list the websites and databases they used for legal information from the Internet. A majority, 121 (95%), listed the SWAZILII website, followed by SAFLI used by 47 (37%), then JutaStat used by 18 (14%); Lexis Nexus used by nine (7%); AfricanLii used by eight (6%); and Butterworth’s publishers and SABINET which was used by two (2%) respectively. Other websites showed a usage of 2% or lower. Figure 5.8 below depicts the number of lawyers using the websites and databases mentioned by the participants.

Figure 5.8: Website and database usage by lawyers

Source: Field data (2017)
5.7.1.3 Formats preferred by participants

In relation to the formats, question 17 of the questionnaire solicited the preferred information format. Kuhlthau and Tama (2001:25) were of the view that lawyers mostly prefer print format as opposed to electronic because of the lack of organization of the latter on the internet. From this question, the participants were required to tick all the preferred formats. The responses showed that 121 (95%) preferred print and 125 (98%) preferred electronic resources. Only one (2%) preferred audio/visual. Table 5.18 below presents the participants’ preferred formats.

Table 5.18: Preferred Format of Information resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio/Visual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microform</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

5.7.1.4 Availability of resources in libraries or collections

Results presented in Table 5.19 show that 99 (77%); 100 (78%); 101 (78%) accessed textbooks, cases, and statutes from personal collections respectively. Law firm libraries and senior colleagues were the most heavily used facilities for access to these resources. It is noted that 46 (36%) of the lawyers accessed journals from the UNISWA library. This may be mainly because the this is an academic library that has subscriptions to journals. The other collections may not have subscribed to journals due to costs of subscriptions.

These results are confirmed from the interviews with librarians, where the Law Society library recorded the lowest results for all the resources. Interviewees confirmed that lawyers did not use the Law Society library often, as it does not have sufficient materials. Furthermore, the LSE responses also confirmed the same. The most used collection was seen to be the, law firm library, the internet and personal collections respectively as shown in Figure 5.7 where the frequencies are 4.7 and above for these three resources.
### Table 5.19: Availability of information resources in collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Law Society Library</th>
<th>UNISWA Library</th>
<th>Public Library</th>
<th>Law Firm Library</th>
<th>Personal Collection</th>
<th>Court Library</th>
<th>Senior Colleagues</th>
<th>Databases</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law text books and practice books</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>37 29%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>99 77%</td>
<td>94 73%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>59 46%</td>
<td>17 13%</td>
<td>38 30%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases law</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>37 29%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>100 78%</td>
<td>85 66%</td>
<td>10 8%</td>
<td>57 45%</td>
<td>13 10%</td>
<td>26 20%</td>
<td>7 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes/Legislation/Decrees</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>27 21%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>101 79%</td>
<td>85 66%</td>
<td>9 7%</td>
<td>41 32%</td>
<td>12 9%</td>
<td>24 19%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>20 16%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
<td>89 70%</td>
<td>89 70%</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
<td>45 35%</td>
<td>51 40%</td>
<td>36 28%</td>
<td>8 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported decisions of the superior courts</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>16 13%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>87 68%</td>
<td>52 41%</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
<td>34 27%</td>
<td>10 8%</td>
<td>19 15%</td>
<td>38 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental publications</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>19 15%</td>
<td>7 5%</td>
<td>72 56%</td>
<td>41 32%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>13 10%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>68 53%</td>
<td>9 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers/proceedings</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>7 5%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>11 9%</td>
<td>8 6%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>25 20%</td>
<td>9 7%</td>
<td>42 33%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Journals, periodicals, magazines,</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>46 36%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>61 48%</td>
<td>16 13%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>7 5%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>53 41%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>13 10%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
<td>34 27%</td>
<td>60 47%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>8 6%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
<td>10 8%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law indexes and abstracts</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>37 29%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>64 50%</td>
<td>31 24%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
<td>8 6%</td>
<td>7 5%</td>
<td>16 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials (dictionaries/encyclopedias)</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>27 21%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>81 63%</td>
<td>57 45%</td>
<td>9 7%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>24 19%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law databases</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>17 13%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>56 44%</td>
<td>19 15%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non legal databases</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>7 5%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
<td>35 27%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>9 7%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>57 45%</td>
<td>37 29%</td>
<td>6 5%</td>
<td>12 9%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with colleagues</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>36 28%</td>
<td>15 12%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>43 34%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews, Newsletters and Circulars, etc.</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>16 13%</td>
<td>8 6%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>40 31%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Seminars, Conference papers</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>3 2%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>10 8%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>4 3%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>5 4%</td>
<td>2 2%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
The LSE were asked if the society has policies that deal with the provision of legal information services in the library. All the participants responded that the Law Society has no library policy. LSE6 further pointed out that there is no qualified library staff and the facilities were not well equipped for legal information provision. Some noted that the Law Society is more concerned with the ‘bread and butter’ issues as opposed to information services.

5.8 Challenges affecting participants (Section E)

This section explored the challenges faced by lawyers in accessing legal information in general and from the different collections or libraries. Section E (question 19-20) of the questionnaire solicited challenges faced by the lawyers about the libraries they used and searching the actual resources; while Section E (question 25- 28) of the Librarian’s interview schedule sought the challenges faced by librarians in providing legal information services to lawyers and strategies they used to serve lawyers. Section D (question 29- 34) of the LSE interview schedule investigated the challenges faced by the LSS in providing legal information services to its membership, that is, the lawyers. The literature review in Chapter Three guides this discussion. Wilson’s general model of information behaviour highlights the different barriers that may hinder information seeking and thus have an effect on the user’s information needs.

5.8.1 Challenges encountered by participants about the libraries/collection

Section E of the questionnaire (Appendix 2); as well as the Librarian’s interview schedule, section E (Appendix 4) and the LSE’s interview schedules in section D (Appendix 6) respectively, intended to establish the challenges encountered by lawyers when accessing the information resources from the different libraries or collections they used. Question 19 was a multiple response question where the participants were asked to tick all the challenges that applied to them. Table 5.20 presents the summarised responses from the lawyers about their challenges with all the libraries. Section 5.8.1.1 presents challenges expressed about the Law Society library in particular.
Table 5.20: Challenges encountered by lawyers in the libraries/collections

N=128

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Law Society Library</th>
<th>UNISWA Library</th>
<th>Public Library</th>
<th>Personal Collection</th>
<th>Law firm library</th>
<th>Court Library</th>
<th>Senior Colleagues</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a member/ No access</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of staff in library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Lack of search skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Lack of computer skills</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhelpful staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate electronic resources</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of this library</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient/Outdated sources</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor ICT Infrastructure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor bandwidth/poor internet connectivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Unknown/never use)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

5.8.1.1 Law Society library challenges

The responses show that 99 (77%) of the participants reported that they are not aware of the existence of the law society library. This was by far the most common challenge. About 17(13%) pointed out that there are inadequate electronic resources and insufficient or outdated resources. The responses from LSEs confirm the results in terms of insufficient/outdated resources and inadequate electronic resources as the interviewees pointed out that:

“There is a library, which is quite old and small. The law society will do better in improving though working on getting more resources and recent journals, textbooks for most of the lawyers who do not have these resources in their own offices” (LSE1).

“We, basically do not have a fully-fledged library but we do have a small library” (LSE3).
“A library is available at the law society office, but Unfortunately, its old dated information and books that are no longer relevant to members as they should” (LSE 6).

“Our library is not properly functional. From the Law Society library, there is no information that could be of use to lawyers.” (LSE7).

“There is a limited library, but the existence of this is unknown so I would say there is no such service” (LSE 5).

However, LSE1 and LSE3 were of the view that:

“Lawyers are aware of the library” or, according to another interviewee:

“Lawyers are aware of should be aware of the library” (LSE6).

This was a contradiction given the lawyers’ high response of non-awareness of the same. LSE5, further said that,

“But the existence of this is unknown so I would say there is no such service”. He further said that:

“I think there is, to an extent a gap between law society executives and its members, as to what is owned by the law society. The dissemination of information is not efficient”

Similarly, LSE4 said:

“I doubt it that lawyers are aware and they need to be informed.”

From the librarian’s point of view, in relation to the LSS they stated that:

“They don’t use the library much because of its lack of resources and fully functional staff since I am involved in all administration work of the office” (LL6).

Figure 5.12 below indicates the frequency of those (lawyers by status) who indicated non-awareness of the various types of libraries and resource provision. It shows that as compared to the other libraries, 110 or 85.9% of the lawyers were not aware of the availability or existence of Law Society library.
From the LSE interviews, section D, challenges noted by the interviewees in providing access to legal information included the lack of funds, lack of facilities, lack of a functional library and time were mentioned by all 100% of the interviewees. Three (42.9%) pointed to the challenge of acquiring expensive material as well as outdated resources. Table 5.21 below summarises the problems as per the responses from the LSE.

Table 5.21: Challenges experienced in provision of legal information by the Law Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities/ functional Library/time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Funding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive material</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdated resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
Another challenge expressed by all (100%) of the LSE interviewees was that the library had no qualified staff, the library facilities were not sufficient, and even the Society’s website was not maintained.

In their own words the interviewees said:

“No, the library does not have a qualified staff” (LSE1, LSE4, LSE6, LSE7)

LSE4 further said that,

“I think we would actually need one – maybe if we had one then that’s the passing vote which would then encourage the members to use the library.

“The LSS, operates with its skeletal staff because eh, it has a messenger and an accountant. We don’t have a qualifying librarian. We don’t have a library staff. When you access the service you just--- it’s a self-help.” (LSE2).

However, LSE5 felt that the

“In sufficient staffing, I believe that if at all there was such facilities, the staff that would be there could manage it. Once it grows bigger, there would be a need for a qualified librarian. For now, what we have can manage”.

In terms of the website, their responses were that;

“I believe the law society is working on a website if I recall. But it is not eh, sufficiently updated. It is still work in progress.” (LSE2).

“Uhm, we do have a website even though it is not properly updated.” (LSE3).

“They do have a website but I think the website is dormant” (LSE5).

“Yes, we do but it is not up to date” (LSE7).

5.8.1.2 Other libraries

In the questionnaire responses (presented in Table 5.19) regarding the UNISWA Library, a larger proportion, 62 (48.4%) of the participants pointed that the major challenge was the lack of access or membership, followed by 35 (27.7%) who mentioned insufficient/outdated sources while 27 (21.1%) said there was inadequate electronic resources.
From the librarians’ interview schedule, interviewees’ responses confirmed such challenges pointed by the lawyers. Some noted that:

“Yes, the library is open to lawyers but there is one hitch, which go with membership, these people have to apply for external membership. They normally pay €500 for those who are pursuing academic programmes with other universities, but those that are applying for membership for purposes of business, like lawyers, the charges are up to €1500 (LL7).

“Private lawyers have no direct access but only have access to gazettes with payment. They have to pay for those gazettes” (LSE5).

In terms of the court library, a majority, 73 (57%), of the lawyers in the questionnaire responded that they had no access to the court library (see Table 5.20). The interviewees further explained that some of the libraries gave access but with certain provisions.

From the librarian’s interview schedule, all seven (100%) of the interviewees confirmed that the libraries had insufficient or a lack of material and lack of funding to provide a comprehensive service. One interviewee, LL1 (14.3%) felt that lawyers did not specify their needs hence the libraries did not collect information resources for them.

5.8.2 Challenges faced by participants during searching

Question 21 of the lawyers’ questionnaire (Appendix 2), solicited the challenges encountered when searching for information from libraries or collections. Figure 5.10 below shows that on average, 70 (55%) of the lawyers lack time to search for any of the information resources in the libraries, followed by an of 60 (47%) on insufficient resources in libraries. On average, 21% face outdated resources in these libraries. Notable on average, only 1% is faced with the challenge of lack of search skills.

5.8.2.1 Lack of time

In terms of challenges per resource, the results indicated that a majority (74%), lacked the time to search for law text books in the libraries followed by Case law (73%), statutes (70%) and 67% government publications and law journals (65%). Those who faced lack of time in searching for newspapers were 59%. A further 56% lacked the time to search for reference materials and 38% lack the time for law databases.
The LSE interviewees, who pointed that lawyers generally do not have the time, corroborated this. One LSE interviewee responded to the effect that the library is not used as,

"most of our junior lawyers, they do not necessarily ..., have the time” (LSE5).

Another pointed out that resources in the Law Society library would not be convenient for all lawyers in the different parts of the country due to the proximity. In his words, he noted:

“The physical library is situated within the law society offices. Attorneys are scattered all around the country and the law library is in Mbabane, so you cannot imagine yourself in a certain point in advocating travelling from Nhlangano to Mbabane to access the library there” (LSE2).

This supports the aspect of environmental barriers as depicted in Wilson’s general model of information seeking behaviour.

5.8.2.2 Insufficient resources

The results per information resources in the collections also show 66% complained of insufficient textbooks, while 65% complain of insufficient cases (65%). A further 64% complain of insufficient statutes, while 63% point insufficient government publications. In addition, 60% point insufficient law journals while 56% complain of insufficient conference proceedings.

This was corroborated by the Librarians’ interviews, where a majority of the librarians said that their resources were not up to date. In their words, their responses included the following:

“Uh, no, we don’t have them case books and We don’t have law journals, we only have textbooks and statutes, even though the statutes are also-, the version is old. They are not up to date, our books, they are not up to date” (LL2).

“We don’t subscribe to databases and our textbooks and statutes are not up to date because we depend on government who has a limited budget” (LSE3).

“We have law reports, newspapers, textbooks and they are not up to date. The problem is money, financial constraints, budgeting is not good” (LSE4).
“The library is not quite up to date with the books. Statutes and gazettes are up to date because we receive them every week” (LL5).

“Nothing is up to date. We are not acquiring any material due to funding” (LL6).

“We have journals, textbooks, newspapers case books and many more. The databases uh, we have Lexus Nexus, which due to financial challenges we no longer subscribe to. I would say the collection is not up to date for financial constraints” (LL7).

### 5.8.2.3 Outdated resources

As mentioned in 5.8.2 above, in terms of outdated resources, an average of 21% across all resources in the libraries is faced with this challenged. Of these, a large proportion, 45% mention they face challenges in terms of outdated law textbooks while 39% face it in case law, with 34% in statutes. This is also confirmed by the librarians as mentioned in 5.8.2.2 above, where most show that the resources are outdated and as a result insufficient to meet the needs of lawyers. Figure 5.10 below outlines a summary of these results.

![Frequency of challenges in search of information resources](image)

**Figure 5.10: Challenges experienced by lawyers in searching of information resources**

Source: Field data (2017)
5.9 Strategies to overcome challenges of information provision

This section presents the responses of the participants as regards suggestions and opinions about strategies that could be applied to overcome the different challenges faced in satisfying lawyers’ information needs. This was dealt with in questions 21 to 25 of the lawyers’ questionnaire and questions 25 to 28 of the librarians’ interview schedule as well as question 29 to 34 of the LSE interview schedule.

5.9.1 Strategies to overcome challenges in general

Question 22 of the lawyers’ questionnaire was an open-ended question, from which the researcher sought to obtain the participants’ views in relation to improving access to legal information for lawyers. The responses were the personal opinions of the participants. A majority, 66 (52%), suggested that the adoption of online resources was necessary; while about 45 (39%) suggested enhanced or improved law collections generally. A further 18 (14%) suggested that there should be subscriptions to law databases. Other respondents felt that maintenance of SWAZILII was required. Five (3.9%) felt that lawyers should provide their own equipped collections, while two (1.6%) felt that lawyers should change their attitude in terms of empowering themselves and also acquire research skills respectively. One (0.8%) participant suggested centralizing of the Law Society library to other regions. Table 5.22 below shows the strategies suggested by the participants.

Question 21 of the questionnaire solicited suggestions on the improvement of access to legal information by lawyers in the different libraries in the country. From the responses, 97 (80.8%) of the participants suggested that other libraries should update their legal collection. Also, 56 (46.7%) suggested that there should be more subscriptions to legal databases and a constant update of the available collection in the libraries, while 17 (14.2%) felt that other libraries should have a law section meant to accommodate lawyers while 15 (12.5%) suggested that there should be wider advocacy of the legal resources provided. In addition, 12 (10%) felt that the membership in other libraries should be open to lawyers for access.

5.9.2 Strategies to improve access by the Law Society

Like the preceding question, question 23 and question 24, were open-ended questions that sought the opinions of the lawyers specifically in relation to the Law Society as a professional
organization and its library, on what it could do to ensure sufficient and effective legal information access for members. Themes suggested by the participants included:

- The Law Society should establish its own online library (95, 75% participants);
- The Law Society should further subscribe to law databases on behalf of the members (72, 57% participants);
- Enhancement of the present collections (59, 46.8% participants);
- SWAZILLI should be updated (45, 37.7% participants).

Other themes suggested by the participants as shown in the Table 5.22 below included:

- The need to hire professional staff for the Law Society library and build a legal resource centre respectively (13, 10.3%); was Advocacy and fundraising was suggested by 25 (19.8%);
- Collaboration with other stakeholders (17, 13.5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish online law library</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscribe to Law Databases</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Current Law Collections</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Cases on SWAZILII</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise or get Donor Funds</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Stakeholders JSC / MoJ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire Professional Staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a Resource Centre</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with Publishers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft a Strategic Plan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with UNISWA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join a Consortium</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft a strategic plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
Most of the suggestions put forth by the Law Society executives, corroborated the lawyers’ responses. A majority, six (86%) of the LSE interviewees supported the lawyers’ responses that it would be good for the society to have an online library, subscribe to databases and have a way of raising funds and seeking donations in order to provide access to legal information for members.

For instance, some of the interviewees felt that an online library and database subscriptions could be good. According to LSE 2’s words;

“*I think if the law society were to be positioned properly to provide library services electronically, it would be easier.... It would be easier for law society members to actually access through an online desk*” (LSE2).

Further,

“*It would be vital to subscribe to databases. I think, it would be the practicality of it because there is a limited number of people who access the physical facilities at the given time and eh, the more people could accessed if we subscribed to access these online eh, facilities, the more money has to be paid so it would eh help in a way*” (LSE2).

Another interviewee pointed out that,

“*The Law Society should take initiative. It would be cheaper that way if the law society on behalf of its members, for example, to subscribe to certain online library databases*” (LSE5).

The Law Society librarian, LL6 also recognised that there was a need for an online library and legal databases as well as a qualified librarian to run the library as she is not a librarian but an assistant? The exact words were:

“A qualified librarian, and acquisition of legal databases accessible online will be good”.

Another interviewee from the Law Society interviews pointed to the issue of lack of funds to support information resources:

“The obvious issue is that we need more finance support. And once we have that, it will be easy to plan for other things like online resources, because right now, with the
resources which we have it will be difficult to establish and maintain or grow a library and to be engaged in a campaign which is going to sensitize members about the full benefits and information” (LSE4).

Another interviewee alluded to an online library being needed,

“The law society offices are open until 5p.m., so after that members who have the need to use library resources after hours they cannot have access to them, so that’s the shortcomings that we have. And besides that materials are not current…..so an online library could solve this” (LSE1).

The LSE interviewees also suggested the issue of fundraising and LSE2 said that:

“The office is not sufficiently funded to get information because it depends for its operations on member subscriptions”.

The LSE pointed out that the Society was struggling financially as it depended on subscriptions, which were not necessarily paid in full by the members:

“Like I have mentioned we are struggling to even meet the basic needs of the law society; payment of mortgage bonds and all these things, and staff salaries” (LSE5).

According to LSE5:

“...from the members themselves- the problems are self-inflicted by the members themselves by refusing to subscribe to the Law Society”.

Furthermore, LSE6 indicated about information access problems,

“obviously getting information and the cost factor is there. So it becomes expensive for the attorneys to fend for themselves.” He also mentioned that:

“If the law society, for instance, sourced the funds themselves and provided the services then obviously the attorneys would be the one’s which are beneficiaries.” (LSE6).

In terms of plans for the future of information services provision, the LSE felt that they are struggling to survive as a society, hence they had no plans. In their words, they said:

“To be quite honest, ever since I’ve been there it’s not something that we’ve discussed. It’s because of the situation, it’s always eh, we are always trying to raise just enough
in order to survive, so when you are in that position you don’t have the luxury of thinking of other things like the access of library services to our members” (LSE4).

“Not that I’m aware of anything being done to address general problems of information services, because the law society will often find challenges in that it is wholly dependent on the subscriptions of members and its tasks are enormous. …. The allowances are paid from the very subscriptions that are collected from the lawyers yet the Law Society will still have to pay a bond for its offices that it has acquired. It has to pay for the skeletal staff members that are there and pay for running costs of those offices” (LSE2).

From the librarian’s interviews, LL6 felt that there were no plans in the pipeline for the Law Society library due to budget constraints. LL6 mentioned that,

“So far, the law society is still at a baby stage and no financial resources to survive. And so far the funds are for the professional services related to ethics professional conducts and other bread and butter issues.”

Table 5.23 below presents responses from the LSE interviews, where six (85.7%) of the interviewees suggested that the LSS as an organization can improve and provide information services by obtaining funding and soliciting donations as well as cooperating with other institutions like the Ministry of Justice respectively. Four (57.1%) of the interviewees noted the need for commitment from members of the LSS and crafting a strategic plan for the Society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions by LSE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding and donations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with other institutions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online library</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription to legal databases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from members</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafting strategic plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving communication between EXCOM and Members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacitating individual offices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
5.9.3 Strategies by the other libraries

One of the questions to librarians sought to find out what their libraries did to assist lawyers when they visited the libraries and could not find the materials they needed. This question intended to investigate how the libraries dealt with the challenges they faced in terms of options used in providing legal information resources required by the lawyers. Three (42.9%) of the librarians interviewed mentioned that they used inter-library loan as an alternative while six (85.7%) recommended alternative sources like use of other libraries or organizations to lawyers.

In addition, in dealing with the challenges faced by the libraries, all of the interviewees felt that one of the solutions would be soliciting funds and or donations to overcome the lack of materials in the collections.

On lack of qualified staff in the libraries, four (57%) pointed out the need to hire qualified staff, which also points to shortage of staff. Three (43%) mentioned cooperation from the lawyers themselves who could specify their relevant needs and collaborations of affiliation or consortium with other libraries could also improve the provision respectively.

This suggestion was corroborated by the responses from the lawyers in Table 5.22 above where 13% provided the same suggestion. Table 5.24 below shows a summary of suggestions for the improvement of provision of legal information services to lawyers from the librarians’ interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion on how challenges can be overcome</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting funds / donations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire qualified staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs specification from lawyers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation with other libraries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded Security CCTV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/ Advocacy of the library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)
Section F of the librarians’ interview schedule asked the interviewees to comment on services planned for information service provision in their libraries. From their responses, five (83%) of the librarians indicated that they had plans to automate, digitize as well as subscribe to databases as a means to improve general information services in their libraries. It cannot be confirmed though that these plans would also cater for the provision legal information to lawyers.

5.10 Summary of the lawyers’ survey questionnaire

It has emerged from the results of the questionnaire that most of the lawyers do not rely much on formal libraries in general, because there is either no access available to them, or there is no useful legal information for them. Further, the Law Society as their main professional body does not have a fully functional legal information centre, as the present library is neither well equipped nor known to most of the lawyers as potential users.

5.11 Summary of the librarian’s interviews

The librarians’ interviews intended to investigate what the libraries provided for the private lawyers in terms of meeting information needs and providing access to legal information.

From the responses of the participants, it is noted that the responses given by the lawyers in their questionnaire regarding their used information needs mentioned in Table 5.15 were confirmed by the librarians’ interviews, in Figure 5.5 where 85.7 librarians noted the statutes, cases and books as the most needed legal information. Further, the interviews confirmed the challenges faced by the lawyers in accessing legal information from the libraries as well as the resources accessed. These were outdated and insufficient resource (section 5.8.2). A detailed analysis is provided in Chapter Six. Table 5.24 provides a brief summary of the librarians’ interviews.
Table 5.25: Librarians’ summarised findings from interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Personal profile and demographic details</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The participants were librarians stationed in libraries that had legal collections in the country, and were in a position to serve users and lawyers who used the libraries. A majority had been librarians for 2 years or more so they had knowledge of the needs of lawyers. Their main responsibilities included reference services, collection development, marketing the library classification and supervision (Figure 5.4). Participants understood the legal information needs of lawyers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section B: Information needs of lawyers | Research materials: text books, statutes, case law, government gazettes, journals, etc. |

| Section C: Access and use of legal information resources by lawyers | The libraries were generally not equipped to cater for lawyers’ legal information needs. The libraries had no policy specifically catering for legal information. The libraries did not offer any skills to lawyers for searching information in their libraries. The libraries had no subscriptions to legal databases to cater for lawyers, hence lawyers did not use them much. The libraries had outdated materials that discouraged the visits by lawyers. |

| Section D: Challenges in legal information service provision by Law Society and strategies to overcome | Society’s major challenge is funding, thus legal information services are not up to date. Strategies to meet these include fund raising, commitment by membership and establishing a functional online library with qualified staff. |

Source: Field data (2017)

5.12 Summary of the LSE’s interviews

The interviews with the LSE showed that the Law Society does not have any means to provide access to legal information for their members due to lack of funds. This confirmed the results of the lawyer's questionnaire in terms of the lack of availability of information resources in the library in the Law Society for their use. A majority of lawyers pointed out that they were not aware of the existence of a library in the Law Society. The responses from the interview participants showed that the library had few useable materials, some reading space and it did not provide any circulation services of legal material. They confirmed that there was no policy...
meant to cater for members’ information needs. Table 5.26 below summarises the findings from the LSE’s interviews.

**Table 5.26: Summarised findings from the LSE interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section A:</strong> Personal profile and demographic details</td>
<td>The participants were lawyers who have been members of the Society since admission as practitioners to the High Court of Swaziland. A majority have been a member for ten years or more. All the Participants have served in the Society executive for more than 2 years. Their main responsibility was to be involved in the governing and administration of the affairs of lawyers in Swaziland. Participants knew the legal information needs of lawyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section B: Information needs of lawyers</strong></td>
<td>Research materials: text books, statutes, case law, government gazettes, journals, and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section C: Access and use of legal information resources by lawyers</strong></td>
<td>Law Society as an organization did not provide any legal information access to lawyers as this was not in their priority. The law Society also had no plans to provide legal information for its members even though it recognizes the need, which is evident by the available library space in the office vicinity. Has a library but it is not well equipped to meet needs of members not that available material information services are up-to-date for use. Lawyers thus do not use the facility. Society has no policies to guide legal information provision and has not prioritized the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section D: Challenges in legal information service provision by Law Society and strategies to overcome</strong></td>
<td>Society’s major challenge is funding, thus strategies to meet these include fund raising, commitment by membership and establishing a functional online library with qualified staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

**5.13 Summary of the chapter**

This chapter presented the findings of the collected data, from a questionnaire to lawyers in private practice meant to investigate their legal information needs and access to legal information thorough the professional body of lawyers, the Law Society of Swaziland. A semi-
structured interview with librarians was used to establish the needs of this group of users as well as services provided from the librarians’ point of view. In addition, another semi-structured interview with the officials and caretakers of the Law Society of Swaziland were administered to further investigate needs and legal information services provided to membership through the Law Society. The following chapter will give an analysis of the presented results.

The methods used for analysis were the descriptive statistics from the SPSS and CSPRO7 as well as the thematic content analysis. Relevant information on the profile of the participants and the organizational characteristics of the lawyers and the legal information provision institutions were obtained. The existing legal information needs and access to legal information by private practising lawyers in Swaziland were identified. The results revealed the various needs of lawyers and the different places in which they accessed legal information in Swaziland. It identified the factors that affected access to legal information, and perceived barriers thereof and further suggestions on how to overcome these from the participants.

A triangulation of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies was employed in order to obtain comprehensive responses that provided clarification of the circumstances around information access and needs of lawyers in the study. Further, a theoretical framework based on literature reviewed in Chapters Two, Three and Four guaranteed the reliability and validity of the research measuring instruments. Cronbach’s alpha tested the co-efficiency for reliability on the overall data.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

6.1 Introduction

Chapter Six presents a discussion of the findings from the results presented in Chapter Five and provides an analysis and interpretation. The data was collected in order to obtain a better understanding of the information needs of private lawyers in Swaziland and to make recommendations for successful legal information provision and access for lawyers.

It has been emphasised that “properly conducted analysis and correct interpretation of statistical data results play a major role in ensuring that conclusions are sound and that uncertainty surrounding them is presented properly” (Wasserstein and Lazar, 2016: 131). The interpretation of data helps in obtaining the meaning of the data that assists in the establishment of the relationships that may exist between the research questions and the objectives of the study (Palinkas, Horwitz, Green, Wisdom, Duan, and Hoagwood, 2015; Mertler and Reinhart, 2016). Consequently, the level of interaction between the data and the issues being investigated becomes clear (Blaxter, Hughes, and Tight, 2006).

This chapter is presented in several parts, the first being the results of the demographic profiles of the participants. The second part summarises the information needs and behaviour in relation to access and services provided to lawyers in Swaziland.

The process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the collected data according to Wasserstein and Lazar (2016) is data analysis. Chapter Five, section 5.1 and Chapter Four, section 4.5 explained the process, rationale and purpose of mixed methods research design which was applied in this study. As was outlined in Chapter Two, a combination of the qualitative and quantitative research methodologies were applied in order to acquire a comprehensive result to cover and clarify issues under study. The research further employed a pragmatic position, which considered the practical perspective of the researcher. In this chapter, the captured data from the qualitative and quantitative research is analysed and interpreted in a systematic manner in line with the research questions. The analysis process aimed to present data in an interpretable form in order to identify the relationships in accordance with the research aims mentioned in Chapter One section 1.3. A theoretical framework based on the
literature reviewed and analysed in Chapter Two, Three and Four gave assurance of the reliability of the study. Further, the validity of the study’s measuring instruments using the Cronbach co-efficiency test was discussed in Chapter Four section 4.11.

This chapter interprets the findings presented in the previous chapter, Chapter Five, linking them with the research questions with reference to studies mentioned in the literature review in Chapter Three. The results from both the quantitative and qualitative collection data tools (Appendices 2, 4 and 6) was collected and analysed and combined to generalise the findings so as to address the main research question and sub-questions provided in Chapter One (section 1.4).

6.2 Analysis and interpretation of data

It has been observed that the interpretive approach, which is comprised of the deduction from data attained, relies on the feelings of the participants, which is part of qualitative research (Robson and McCartan, 2016). Habitually, the researchers also rely on their experience of particular settings to be able to understand and read between the lines of the information or data provided by the subjects under study. While, this study engaged a mixed method successfully, (combination of qualitative and quantitative methods) (see section 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.5.3), it focused on the pragmatic position and used a phenomenological approach as a guide. Briefly, the word ‘data’ means information collected in a systematic way, and organized and recorded (Antonius, 2003: 2), to facilitate a correct interpretation for questions the researcher wants answered. It is further said that data are not fixed per se but are susceptible to reconfiguration, thus can be an alternate way of finding answers to questions a researcher wants answered (Schostak and Schostak, 2008: 8).

These ideas are the methods used to analyse the qualitative and quantitative data in the present research. Scholars have pointed out that qualitative data analysis methods need to be systematic, chronological, confirmable, and uninterrupted; they require time and deferral or delay jeopardises the analysis. Further, the use of comparison for improved feedback to enlighten and accommodate alternative explanations (Morgan and Krueger, 1998: 11) is expected. While conducting a study (whether qualitatively or quantitatively), (see section 4.5.1, 4.5.2, 4.5.3), the purpose is to produce findings; the qualitative method employs concepts, terms and symbols to construct a basis of communicating the data revelations. Quantitative methods use procedures and techniques to analyse the data numerically (Antonius, 2003). As
mentioned, the study used both methods and section 4.5.3, Table 4.1 discusses the differences and similarities of these two.

Thomas (2010) and Robson and McCartan (2016: 408) posit that the process and end outcomes of analysis provide the bases of interpretation and analysis thus should not be taken lightly. Accordingly, these scholars argue that, the process of coding, comments, identification of similar phrases, patterns themes and relationships, gradual elaboration and linking of generalizations to formalised knowledge in constructs are significant analytical moves in qualitative analysis. The different views and ideas expressed by the scholars have been earmarked as significant for this study.

Wilson’s 1999 general model of information behaviour was used as the theoretical framework for the entire study. Further, in using the mixed methods approach in data collection using quantitative and qualitative methods and triangulation as discussed in section 4.5.3.1, the study adopted the pragmatic position and used a phenomenological approach. As mentioned in Chapter Five, (section 5.2) data collection was through a self-administered questionnaire for lawyers to collect both quantitative and qualitative data, while qualitative data (section 4.8.2) gathering was through interviews with the Law Society Executives and librarians in libraries that have legal information resources.

This current chapter attempts to link the literature review components with the research results with the research questions and theoretical framework. For the purpose of a coherent and complete discussion and interpretation of the findings, using triangulation, the responses from the questionnaires were triangulated with the responses from the semi-structured interviews. Some of the data presented in Chapter Five has been reproduced to answer the following research questions of the study:

- What are the information needs of lawyers in Swaziland?
- How do lawyers in Swaziland access and use legal information?
- What information resources do lawyers in Swaziland use?
- What are the challenges affecting lawyers in satisfying their information needs, and lastly;
- What strategies could be adopted to overcome any challenges faced by lawyers in satisfying their information needs?
The results were presented as an analysis of the quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire (section 5.2). It is essential to be mindful in this stage of the fact that the data from both the quantitative and qualitative sections are connected as the qualitative data sought to investigate the present situation in terms of access to legal information for lawyers via the legal information institutions found in Swaziland.

Semi-structured interviews as a data-gathering tool assisted in obtaining additional data meant to clarify and shed more light on the issue of lawyers’ legal information use and access as per their information needs. It further helped the researcher to explore and expand on the quantitative findings to yield a more in-depth account of the extent and availability of legal information for lawyers in Swaziland. Interviews recorded by audio and verbatim transcripts of the same were compiled for analysis and interpretation (section 4.8.2) once the participants had consented to the recording. The notes taken during the interviews on the schedules served as a backup during the recording procedure.

In the next section, the researcher explores the analysis of the both the questionnaires and interviews data according to thematic content analysis. The researcher used similar codes for the same themes that were used in the questionnaire and the interviews. The main themes from the semi-structured interviews reflected the research problem, namely, to investigate or establish the information needs of lawyers and whether legal information needs were satisfied particularly by the Law Society of Swaziland’s information service to members.

### 6.3 Demographic details of participants

The first significant variable per Wilson’s 1999 general model of information behaviour, which guided this study, consists of the ‘information user’. It was thus essential to describe the participants involved in this research. The participating lawyers in the questionnaire were described based on their geographic location, status in the profession, duration, qualification, age, and gender.

#### 6.3.1 General information

Since this was a census of all private practising lawyers in the country, from a total of 170 surveyed participants, 128 responded. This yielded a positive response rate of 75.3% for lawyers, which is a reasonable proportion to enable generalization. For the purposes of this
research, ‘participant’ was preferred as opposed to ‘respondent’ to avoid confusion with the legal process of cases. These lawyers were from one hundred and two (102) active law firms in Swaziland’s four regions.

More than half (52%) of the participants were from the Hhohho region, and 43% from the Manzini Region as shown in Figure 5.1 in Chapter Five. The other two regions (Shiselweni and Lubombo) had a low representation of 2% each. This geographic discrepancy is because the main business districts with the major courts are in the Hhohho and Manzini regions where the highest court of the land and magistrates’ and Swazi courts are found.

In terms of gender, like many studies of this profession, (Fombad, 2010, Haruna and Mabawonku, 2001; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010 and Otike, 1999), a majority of lawyers (81.3%) were males while females accounted for only 18.8%. Males in Swaziland thus still dominate the profession. Even in this study, the legal profession is predominantly male. One of the reasons for this may be that females join the corporate world more as opposed to the pressurised court business. In terms of age range, of note is that of the 104 males in practice, almost a third of them (26.9%) were in the age range of 31 to 35 followed by the age range of 41 to 45 at 22.1%. Furthermore, almost a third (29.2% and 20.8%) of the females were in the age range of 31 to 35 and 41 to 45 years respectively.

In terms of the range of years in legal practice (experience), the responses showed a high number of lawyers in the profession at an entry level. In this regard, almost half, (48%) had 0 to 5 years’ experience and 23% had 6 to 10 years’ experience. This suggests that there was a high number of lawyers with less experience in practice as opposed to those with over 10 years’ experience (Table 5.5) hence, this may have an influence on their need for access to timeous and current legal information. This lesser experience, in practice and in business, may mean that affordability of resources may be an issue; hence, some provision for them has to be in place.

From these age ranges as shown in section 5.3.4, it was seen that a large proportion of lawyers, 61 (48%) were those who call themselves attorneys and professional assistants and who were mostly within the range of experience 0 to 10 years in service. These, as mentioned, were those that were regarded as in the entry and mid-level of the profession. The results also revealed that less than a larger proportion (40%) of the participants’ current position was that of attorney as depicted in Table 5.5. The high number, 91 (71%) of the lawyers were in the early (0 to
5 years) and mid-stage (6 to 10 years) of their careers and this is significant in that it influences the need for legal information provision. Scholars have pointed out that the years of experience have a great influence on the need for information (Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001; Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, 1996; Wilkinson, 2001). Staudt (2003) argued that younger lawyers are the ones that have a greater need to find information on new issues, conduct research, handle and argue motions in court as delegated by their senior colleagues, hence the need for more access to timely information. These studies showed that information needs of experienced users are less because they already have knowledge of the subject field. Scholars have pointed out that the more experienced a person is, then the lesser the need to search and acquire basic legal information (Wilkinson, 2001; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010).

Those in higher positions in the firms were mainly in the experience range of 0 to 5 years in these positions, hence, even if they had experience in the practice, they may have been new in these positions in these firms offices; as such these firms’ offices may not have been adequately equipped with legal information resources as yet. The results showed that the lawyers were made up of attorneys (38%), partners (25%), and associates (21%) who were in the experience range of 0 to 5 years in these positions. This suggests that more participants were in the lower level and early years of practice, which is likely to have an impact on their information needs.

To illustrate this, as mentioned, Chapter Five, Table 5.5 shows the percentages of the duration of each practice role, where the professional assistants and attorneys were in the lower years (100% and 65% respectively) hence had less experience.

Furthermore, from this distribution, in terms of the highest qualifications, 86.7% had an LLB degree; while only 8.6% had an LLM. This suggests that lawyers in active legal practice do not undertake further academic pursuits after the LLB degree. It has been observed in other studies in developing countries, that lawyers are too busy and have no time to pursue further studies, as they do not see the need after getting the basic qualification required to practice law (Fombad, 2008: 204). A study by Khan, Bhatti, and Ghalib (2011) showed that there was a higher percentage of lawyers with a basic degree in law.

Another reason why most lawyers in this study do not bother to go further in academic qualifications may be seen from the results on needs for legal information given in question 9 of the lawyers’ questionnaire. It is noted that there were fewer lawyers who lecture in any institution, which normally requires a higher degree. Table 5.9 showed that only 39% needed information for further education, which shows that they were less interested in furthering their
education, except where they would do research for their main roles in the legal practice. Almost all the lawyers (99%) usually need information for professional updates as opposed to furthering their education.

In terms of gender and positions of the librarians, the results showed that this profession was dominated by males as more than half (57%) were males with only 43% females (Table 5.3). A majority (71%) of them held the position of assistant librarian or librarian, which are professional positions in the LIS field, hence they are considered as qualified to give credible results on the topic under study.

Males also dominated the LSE, as 86% were males with only 14% females (Table 5.4). The positions they held in the committee were one of each, with similar roles with the main one as that of general duties of the society. More than half (57%) of them had duties that included LSS management services, compliance with Legal Practitioner’s Act duties as well as guidance of legal practice (Table 5.8), these put them in a position to know the operations of the LSS. Further, their length of service was considered as having a bearing on the research problem under discussion in terms of their experience while serving lawyers.

Results showed that from the librarians interviewed, more than half (57%) have been in the information service for over six years. In the LSE’s interview, they had come into office at different times as committees change, but the results showed that all of them had served in the office for at least two years. This infers that they understood the needs of lawyers and the organization of the LSS, as they were lawyers themselves.

However, in terms of qualification of the librarian in the LSS library, it was noted that there was no qualified staff for the library. The one present was an administrative person and accountant of the LSS who also acted as a librarian of sorts (Table 5.3). From the librarian’s interviews, interviewee LL6 pointed out the fact that she is responsible for the library and other administrative duties of the LSS. Furthermore, since the LSE were all lawyers, they had been members of the LSS for more than five years. Interview responses from the Law Society executive and Law society librarian showed that the LSS library lacked qualified staff as the one available was not a qualified librarian nor did she have an LIS qualification (Table 5.3)
6.4 Information needs and behaviour of lawyers

The information needs of lawyers were briefly discussed in Chapter One, the introduction of this study, section 1.1 and section 1.9. A further address of the same was covered in Chapter Three, section 3.2 where it was revealed how different studies had established the need to undertake further study in order to address unique information needs of lawyers in Swaziland. Wilson’s information behaviour models put the information user at the centre for the information needs and barriers epitomized by interrelating variables. This study placed the information need as the main motivation, and identified the barriers that hindered access to legal information in meeting the needs of lawyers. The first objective of the research was to investigate the information seeking behaviour of the lawyers in Swaziland with the view of determining their legal information needs. With this objective in mind, the researcher asked questions that would identify their needs. Questions that were asked for this objective were questions 3, 8 and 9 of the lawyers’ questionnaire, which required the lawyers to stipulate their position in legal practice, their work roles and the activities they did.

The results as presented in Chapter Five (section 5.4, figure 5.3) show that all (100%) of the lawyers in this study needed information to perform the roles of legal advising, disputes and negotiation, drafting and representing clients. Furthermore, 84% dealt with estates while 88% did legal research. A further, 66% had administrative duties, while 59% had management duties. Conveyancing and lecturing was only performed by 15% and 12% respectively. This creates the context of the information needs depicted in Wilson’s 1996 model. These work roles may be one of the reasons lawyers did not pursue higher academic qualifications as they were not involved in teaching, but were involved in the practical context of legal services. These roles give rise to the need for the different sources of legal information that are accessed from various collections and sources.

Studies by Otike and Matthews (2000); Haruna and Mabawonku (2001); and Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) found that the operations of lawyers range from representing clients in legal matters, drafting legal documents and providing legal advice in any form that requires extensive information in different forms as this study had found. According to Otike and Matthews (2000), lawyers are mostly involved in the practical use of legal information theories to bring solutions to individual problems to serve the interests of their particular clients. According to Kuhlthau (1993), information needs evolve from a vague awareness of something (legal information services in this case), followed by locating the information that contributed
towards the understanding, clarifying the meaning and expanding the information obtained to bring about a solution. In the legal workplace situation, Fay (2017, 120) opines that this means one has to be in ‘constant and reflective awareness’ of the legal subject. While other scholars reiterate that information need is a factual situation interconnected and inseparable from ‘information’ and ‘need’ (Wilson, 1981), it follows that the roles the lawyers perform therefore have an influence to the information needed as it occurs within particular situations.

Shen, Tan, and Zhai (2005) and Wilson (1981) posit that the context or information situation of the user from whence the information need arises is important. They contend that it is important to contextualise the user’s situation in order to know the information need. The results in this study established the information needs through contextualising the situation of the lawyers’ roles in the legal practice. As mentioned above, section 5.4 presented the results of the main roles of a majority of lawyers, which were legal advice, disputes and negotiations, drafting legal documents, and representing clients. Cole (2011:1231) concurs and points out that the “bases of the complexity of information needs is rooted in a paradox” that require one to go deep into understanding the particular individual’s field. Wilson’s general model (1981:5) explains how information need arises and what barriers may curtail the actual access to satisfying the information need (section 5.5.1, Figure 5.6 and Table 5.9). These results confirm the literature review on lawyers’ information needs, where Haruna and Mabawonku (2001:69) posited that lawyers require access to good legal information like court decisions, past cases, current legislation and legal policies. As mentioned, the responses from the questionnaire confirmed what both interviews (librarians and LSE) reported in terms of the resources needed (section 5.7).

Lawyers have been said to wear different hats in different situations as some are referred to as attorneys, counsels, representation, solicitors, barristers, advocates, public defenders, and prosecutors and many other names which include administrators, managers, and so on (Otike and Matthews, 2000; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010). Fagbemi (2017:24) opines that “lawyers are the bedrock of courts of justice and crusaders for the entrenchment of the rule of law”. Consequently, it is observed from the results that lawyers’ roles involve a representative capacity, appearing on behalf of clients, drawing up papers, pleadings or documents. They execute various acts in connection with proceedings or potential cases before a court, panel, commission or officers constituted by law or having authority to take evidence in or settle or
determine disputes and issues of controversy in the application of the judicial power of the state or any relevant division (Fagbemi, 2017).

As shown in Figure 5.3, all 100% of the lawyers confirmed their duties as involving legal advice, disputes and negotiation settlements, drafting and representing clients. From these results, 84% dealt with estates while 88% did legal research. These roles give rise to the need for different legal information accessed from various sources and collection. The duty and burden that comes with such onerous roles demands access to complex current legal information. Ultimately, there is need for legal practitioners to conduct their clients’ cases competently and in accordance with the stipulations of the law on top of ensuring the best interests of their clients. Wilson in his model orated that information needs are secondary needs meant to satisfy a primary need, which may be physiological, affective and cognitive, to dispel the uncertainty that may be a barrier in the satisfaction of addressing issues related to their role (Wilson, 2006:663).

In answering, the research question related to ‘the information needs of lawyers’, all three categories of participants (in questionnaire and interviews) pointed out that lawyers in private practice needed information related to defending and presenting cases on behalf of their clients; advising, and professional updates. Figure 5.9 shows that almost all (99%) indicated this as well as 95% who indicated the need for case law and 93% for legal references, while 91% indicated the need for statutes, and 81% needed information from both colleagues and clients for answering queries.

These results confirm the literature review on lawyers’ information needs, where Haruna and Mabawonku (2001:69), posit that lawyers require access to good legal information like court decisions, past cases, current legislation and legal policies. Otike and Matthews (2002) in a study on information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in the UK found that the information needs are actually influenced by the nature of the work they do. Furthermore, the expressed non-usage of the libraries by lawyers is attributed to the unavailability of resources that relate to the nature of their work.

### 6.4.1 Information resources used by the lawyers in Swaziland

As a follow-up to the information needs, question 13 of the lawyers’ questionnaire asked the lawyers to indicate the kinds of information resources used by them to answer the research
question relating to the information resources used by the lawyers in Swaziland. Figure 5.5 in Chapter Five shows the frequency of use of particular legal information resources needed for the different roles in legal practice. It was confirmed by all three types of participants of the study that the most needed and used resources included law textbooks, cases, statutes, unreported decisions, government publications, law journals and reference materials (see Table 5.15 in Section 5.7.1).

The interviewed librarians and LSEs also confirmed the same as they pointed out that these resources were what lawyers mostly used in their legal practice (section 5.7.1). A study by Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010a) on the assessment of information sources used by lawyers, shared the same outcome in their study results. As mentioned, section 5.7.1 presents results of the usage of different information resources where it shows that 100% lawyers used textbooks, over 95% used cases, the constitution, and unreported decisions of superior courts as well as government publications (see Table 5.15).

From the questionnaires, it emerged that lawyers would prefer an online resource centre to meet their information needs, as they had no time for physical visits to libraries. Gardiner, McMeneny, and Chowdhury (2006) contend that ‘limited time’ is one of the factors that impinges on information seeking. The interview with the LSE confirmed that online resources from the Law Society collection were non-existent, yet it seems that lawyers use more online resources in this age. This is seen in the fact that a majority (86%), shown in table 5.15 use the internet. Further, almost all (95%) seemed to access search engines like Google as seen in Table 5.16. A study by Hinson, Ofori, and Atuguba (2007) found that a majority of lawyers felt that accessing internet resources enhances their productivity.

This may be supported by the fact that information in Google is free and one is able to obtain leads to relevant sites of legal information, which may also be convenient for those who have no time to go to libraries like lawyers. This is also an advantage for those with less experience in legal practice (0 to 5 and 6 to 10 years) who were a majority 85% in the study. These may not be in a position to afford the expensive legal resources at this early stages of their career and may be more familiar with the internet environment. Table 5.17 also showed that all (100%) of the lawyers in the age group of 21 to 25 use Google. The age group of 56 years and over showed that all (100%) also used Google. This result may be because the senior group have no time to search for information themselves as they usually send their assistants. The age
group of 21-25 is said to be more exposed to online resources than their seniors in this information age.

In terms of preferred formats, the results presented in Section 5.7.1.4, Table 5.17 showed that almost all the lawyers (98%) preferred electronic formats, which is supported by the high usage of the internet. However, it is noted that almost all, 95%, also prefer print. It can be conclude in these results that lawyers use both electronic and print formats. A recent study of information behaviour of engineers by Wellings and Cassselden (2017: 6-7) found that engineers, who are professionals like the lawyers in this study, seem to prefer both electronic (online) and print formats, where he noted that they seem to print out the electronic resources to read on paper. This may be the case with the present population, as they usually need to have the actual material at hand (an observation by the researcher). The stance of preferring the internet and electronic formats by the lawyers in this study, may be evident in the results of question 12 of the lawyers’ questionnaire, where over 70% rated themselves as good in the ability to search for information (section 5.6.3, Table 5.14).

**6.5 Information access and use**

It was necessary to determine where the lawyers accessed information resources, to answer the research question on how lawyers in Swaziland accessed and used legal information needed. Hence, the participants were asked to state the points of accessing the needed information and frequency in questions 10 and 11. Section 5.6.1 presents these results and showed that a very low percentage (2%) of lawyers access the Law Society library and only 5% use the public library and the court library respectively, while almost half 43% used the UNISWA library. From the responses, it was evident that the first point of access is both the personal collections and other colleagues, which was mentioned by 94% and 97% of the lawyers respectively. From these responses, it can be inferred that lawyers preferred to use collections in closest proximity and familiar collections first before going out of their comfort zones.

All (100%) of the interviewed librarians and 100% of the LSE officials pointed out that the greatest inhibiting factor to the provision of legal information to the lawyers was inadequate resources, inadequate funding and priorities of the libraries. This was confirmed by Haruna and Mabawonku (2001)’s study where it was noted from interviews that the extent to which lawyers consulted libraries was low due to various reasons like those given in this study.
One of the interviewed librarians, LL1, further contended that the fact that the lawyers themselves did not stipulate their needs especially when at public libraries makes it difficult for libraries to ensure relevant provision of legal information to lawyers. However, this cannot be regarded as acceptable as libraries have a mandate to service the needs of all. The libraries should establish an outreach programme and conduct a needs assessment of lawyers’ information needs to ensure that they provide a service that meets the lawyers’ information needs.

The low percentage of library usage by the lawyers may also be because there is no relevant information sources as reported in Section 5.8.1 and Table 5.21. The results also showed that all (100%) of the lawyers used colleagues (Figure 5.7) as a point of access rather than libraries. Wilson’s 1999 general model accommodates this conclusion as it points out that information seeking behaviour can include other people through information exchange. In this regard, the lawyers used other colleagues as informal sources of information. Further, it emerged from the responses that 83% access the law firm libraries and 81% visited the internet. In this regard, the mean of those who consulted the internet, personal collections, law firm library; online databases and other sources was high (Figure 5.4 to 5.6)

As noted, the results showed that the other challenge is ‘lack of time’ for the lawyers. This may be due to their busy schedules in terms of physical visits to the libraries. Scholars have pointed out that the nature of the tasks of the lawyers require them to have access to timeous information (Wilkinson, 2001; Haruna and Mabawonku, 2001). Challenges mentioned in Table 5.21 showed that over 70% lacked time to search for or access information from the different resources in libraries. This confirms that most of the lawyers rarely visited the libraries that have legal information resources.

From the responses, it was evident that the first point of access is both the personal collection and other colleagues, which were used by 94% and 97% respectively. From these responses, it can be inferred that lawyers prefer to use the familiar sources first before going out of their comfort zones. Thanuskodi (2010)’s study observed that lawyers preferred to consult their personal collections first. Wilson’s 1999 general model also shows that information seeking behaviour is related to the psychological condition of the user, who may be hindered by fear of the unknown thus settling for familiarity. Familiarity, in this case includes other people and personal collections as information channels. In this regard, the lawyers used other colleagues more as the Figures show. Wilkinson (2001) investigated information resources used by
lawyers and found that lawyers overwhelmingly preferred informal sources when accessing or seeking information, which is confirmed in this study.

Further, the used resources were sourced internally rather than externally, hence the present study depicts that a majority of the lawyers used the law firm libraries, colleagues and personal collections. The results also showed that 83% of the senior lawyers (Figure 5.8) relied on sending assistants to locate information for them. Otike (1999) in his study on lawyers found that it is common for legal practitioners to delegate information seeking responsibilities to serve their information needs (Otike, 1999: 35-37). This is particularly so for the senior lawyers in this study. The foregoing responses are thus in line with the literature review regarding the first point of reference in seeking information being the known sources (Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001; Niedzwiedzka, 2003). These common sources or channels in this case were colleagues and their personal libraries.

Most of the interviewed librarians’ responses on the question of usage of the libraries by lawyers confirmed that lawyers rarely visited their libraries. The interviewed librarians mentioned that the lawyers’ visits were not frequent (section 5.6.2). This may be interpreted to mean that indeed lawyers preferred to use other means, which were convenient to them to access the information they needed along with the fact that they had no time to visit libraries as shown in responses from question 20 depicted in Figure 5.12 on the frequency of accessing the different access points. It is also evident that the Law Society library was not vital for them as the results showed that only 2% used it as seen in Figure 5.4. In addition, the fact that this library is not functional as pointed by the LSE interviewees who said that it was not equipped with relevant resources to serve the needs of members.

When analysing the responses given by the lawyers in question 11 from the ordinal data that was recorded using a 5-point Likert scale, the responses showed that the lawyers were not objective. Hence, their responses did not meet the requisite of being reliable measures. Even the latent construct for library use was also not close. In this question, the lawyers were supposed to range the frequency of consulting the given sources or collections as either; Very often (1); Often (2); Not Often (3); Never (4); Not sure (5). The reliability analysis output shown in Table 6.1 below shows ($\alpha = .368$), which is on the fringe in terms of the correlation between the methods of consultation used by lawyers.
Table 6.1: Reliability statistics of access to sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

To improve the Cronbach’s alpha score the item-total statistics was used to delete methods used that were more than $\alpha = .368$ in Table 6.2 below.

Table 6.2: Item- total statistics of sources consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item-total statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask other colleagues</td>
<td>36.4922</td>
<td>9.244</td>
<td></td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Librarian</td>
<td>38.5625</td>
<td>9.398</td>
<td></td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS library</td>
<td>38.6328</td>
<td>10.155</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal collection</td>
<td><strong>36.0859</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.630</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-.130</strong></td>
<td><strong>315</strong></td>
<td><strong>.386</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>38.5547</td>
<td>9.462</td>
<td></td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISWA library</td>
<td>38.1641</td>
<td>9.020</td>
<td></td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts library</td>
<td>38.5234</td>
<td>9.984</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law firm library</td>
<td>36.5078</td>
<td>8.488</td>
<td></td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>36.1016</td>
<td>9.557</td>
<td></td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Assistant</td>
<td>37.3984</td>
<td>8.131</td>
<td></td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Databases</td>
<td>36.1641</td>
<td>9.115</td>
<td></td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>37.4922</td>
<td>9.512</td>
<td></td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

The ‘Use of personal collection’ was deleted and the alpha score improved from $\alpha = .368$ to $\alpha = .447$ as shown in Table 6.3. The value was still below $\alpha = .7$ hence, the responses given by the lawyers cannot be said to be reliable. These results indicated that they did not use the libraries often, which could be inferred as because they did not have the time as shown in responses from question 20 and the fact that these libraries were not equipped with relevant resources.
Table 6.3: Reliability statistics after deletion of ‘personal collection’

Reliability statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

To further test the latent construct of ‘library use’ based on only library collections selected from the list in Table 6.2, the Law Society library, Public Library (SNLS), UNISWA library, court library and law firm library were analysed. Reliability statistics shown in Table 6.4 below, with the highest showing 0.405, was still below the expected 0.7 minimum.

Table 6.4: Item-total statistics for libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS library</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>3.577</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISWA library</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts library</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>3.549</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law firm library</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

The alpha score improved from $\alpha = .347$ to $\alpha = .423$ after dropping law firm library to improve reliability in Table 6.5 below. The value remained below $\alpha = .7$ hence the responses given by the lawyers on the latent construct of ‘use of libraries’ was not reliable.
Table 6.5: Reliability statistics after deletion of ‘law library’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2017)

In summation, statistics from Table 6.6 below show that the mode value of 4 = ‘Never’ on all the options of library consultations. Lawyers did not visit libraries hence they could not give reliable responses to question 11.

Table 6.6: Statistics of sources accessed by lawyers for legal information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Field data (2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISWA library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask other colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law firm library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Databases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the interview with the librarians, the response from a majority, five (71.4%) of the librarians as shown in section 5.6.2, show that lawyers rarely visit the libraries which is what was confirmed by the reliability test results above. This also leads to the conclusion that indeed lawyers preferred to use other means, which were convenient to them to access the information they needed rather than libraries. Considering this with the responses that they did not have time to visit libraries as shown in responses from question 20 of the lawyers’ questionnaire (Appendix 2), it is evident that libraries are not convenient in accessing information for them.
The lowest result of 2% usage relating to accessing the Law Society library is noticeable in Figure 5.4. It is observed that the lawyers would hardly visit the library at all due to this fact.

The low percentage of library usage by the lawyers may also be because there was no relevant information sources available to them in the collection. This was confirmed by the lack of up-to-date resources as revealed in the librarian’s interview schedule results in Table 5.19. The factor of time frame for the lawyers’ busy schedules in terms of physical visits to the libraries also played a role in this instance. Scholars have pointed out that the nature of the tasks of the lawyers require them to have access to timeous information (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010; Adewale and Mansor, 2014).

According to question 21 of the lawyers’ questionnaire, challenges noted showed that over 70% lack time in terms of seeking or accessing information from the different resources in libraries. This suggests that most of the lawyers rarely visit the libraries that had legal information resources. This confirms Wilkinson (2001)’s argument that information users seek the most convenient accessed resources or channels to meet their information needs.

In determining the places where lawyers accessed the different resources, the results showed that certain materials were found in particular libraries or collections more than others were. For instance, most lawyers used the law firm libraries to get textbooks, statutes and case law, although however they are challenged in terms of outdated material, which hinders access to current information. About 63% pointed out that their law firm libraries were not up-to-date as revealed in question 20. A study by Otike (1999: 34) concluded that libraries were not adequate to meet lawyers’ needs. Wilson’s 1996 model depicts barriers that show hindrances of access to information by users in terms of environmental aspects.

One of the Law Society executive interviewees (LSE2) pointed out that the proximity of the Law Society library is also a factor that may affect access as it is situated in Mbabane, away from even the courts where law business is done as mentioned in Chapter Five, section 5.8.2. Thus even if it had relevant resources, visitations would still be limited because lawyers just do not have the time due to the proximity.

In terms of the frequency of usage of the internet and online databases, seen in section 5.6.2, Table 5.13, it was evident that these experienced a high percentage of consultation as they amount for a 87% and 81% frequency of use respectively. This shows that ICTs were heavily used as compared to the libraries. A study by Das and Jadaba (2017: 15) found that the growth
of ICTs in the digital environment has drastically changed the information seeking patterns of users as law students relied more on electronic resources found in the internet. Lawyers in the work place in this study showed that they have also been influenced as they relied more on the internet and online databases to meet their needs than print-based resources.

Section 5.6.3 related to their ability to search for information, and from the results in Table 5.15, a majority, 70%, of the lawyers rated themselves as good at searching and a few, 17% rated themselves as very good. It is argued that in this era of information overload, social media has made information users believe that they are ‘search experts’ (Caputo, 2012). However, according to Fay (2017: 120) and Bates (2013: 172) studies have shown that “there is no correlation between digital familiarity and skills information.” So, even though the lawyers were using the online resources, this does not mean they had good information skills.

In determining the places where lawyers access the different resources, the results showed that certain materials were found in particular libraries or collections more than others. For instance, most lawyers used the law firm libraries to get textbooks, statutes and case law, while most use the UNISWA library to access journals as mentioned earlier. However, 53% of the law firm libraries and personal collections faced the challenges of outdated material or insufficient resources as mentioned earlier (see Table 5.21). Wilson’s model (Wilson, 1999: 256) noted that another barrier that hinder access to information by users is when the demands they make for information sources result in failure due the unavailability of the resources needed.

One of the Law Society executive interviewees, LSE2, pointed out that the proximity of the Law Society library is also a factor that may affect access as it was in Mbabane, whereas lawyers were scattered throughout the country, therefore it was not practical for lawyers to use it. The library is also far from the courts where law business is conducted. Therefore, even if it had relevant resources, visitations would still be limited because lawyers just do not have the time due to the libraries’ proximity as mentioned earlier.

6.5.1 Usage of libraries by lawyers

Since the study was mainly about investigating the access to legal information by lawyers, it was necessary to look into the usage of the different libraries and the extent to which the Law Society of Swaziland’s library was meeting the needs for accessing information by its members. From the responses (section 5.6.2), it showed that most of the lawyers (63%) did not use the Law Society library, only 37% were using it. In addition, a majority, 74% did not use
the court library, only 26% used it. Even the Public Library had only 23% of the lawyers visiting it, while UNISWA Library had only 17% of the lawyers using it. In terms of the frequency of usage of these different libraries, as mentioned earlier, question 19 responses made it evident that a majority, 76% of the lawyers did not visit the Law Society library as discussed in section 6.5 and seen in Figure 5.15 of Chapter Five.

This suggest that these places were not convenient to them due to their busy schedules as pointed out by Wilkinson (2001), Haruna and Mabawonku (2001). Alternatively, these libraries also had further barriers for the lawyers in terms of access being availed to them, as more than half, 57%, had no access to the court library while 48% had no access to the UNISWA library (see Table 5.21). The International Federation of Library Association (IFLA), in its report on ‘putting libraries on the agenda- new development and access to information’ (IFLA, 2017) has pointed out that access to information is essential to achieving a lot across the board and thus there is need to have information that is open to all. By having stringent conditions in the access to legal information in these library collections, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) in the country are undermined. Further, one of the interviewees, LSE4 pointed out that the proximity of the Law Society library makes it inconvenient for lawyers to use it.

The significance of legal information access for lawyers especially in the entrance stages in the profession cannot be over emphasised. From the results in this study, 89% of lawyers in the 0 to 5 years of experience did not have good personal collections as opposed to 100% of lawyers with over 10 years of experience in practice (Table 5.13). It is evident from the results that those with more experience accessed legal information from their personal collections and / or their law firms. According to Otike and Matthews (2000: 243) and Kidd (1981), the age and experience of a lawyer has a great influence on the information need as they contend that the more experienced lawyers have carried out so much research in legal practice such that they may not need to consult sources as often as the entry-level lawyers. This may also account for the fact that the experienced lawyers already had a good collection secured over the years. Consequently, some consideration has to be taken into account for the entry level professionals.

Information literacy is a significant part of the everyday working life of any professional. This is the ability to recognise an information need and be able to efficiently locate, explore, analyse and effectively use and communicate in various ways (American Library Association, 2015; Association of College and Research Libraries, 2000). Section 5.6.3, Table 5.14 reported on the ability to search and easily access legal information by the participants. They were to rate
their skills through ticking the option that applied to them from ‘Very Good’, ‘Good’, ‘Fair’, ‘Poor’ and ‘Very Poor. A majority, 70% responded Good, which infers that they are information literate. In this case, ‘Very Good’, ‘Good’ and ‘Fair’ are taken as positive attributes and such responses were high; while ‘Poor’ and ‘Very Poor’ were taken as negative and responses here were low.

From the responses of the interviewed librarians which were to the effect that they did not offer specific training or information skills to lawyers to search except upon request for tours, and the lawyers’ responses above, it is concluded that the lawyers considered themselves skilled in this premise. Thanuskodi (2010)’s study concluded that academic lawyers were able to acquire information they needed through the use of IT based resources. For the present lawyers who were in practice, this shows that there was much change in information literacy development of the lawyers in terms of being aligned with the changing information in terms of content delivery in the electronic age. Winterton (2011: 32) observed that with the rise of electronic publishing and delivery, it seems lawyers were keeping abreast of their IT skills. Winterton had also orated that in these days of virtual libraries where legal information is primarily in electronic form, there is a necessity for lawyers as users to be able to access publications in any format. This is a need in the present study where Swaziland is concerned. Legal research libraries need to alter their collection development policies to include more electronic resources. As a follow up on this point, the participants showed a high usage of the internet through search engines like Google and Yahoo. Section 5.7.1.1 reports that a majority, 95%, of lawyers used Google across in all the age ranges.

Question 15 of the survey questionnaire solicited information on the websites used by the lawyers. Results presented in section 5.7.1.2, Figure 5.8, showed that a majority, 95%, used the SWAZILII to access decisions of the superior courts, 37% accessed SAFLI and 6% accessed AfricanLii, which were free online legal databases. These databases are not sufficient to meet all the needs of the lawyers, hence more electronic library resources are required. It is also noted that 14% accessed Juta, while 7% accessed Lexis Nexus, 2% accessed Butterworth’s and Sabinet respectively. Of note is that these require subscriptions, hence most lawyers in the entry level may not afford them. The high results for use of the free online resources may be related to affordability, as it is known that legal information is expensive. The other databases that are used less may be expensive for the lawyers, hence, are only accessed by those in firms that have the financial resources to subscribe to such databases. This is where the Law Society
could play a role in meeting the needs of its members by subscribing to the other relevant databases.

In terms of preferred formats of the resources used (section 5.7.1.3, Table 5.18) it seems that from the results, the lawyers preferred both print and electronic formats, with a slightly higher rate for the latter, which was preferred by 98%. This infers that online resources would be best for the lawyers. From the interviewed librarians, responses showed that a majority, 85.7% of the libraries were not automated so unable to provide electronic resources to the lawyers. Most did not have a policy (section 5.6.1) relating to provision of legal resources to lawyers specifically. Such policies could have provided for the acquisition and adoption of electronic formats of legal information resources.

6.6 Challenges of access to legal information

This section discusses the challenges of access to legal information experienced by lawyers in relation to environmental challenges applicable to Wilson’s model. This is in terms of responses relating to the questions on challenges affecting lawyers in satisfying their information needs in Swaziland.

6.6.1 Challenges at the Law Society Library

Challenges encountered by lawyers when accessing legal information from the Law Society library specifically, include the fact that a majority (86%) of them were not aware of the Law Society library as shown in Figure 5.9. However, some of the Law Society executive interviewees (section 5.8.1) were of the view that lawyers were aware of the existence of the library as they were notified through meetings. Nevertheless, it is concluded that even though members of the LSS, that is lawyers themselves, may have been told about the library, they were not predisposed to use it because it is not functional or equipped with useful information for lawyers as was confirmed by the interviews.

In addition, this non-usage is likely to be because the LSS not placing access to legal information provision as a priority in their plans. This is corroborated by the responses of the executive officials. For instance, LSE5 pointed out that lawyers had to fend for themselves and that it was important for them to have a comprehensive collection. LSE4 argued that it was not
the duty of the LSS to provide legal information to its members, which shows that information access for lawyers was not a priority. Hence, there was no development of any sort in regard to the acquisition of resources in the limited library. A study by Otike (1999, 34) concluded that libraries were not adequate to meet lawyers’ needs. However, the law societies of South Africa have comprehensive and functioning libraries which support the members’ information needs. This was observed from the Law Society of KwaZulu-Natal library’s website (Law Society of South Africa (LSSA), 2015), and (KwaZulu-Natal Law Society, 2017) where it was noted that online resources access is available to members, accompanied with live chat from the Society’s librarians. Further, literature reviewed in Chapter Three, section 3.6, revealed that other professional organizations like the Law Society of England and Wales (Wales, 2017) provide online resources to members.

6.6.2 Challenges in the other libraries

One of the challenges noted from the lawyers’ questionnaire responses was the lack of access to some of the libraries (Table 5.20). For instance, more than half, 57%, had no access to the court library and 48% had no access to the UNISWA Library. This is mainly because these two were meant to serve a special group being the judges and the students of UNISWA respectively. It is known by the researcher as well that the court library is only open to the judges of the High Court, hence the non-usage of this library by the lawyers. The UNISWA library is for use by academics and students. Membership to the UNISWA library is open to lawyers through external membership where a fee has to be paid. Such a fee could be one of the hindrances for those who are still new in the profession and cannot afford the membership fees.

As regards the preferred access points discussed in section 5.6.1, which were personal libraries, law firm libraries and colleagues, the challenges noted according to the lawyers’ responses in Table 5.20, were that 53% of the personal collections and 46% of colleagues’ collections were either out-of-date or had insufficient resources. The preceding responses were thus in line with the literature review regarding the first point of reference in seeking information being from the known sources (Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001; Niedzwiedzka, 2003). These sources in this case are colleagues and their personal libraries. These points of access also lacked electronic resources, which the lawyers needed. Das and Jadab (2017) noted that some studies on the use of electronic legal resources identified restricted access, slow connectivity and lack of library support services as the main problems faced by users.
These were the same challenges experienced by the lawyers in this study. It is suggested that these could easily be dealt with through the establishment of an online resource centre through the Law Society Library. Das and Jadaba (2017) concurs with Aforo and Lamptey (2012), and Oguntuase and Falaiye (2004) that libraries are gateways for fulfilling legal information needs and there is a correlation between the adequacy of a library collection/resources and frequency of library usage/visits by users. This idea of a required online central resource centre is reflected in the high percentage of usage of online databases and the internet by 81% of participants as seen in Table 5.12. This high usage of online databases and the internet is also seen in Figure 5.7 and Table 5.13 to meet legal information needs as already noted above.

The present study results confirm this given the low number of library visits by lawyers as a result of inadequacy of the collection as reported in section 5.6.2, (Figure 5.6). The frequency of use of the public library was also low with a mean of 2.3% usage (Figure 5.7). In addition, even those who visit these libraries point out that they were either outdated in terms of resources or had no relevant information as confirmed by the librarians’ interview responses in Table 5.23 and the lawyers’ responses in Table 5.20. As a result, it seems the only practicable way of maximising access to legal information as suggested by Otike and Matthews (2000: 241) is by “setting up their own library on a co-operative basis”, which can be done best by the Law Society in this case. This is because existing libraries have barriers of one form or another.

All the Law Society officials in the interview confirmed that the Law Society library lacked relevant facilities, funding and reported that lawyers have no time to use the library anyway. This is not in keeping with the literature in other countries where Law Society libraries are popular and used by lawyers, as seen in the KwaZulu Natal Law Society in South Africa (KwaZulu-Natal Law Society, 2017).

Wilson’s 1999 model of information behaviour confirms that there are environmental barriers that may be experienced by information seekers, who then have to engage others ways of accessing information. In this case, the lawyers often used the online resources to overcome this barrier. The interviews with librarians and the executive officials of the Law Society corroborated the resources needed and the fact that they were lacking in the collections (Table 5.23 and Table 5.22). Noted is that a high percentage of the lawyers, (95%), confirmed the need for frequent use of text books, case law, statutes, government publication and journals (Table 5.15).
The non-availability of resources in the existing library collections poses a major problem in terms of information access for lawyers, especially in cases where the lawyers do not have good collections of their own. Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) reiterated that the currency and availability of the information affects timely access, which is more evident to those who are in the entry stage of the profession (Kuhlthau and Tama, 2001) as they are known to require more and different legal information sources.

Another problem experienced in accessing legal information was the currency of the information sources found in the libraries. It is evident from the results that materials from the law collections under study were outdated and needed updating. This is seen in Table 5.20, which showed that most of the libraries, including the personal collections had outdated material and this further, was not adequate.

It also seems that many participants did not appreciate the role of the Law Librarian and the professional association in legal information access in this study. This is seen from the fact that very few (13%) of the lawyers responded that they consulted a librarian. The interviewed librarians, whose response also mentioned that few lawyers approach them for any information or even for recommendations, further corroborated this.

Noted from the LSE interviews was that there was a lack of commitment from the LSS members as noted by four (57.1%) of the interviewees. According to the LSE, the Society depends on membership subscriptions for survival and it was currently struggling to make ends meet (section 5.9.2).

6.7 Suggestions to overcome the challenges

This section discusses the suggestions to overcome the challenges noted by the participants of the study in relation to legal information needs and access by lawyers.

6.7.1 Suggestions on challenges in the Law Society of Swaziland and LS library

As presented in section 5.9.2, results from the lawyers’ questionnaire showed that a majority, 75% of the lawyers, felt that the Law Society should establish its own online library, while almost half, (46.8%) suggested that the present collection should be enhanced or improved. Further, more than half, 57% of the lawyers suggested that the Law Society should subscribe to legal databases. Of note is the 37.7% of lawyers who suggested that SWAZILII should be
updated. Another significant result is that of the 20% of lawyers who suggested advocacy of the Law Society library and fund raising.

In terms of the LSE interview schedule, the interviewees’ responses corroborated with the lawyers’ results. A majority, six (85.7%), of the LSE interviewees corroborated with the lawyer’ responses and noted that the Society should raise funds and look for donations. About six (71.5%) of the LSE felt that it would be good for the Society to have an online library, and more than half, (57.5%) suggested that the LSS should subscribe to legal databases for its members. Even from the librarians’ interviews, the Law Society librarian, as mentioned in section 5.9.2 suggested that an online library would be beneficial.

From the results, it can be inferred that the popular suggestion of establishing an online legal information resource centre or collection for its members is crucial because it is convenient as it can be accessed remotely, from where the lawyers are. It was noted that physical use the library’s facilities (section 5.8.1.1 and section 6.5.1) was not convenient due to its proximity as it is situated far from court business and lawyers’ offices (section 5.8.2). The findings from the literature in Chapter Three also point out the habit of lawyers preferring familiar and convenient sources as their point of access. Hence they preferred to access legal information at their personal collections, law firm libraries and colleagues (Figure 5.6). The challenge of insufficient resources from these would be solved by the online library.

More than half, 57.1% of the lawyers (Table 5.22) as well as more than half, 57.1% of the LSE interviewees (Table 5.23) also suggested that the LSS could subscribe to legal databases for its members. This could cater for the challenge of expensive legal material as collaborative ownership of information promotes access (Otike and Matthews, 2000; Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010a and Haruna and Mabawonku, 2001). In addition, it would cater for the lawyers who are still in the entry or mid-level of their career and cannot afford resources as yet.

More than half (57.1%) of the LSE also felt that there was a lack of commitment from members and thus suggested that lawyers should commit to the LSS by paying their subscriptions. LSE5 felt that the problems faced by the society were self-inflicted by the members themselves by refusing to subscribe to the Law Society. This suggest that the members were not honouring their dues to the Society, which could assist in improving legal information access.
6.7.2 Suggestions on challenges in the other libraries

All the librarians (100%) interviewed suggested that soliciting funds or donations should be done (Table 5.24) to cater for legal information needs. More than half (57.1%) of the librarians interviewed also suggested lawyers needed to specify their needs for assistance in the libraries. Further, 42.9% librarians suggested a consortium or affiliation with other libraries to share costs and resources. The lawyers also suggested this. There were 13.5% who felt that the LSS needed to collaborate with other institutions along with 85% of the LSE interviewees (see section 5.9.2, Table 22 and Table 5.23).

The lawyers also suggested that other libraries should open up membership to lawyers as discussed in section 6.6 above. Another noted suggestion was that of advocacy of library services. Almost a quarter of lawyers (19.8%) (Table 5.22) felt that there should be advocacy in the libraries as well as in the Law Society library. This is evident from through the responses that show that they were not using the libraries (Figure 5.7). The librarians’ also shared the same suggestion, as 28% of them mentioned this in section 5.6.1. In addition, 42.9% of the librarians further suggested the need for affiliation with other libraries. This would be another way to improve legal information service delivery to the lawyers.

6.8 Summary of the chapter

This chapter provided a discussion of the findings presented in Chapter Five. The research results are presented as an analysis of the quantitative data obtained through the questionnaire (Chapter Five, section 5.2) and the qualitative data obtained from the individual semi-structured interviews. Of importance is to note that the data from the quantitative and qualitative sections were linked and triangulated to show the relationship of the legal information needs and access to legal information of the population under study.

The results of the data captured from the quantitative and qualitative research as presented in Chapter Five are interpreted systematically as the next step of this research process. The analysis process aimed to present a comprehensible and easily interpretable result meant to identify trends and relationships in accordance with the research aims as mentioned in Chapter one.
The results in this research showed similarities with findings of other studies conducted in some of the developing countries. For instance, Haruna and Mabawonku (2001) in Nigeria, and Otike and Matthews (2000) in Kenya, noted that lawyers need legal information to fulfil their roles in advising, defending and representing clients, getting professional updates and case law. The results of the present study alluded to the same. Further, it was noted in this study that lawyers need text books, cases and current unreported judgements of superior courts, statutes and government publications, just as Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) study confirmed the same.

According to the results of the study, a majority of lawyers showed that they access legal information from colleagues, their law firm libraries and personal collections as opposed to external library collections. Wilkinson (2001)’s study found that lawyers overwhelmingly preferred informal and internal sources when seeking information rather than external sources. It seems there has been a shift in terms of preference for formats of resources. The study’s results showed that lawyers seem to prefer both electronic and printed format resources as noted in section 5.7.1.4 which was not the case in Kuhlthau and Tama (2001)’s earlier study which reported that lawyers preferred the printed format. The legal profession has adapted to the digital environment. The present results actually show a slightly higher preference (98%) for electronic resources. With this evidence, the idea that an online library resource centre should be availed through the Law Society holds much ground from the lawyers’ suggestions.

Hinson, Ofori, and Atuguba’s (2007) study in Ghana, pointed out that a majority of lawyers were of the view that the use of the internet to find information improves their productivity. This seems to be in line with the responses of the lawyers in the present study who are seen to overwhelmingly use the internet, especially Google for their legal information searches. Lawyers in the current research also showed an ability to seek and gather information as 70% rated themselves as good in search abilities (Table 5.14).

The suggestions by most of the respondents were that there should be an online library meant for lawyers’ access to legal information through the Law Society. This in itself shows that they have reached a reasonable standard in their abilities to search and find information in the ICT information highway. However, a study in Pakistani, Bahawalpur city by Khan, Bhatti, and Ghalib, 2011) concluded that some lawyers needed computer training of sorts in order to be able to retrieve information from ICT tools as their skills were poor. This was not the case in the current study according to the lawyers themselves.
CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary, conclusion and recommendations of the findings as presented in Chapter Five and interpretation of the results presented in Chapter Six of the study. The summary and conclusions are in accordance with the research objectives and research questions as well as the suggestions for further research. The study was guided by the following research questions:

- What are the information needs of lawyers in Swaziland?
- How do lawyers in Swaziland access and use legal information?
- What information resources do lawyers in Swaziland use?
- What are the challenges affecting them in satisfying their information needs, and lastly;
- What strategies could be adopted to overcome such challenges faced by lawyers in satisfying their information needs?

The study was guided by Wilson’s general models of information behaviour discussed in detail in Chapter Two. Other models discussed in Chapter Two that had related aspects applied in the study included Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process (ISP) model and Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain’s information seeking behaviour model of 1996.

Quantitative and qualitative data obtained from questionnaires and interviews were captured using CSPro7 and analysed using SPSS24 to generate descriptive and inferential statistics (section 4.9, section 5.1). Together with the lawyers’ self-administered questionnaire, the two semi-structured interviews with the Law Society of Swaziland executive officials (LSE) and librarians were used to assemble data from the research participants about their organizations.

This chapter also discusses the suggestions gathered from the participants and further makes recommendations through comparing the actual research findings with the objectives and research questions of the study. The chapter also discusses how the study contributes to the existing body of knowledge on this topic in the LIS field. Furthermore, the limitations and possible areas for future research in the topic are discussed. It also shows how the research questions set out in the initial stage (section 1.2) of the study were addressed.
7.2 Summary of the findings

This section briefly summarises the results of the study presented in Chapter Five and interpreted in Chapter Six and provides conclusions based on the research findings in the order of the research questions from both the questionnaire and interview instruments. The broad objectives of the study were to investigate the information seeking behaviour of private lawyers in Swaziland; determine the lawyers’ information needs and establish how their information needs were met and whether the LSS met the information needs of its members, the lawyers, through the library service it offered.

7.2.1 Background

All three types of participants in the study, that is, the lawyers, the librarians and the LSE noted that lawyers needed legal research information sources. The results were presented in Chapter Five, section 5.5 and 5.6 and analysed in Chapter Six, section 6.4 and 6.5 respectively.

The results from the data obtained from the research tools, questionnaire and interviews showed that from the total of 170 questionnaires distributed to the lawyers; 128 were returned, yielding a 75.3% response rate while, interviews with seven librarians and seven LSE yielded a response rate of 100% and 77.5% respectively (Chapter Five, section 5.2).

The results of the study revealed that more than half, 52%, of the lawyers were in the Hhohho region, followed by 42% in Manzini, while only 2% were in the Shiselweni and Lubombo regions respectively. This imbalance was due to the fact that Hhohho and Manzini are the administrative and industrial regions in the country (section 5.3). Of the lawyers, 81% were males and 18.8% females.

A majority of the lawyers, 74 (57.8%) were within the age group of 26 to 45 years (Table 5.7). Most, 65%, were attorneys with 0 to 5 years’ experience in practice. Results also showed that 86% of the lawyers held a basic law degree with few of them pursuing higher qualifications (section 5.3.5). Their main work roles included legal advice, disputes and negotiations, drafting legal documents, and representing as well as administration of estates (section 5.4). These factors of year of experience and work roles all had an influence on their information behaviour and information needs in legal practice.
7.2.2 Information needs and information behaviour of lawyers

The study explored the information needs, and purpose of seeking information and the access and use of legal information by the lawyers. The results were discussed in section 6.4 and supported by literature in Chapter Three, section 3.2, and reported in Figure 5.3. Results indicated that all 100% of the lawyers generally needed and used legal information for legal advice, disputes and negotiations, drafting legal documents, and representing clients, followed by 88% for legal research, and 84% for administration of estates and 66% for administrative duties. In terms of information resources used, the results showed that a majority of 95% used textbooks, cases, statutes, government publications and journals which were confirmed in empirical findings in section 5.5.1 and by the literature on studies of lawyers such as Wilkinson, (2001); Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010); Olorunfemi and Mostert (2012) and Otike and Matthews (2000).

The study also found that lawyers, like legal practitioners in other countries (Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura, 2010a; Otike and Matthews, 2000; Wilkinson, 2001) needed and mostly used legal information resources like textbook, cases, (reported and unreported), statutes, journals and other information sources supportive of their roles in the administering of legal services to clients (section 5.5.1, Figure 5.5 and Table 5.15).

The study investigated the information seeking behaviour of the lawyers in Swaziland through questions on information resources used. The information resources that were identified and frequently used (section 5.7.1) were research materials as presented in Table 5.15 such as law textbooks (100%), cases (99%), statutes, and the Constitution (98%) as well as unreported decisions of superior courts (93%) and government publications (91%), (section 5.6.2, Figure 5.9 and section 5.7.1, Table 5.18) as opposed to local libraries.

7.2.3 Information access and use

Concerning the access of information resources to meet their needs, the study found that a majority of the lawyers normally accessed information via informal routes such as from their colleagues, law firm libraries and personal collections followed by the internet (section 5.6.1, section 6.5 and 6.5.1).

A majority of lawyers accessed legal information from other colleagues (97%), their personal collections (94%), online databases (87%) and a further 81% obtained their information from...
the internet, while 83% accessed information from the law firm. The results showed that very few accessed legal information from the libraries in the country. The results showed that less than half, 43%, accessed information from the UNISWA Library, while a small number, 5%, used public libraries or the court library and even less, 2% only, used the Law Society Library.

The study identified several challenges in accessing legal information. More than half, (53%), of the lawyers noted lack of time as their major challenge to accessing information, followed by inadequate or outdated resources and lack of adequate electronic resources in all the collections and libraries they accessed. In relation to the Law Society Library, the major challenge noted was that 77% of the lawyers were not aware of or even used the library of this organization. The librarians who said that the libraries faced challenges such as lack of material, lack of funds and the fact that the librarians were also unaware of the lawyers’ specific needs confirmed these findings.

The study also revealed that 86% of the lawyers used the internet to search for legal information and a further 95% accessed Google to locate information. In addition, from the results, a majority, 98%, were comfortable with the use of both the electronic and print format of resources. A majority, 70%, rated their ability to search legal material independently as good. The growing awareness of the advantages of online legal resources in the information society influences information behaviour, as more people appear to have less time to physically visit libraries, they prefer to access information using ICTs (Kadli and Kumbar, 2013).

An important finding from the literature review in section 3.2.2 and the empirical findings in this regard is that lawyers used these points of access due to the lack of time (section 5.8.1) and did not frequently visit the Law Society Library or other libraries for that matter. Further, they used these sources because the external libraries lacked up-to-date relevant information for them to utilise.

The research further investigated the points of access of the different information sources as per the second research question. Again, here it was established that lawyers’ main points of access to legal information were their personal collections and law firm libraries or colleagues which were themselves not always adequate as their resources had insufficient information and were also outdated in some instances. It was further confirmed that lawyers did not access information from their main professional body, the Law Society of Swaziland’s Library, mainly due to the fact that most were not even aware that it existed. In addition, even though it
existed, the library was not well equipped in all aspects, ranging from staffing to resources. This was shown in Chapter Six, section 6.5.1.

According to the literature reviewed in Chapter Three, studies by Wilkinson, (2001); Lawal, (2012); Leckie, Pettigrew, and Sylvain, (1996); Fay (2017), revealed that professionals usually start their searches by accessing familiar sources before going to external sources, and this was also noted in this study. However, these familiar points of access in the present study were also found to have their own challenges as alluded to earlier (section 5.8.1.1; 5.8.1.2 and Table 5.19). Wilson’s 1999 model, which served as the underpinning theoretical framework of this study (Chapter Two, section 2.3) confirmed that barriers that hinder information needs and information access for users. It was also found that lawyers relied more on the online resources and SWAZILLII for unreported cases (Figure 5.12) which also was not regularly updated.

7.2.4 Challenges

The study revealed that the challenges encountered by lawyers while seeking information included inadequate electronic resources within their most used collections (personal collections, 43% and law firm libraries, 45%) and insufficient or outdated resources which was a challenge for more than half, 53.1%, in terms of the personal collections and for 53.9% with law firm libraries. Table 5.19 summarised these responses.

It was noted that less than half, 48%, of those who wanted to use the UNISWA Library reported the problem of lack of membership as hindering their access, while 21% said there was insufficient electronic resources and 45% said the UNISWA library resources were out-dated. Concerning the Law Society Library, a majority of 86% of lawyers were not using the Law Society Library because they were not aware of it as noted earlier. It is thus evident from this study that lawyers’ needs were not properly satisfied due to unavailability of resources in the libraries or lack of knowledge about and lack of access to the collections.

The study found that quite a number of lawyers (86%), (section 5.8.1, and Figure 5.13) were not aware of their own professional body’s legal information services, the library in particular, yet the executive officials believed that members were notified and aware of its existence. It appears lawyers do not realise the significance of their Society hence advocacy is needed to sensitize them.
Furthermore, it was found that the information needs of lawyers were not supported by their Society in any way. This, according to the LSS librarian was because the Law Society was struggling financially and depended on donor funding to run their library services. In addition, according to the LSE interviewees, the library was not a priority and it did not have a policy of any sort to cater for such needs (section 5.7.1.4).

The reason for the non-awareness of library services for lawyers in the LSS may be due to the fact that there was very little that was available or of use to them in the collection. This was noted from the responses given by both the lawyers and the LSE interviewees in section 5.8.1.1

7.3 Conclusion

It is common cause that legal information access is a significant aspect in the administration of justice in any community, and the information needs of lawyers must therefore be met in order for them to play their roles within the justice system. The information needs and use of information sources by lawyers in Swaziland are no different from other lawyers. The advancement of information communication technology and globalization of legal practice and increase in lawyer’s mobility puts more pressure on ensuring accessible legal information in this age. Consequently, the Law Society in the country has to play a role and adopt strategies in the legal environment in terms of providing access to legal information for its members. The members of the Law Society as well, need to be aware of the issues affecting their society and should provide a more proactive library and information service to meet the diverse needs of the lawyers.

7.3.1 Summary of the chapters

Chapter One of the study provided the background to the study and an outline of the research problem. It outlined the research questions, the significance of the study and its scope and limitations. This chapter also covered the research objectives, and a brief outline of the methodology used.

Chapter Two of the study presented the conceptual framework addressing different models and guidelines that underpinned the study. It started by introducing what theories or models were and then reviewed several models, which included Kuhlthau’s ISP model established in 1997 and reviewed in 2001, and Leckie, Pettigrew and Sylvain’s (1996) general model of information seeking behaviour of professionals. These were discussed in relation to the aspects
that applied to the present study and how these aspects were included in Wilson’s general model of information behaviour of 1981 to 1999, that underpinned this study.

Chapter Three of the study introduced the literature review and the significance of reviewing studies that were similar to the current research. This chapter identified studies done on the topic in different countries, and how these revealed the challenges in information needs and access to legal information of lawyers. There were gaps identified in the literature in relation to the current study and the stance of the Law Society of Swaziland to determine the information services offered to its members.

Chapter Four explained the methodology of the study, which applied the pragmatist approach and used mixed methods. The core intention of this chapter was to describe the methods followed to obtain evidence to address the research question and sub-questions of this study. It outlined the philosophical underpinnings of different research methods, the research paradigm, and research design. It further identified the population the of study, sampling and data collection procedures, data analysis strategies, validity and reliability of data collection instruments, ethical considerations as well as the pre-test of the study. The chapter ended with the techniques of analysis and validation of the empirical data.

The chapter showed that the study used the mixed method approach by adopting and triangulating qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis (Chapter Four, section 4.2.1, section 4.5.3). The population of the study comprised of lawyers in private practice in Swaziland, LSE officials and librarians in facilities that had a legal information collection (section 4.6). A survey research design was used. Data was collected using a self-administered questionnaire and interviews as tools (section 4.8). To ensure reliability and validity of the results, a co-efficiency test being Cronbach Alpha was run on the findings of the questionnaire, which indicated that the perceived variables in the research instruments were reliable (section 4.11). A census sampling of all lawyers in private law firms registered with the Law Society of Swaziland (LSS) was undertaken (section 4.7.1).

Chapter Six presented the data analysis of the results presented in Chapter Five on lawyers’ information needs, information access and challenges faced by these lawyers in Swaziland and the stance of the libraries that had legal information collections in the country as well as the LSS in providing access to its members. This chapter highlighted the framework that underpinned the study and the demographic aspect of the participants. It further showed the
reviewed literature’s relevance to the topic under study and how the gaps in knowledge were filled through the study.

The first research objective of the study dealt with the information needs and information access of legal information by lawyers in Swaziland and the following findings were realised. The results discussed in section 6.4 and supported by literature in Chapter Three, section 3.2, indicated that all 100% of the lawyers, generally needed and used legal information for legal advice, disputes and negotiations, drafting legal documents, and representing clients, followed by 88% for legal research, and 84% for administration of estates and 66% for administrative duties. On information resources used, the results showed that 95% used textbooks, cases, statutes, government publications and journals which were confirmed in empirical findings in section 5.5.1 and supported by the literature on studies of lawyers by Wilkinson, (2001), Tuhumwire and Okello-Obure (2010); Olorunfemi and Mostert (2012) and Otike and Matthews (2000). This chapter also discussed the suggestions given by the study participants in terms of the topic under study concerning lawyers.

Chapter Seven presents the summary, conclusion and recommendation of the overall study and shows how the research questions were answered. It further shows how the study contributed to existing knowledge concerning the information behaviour and information needs and access to legal information by lawyers in Swaziland in terms of the LIS field.

The second objective of the study intended to determine and establish how the information needs of lawyers were met. The findings of the results showed that lawyers were mostly expected to fend for themselves in terms of meeting their information needs. The findings also showed that lawyers were not using the libraries that provided legal information collections in the country due to challenges (section 6.6) faced by both the libraries and the lawyers themselves. Furthermore, their Law Society Library was not used for access to legal information sources by the lawyers to meet their needs as they were not aware of its existence or its services. Also, the Law Society itself had not prioritised information access or library services for its members. Generally, in all the libraries, the legal information sources were inadequate and out of date. The research question from the broad objective also dealt with the strategies suggested for the improvement of access to legal information for lawyers by the libraries and the Law Society of Swaziland.
7.4 Suggestions to overcome the challenges faced in meeting lawyers’ information needs

The participants of the study were asked to provide their own views on how to overcome the challenges faced in terms of access to legal information. A summary of their suggestions are provided below:

- An online legal resource centre should be established by the Law Society Library to cater for the needs of the lawyers, which can be accessed virtually even in their offices.
- Library collections should be updated with current legal information, which is important for them to keep abreast of the latest developments in the law.
- Soliciting funding from donors, legal agents and the government would improve the situation for the Law Society Library. Also, collaboration with other similar organizations and forming a consortium would lessen the costs and improve access to legal information through the Law Society.
- An improved working relationship by the LSS with the government, specifically the Ministry of Justice (MoJ), and UNISWA Library was also suggested.
- Customisable services should be offered to create personal information environments with relevant legal research materials in the LSS.
- An improved awareness, utilization and acquisition of legal resources would be beneficial for the lawyers. A collective goal and purpose in the support of the LSS by its members is required as the Society’s survival depends on its membership subscriptions. There should be enforcement of this for all practitioners.
- Investing in ICT for improved access to legal information should be a priority of the LSS since it currently has limited ICT infrastructure. The study further recommends the need to source funding and donors. Therefore, concerted efforts for fundraising drives should be undertaken by the LSS to improve its finances. Collaboration programs between the Government, UNISWA and the LSS should be encouraged to enhance the provision of legal information services through improved access.
- In addition, legal databases should be subscribed to by law libraries, especially the Law Society. In addition, the government should improve funding for facilitating access to a wide range of information resources in these libraries. SWAZILII as the main local open access legal database was widely used by the lawyers (Chapter 5, Figure 5.12), should be enhanced and updated frequently for ease of access to current judgements. Interviews with the LSE pointed out that this database has challenges and the Society and government should work together to improve its functionality.
Results showed that one of the major issues with this database was that the judgements found there were not signed officially, and further the judges were not involved in the compilation in any way as some were not aware of the current judgements of colleagues.

The above suggestions and the recommendations that follow constitute the guidelines that can assist in improving the lawyers’ access to legal information resources.

7.5 Recommendations

Literature reviewed in the study showed that legal professional organizations like the Law Society of South Africa and Law Society of England and Wales contributed to their member’s information needs through providing access to legal resources through ICTs or online resources. Further, results of the study showed that lawyers have the relevant skills to navigate ICT resources to find the information they need. As such, it is recommended that the LSS could follow suit and make efforts to establish an online resource centre for its members via its facilities. However, even though it is recommended that a fully functional online library be established by the LSS for its members, challenges faced by the LSS were noted (section 5.8.1, Table 5.20). According to the LSE interviews, the LSS lacked finances for the library, qualified library staff and commitment by lawyers to their society.

It is also recommended that the Law Society invest in ICTs that support legal information access for its members. This can be done through subscribing on behalf of the members to online professional development programmes and databases that can enhance access to legal information and further promote life-long continuing learning and education for lawyers. This would further improve on their practicing skills and expansion in areas of specialisation in addition to cutting the costs of expensive legal resources as this will be a collaborative initiative.

Results of the study showed that there is a lack of cooperation between the members and the LSS, hence, efforts should be made to ensure that there is a collective goal and purpose in the support of the professional organization by the legal fraternity. It is important for the members to fully understand the goals and objectives of the Law Society of Swaziland. The Society depends on its members for survival and should not depend on the contributions on a voluntary basis of members to support its mandate. A framework should be developed to encourage active
participation in the Society’s business. It is recommended that there should be enforcement of the Legal Practitioners’ Act in terms of membership and fees related issues to support the running of the Society. As once noticed by the researcher, the running of the Society appeared to be of a voluntary nature, yet this should not be the case if the Society is to fulfil its mandate. Results showed that lawyers were not aware of services provided by their Law Society even though these were limited.

The lack of awareness shows the lack of knowledge lawyers have about their association, which is not conducive for the respect and integrity of the profession. Hence, it is recommended that legal practitioners should be more proactive regarding the role of the Society in providing access to information. Further, they should be involved in improving collaborative legal information access with LSS to ensure an improvement in the legal system in the country. As such, they should be the ones to push for a vibrant library service through supporting the Society in terms of paying their dues or subscriptions for the running costs of the organization.

The findings also revealed that there was a lack of advocacy on the part of the LSS or other libraries in terms of information services provided for legal practitioners. As such, it is recommended that these organizations should work on marketing their services to encourage participation of the lawyers for the enhancement of their legal information access. Lawyers should also consider working with others in the legal fraternity about the significance of information access. They should attend workshops, invest time and money in creating bulletin boards, do research on legal matters and publish and connect to electronic forums that engage in collaborative thinking and sharing of information.

It is known that lawyers have busy schedules as per studies presented in the literature review. This was also confirmed in the findings of the study where a majority indicated the lack of time to search for information resources from libraries. Therefore, the success of access to legal information depends on the availability of a vibrant online library that can be accessible anytime in the confines of their offices and so requiring less time to physically visit the libraries while promoting extensive access to more reading materials.

The inconvenient proximity of the Law Society Library, being located in one of the four regions, would be solved through the establishment of an online access centre or resource collection to all legal information sources relevant for legal practitioners in the country. Winterton has opined that practising lawyers have become much more mobile in today’s
globalization in all jurisdictions in the different legal systems (Winterton, 2011: 30), hence a relevant and sufficiently aligned library service is necessary.

The study also found that a majority of the lawyers felt that they were adequately skilled or information literate in searching for information (section 5.6.3; section 6.5.1). This shows that in this electronic/digital age, the lawyers may not be in need of a physical library building (as this is inconvenient due to proximity and time constraints), but have the skills to easily find information from online resources which should be provided by their Law Society. Furthermore, legal information does not come cheap, hence some, especially those in the early stages of their legal careers may not be able to afford their own resources or firm collections. The Law Society as the main body that is paid subscriptions by the members should thus dedicate part of the subscription monies raised on funding the library.

Providing access to legal resources by the Law Society would enhance the substance of the administration of justice; bring the needed prestige and respect to the profession, as lawyers would give better legal services. It would also promote unity and higher standards among legal practitioners. It would also reduce the costs as Otike and Matthews (2000) suggested, given that a collaboration for a common legal information centre among the lawyers would be ideal.

7.6 Future research

The study considered measures to potentially address limitations and increase generalisability of the results. However, there were gaps identified from the discussions that exposed some aspects for further research. One of these was the fact that even though the research focused on the legal environment in Swaziland, private legal practitioners are but one of the different groups that constitute the legal profession in the country. Other groups include lawyers who are members of the Law Society by virtue of having been admitted accordingly, and those that work as legal advisors or officers in parastatals or private companies of a non-legal nature. There are also legal practitioners in the chambers of the Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecution (DPP), as well as those that fall under the Judicial Service Commission (like judges, magistrates, court registrars); and legal academics who teach at the University. Although the researcher believes that the findings could apply to these other branches, some perceptions specific to them may be deficient.
This limitation require further research to investigate how access to legal information for lawyers in the other spheres that were excluded from this research can be improved. Another study could be conducted in relation to the improvement of access to legal information for all lawyers when they come to the high court where there is a library that also provides a service which is challenged in terms of meeting the needs of legal practitioners.

This study would be helpful as a baseline for shaping future research and acquiring insights on the legal information domain to develop a vibrant legal resource centre that can serve the entire legal fraternity in the country.

### 7.7 Contribution and originality of the study

Literature reviewed in this study indicated that current research concerning lawyers and their information access and behaviour in Swaziland were non-existent. Studies that were noted were those investigating information access and behaviour of students in the University of Swaziland in agriculture (Devi and Dlamini 2014.) and those in adult education (Ngcobo, 2014); and none of these students studied were in the legal field for that matter. Thus, this study focused on the lawyers in private practice and their information seeking behaviour, information needs and information access. No studies reported in Swaziland investigated lawyers in the work place or even linking the population of lawyers with organizations and their information needs or behaviour. Hence, the present study filled this gap.

Studies done by Tuhumwire and Okello-Obura (2010) and Haruna and Mabawonku (2001) and Otike and Matthews (2000) on the legal sources and services to meet the needs of lawyers in other African countries suggested that information access for lawyers could be enhanced by a collaborative approach where a centre of legal information could be established for lawyers. The present study confirmed these observations by made by these scholars. The researcher noted the need for Swaziland to work on the suggestions from similar studies and provide a customised provision for the country’s lawyers.

This study also focused on the Law Society of Swaziland and the need for it to enhance access to legal information for lawyers which was not done before. It also looked into the link between the three groups of the population under study, which were the lawyers, librarians and the Law Society executives, which has not been studied before.
The present study highlighted the information needs of lawyers and the significance of access to legal information. The study indicated the information behaviour patterns of lawyers in relation to information access and suggested improvements to access by the lawyers’ professional organization. The results of the study showed that the LSS as a professional body had difficulty in supporting the information needs of its membership. The study described the importance of following new trends in terms of this issue where the LSS could follow suit like its counterpart organizations such as the Law Societies of South Africa, which provide access to legal information resources for its members.

### 7.7.1 Contribution to theory and practice

The study contributed to the body of knowledge in the field of LIS in that it helped maximise the issues of information seeking behaviour and access to legal information for lawyers. Further, the study also contributed to theory through the results of the study, for instance, in terms of access, it was found that lawyers prefer conveniently located sources due to their busy schedules, hence the need for online resources given that lawyers are now skilled in the use of ICTs. The results also showed that the present open access SWAZILII database which was used the most of all online facilities was not updated frequently, hence the need to improve this.

Wilson’s general model of information seeking behaviour (1999) which underpinned the study was used as a guide to specifically show the environmental aspect of information behaviour patterns and needs in terms of barriers for accessing quality and current legal information.

The theoretical contribution of this study is noted in terms of its recommendations specifically relating to Swaziland’s lawyers, and further providing insights to the Government on the information needs and access to legal information for lawyers in order to improve legal services to the nation.

From a pragmatic viewpoint, the study’s recommendations espoused can be used to contribute to policy, generate guidelines to enhance the provision in information services for private lawyers in Swaziland, and further to create and generate guidelines that can enhance the provision of information services to all lawyers. It will be especially useful to the Law Society of Swaziland.
The present study discussed the applicability of Wilson’s 1999 general model as a theoretical framework as seen in Chapter Two, section 2.4. The findings were interpreted in relation to this model based on the comparisons of the events that emerged in the study by focussing on a specific group of users, which were the private lawyers in Swaziland.

Future studies can therefore use Wilson’s model and incorporate Leckie’s model of information behaviour which highlights the roles and environment in the workplace through using formal sources that are collaboratively established and shared to meet the legal information needs with liaison between the Law Society and libraries and the relevant institutions like the government and university library.

7.8 Conclusion to the study

This study presented findings based on the main research question which was to examine the information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers, then analytically addressed the five research questions (section 1.3 and 1.5) and interconnected the findings with related literature. As mentioned, Wilson’s general model of information behaviour 1999 supported this study as the theoretical framework with guidance of the discussions. This discussion of findings produced enlightening ideas to the provision and improvement of legal information access services for lawyers.

Firstly, the study revealed the different information needs for lawyers in relation to their roles in legal practice, which were mostly, legal material for legal advice, disputes and negotiations, drafting, and representing clients. The study further revealed that lawyers prefer both print and electronic formats.

The information seeking behaviour of the surveyed lawyers involved reliance to informal sources like colleagues and personal collections as well as convenient source like their law firm libraries.

It was further revealed in the study that lawyers were skilled in using ICT based resources and searching online resources including Google as the main search engine. The lacked timed most hence these were convenient to them in terms of their busy schedules.

It was found that the Law Society of Swaziland as their main professional body was not meeting the lawyer’s information needs. Further the libraries or collections in the country were also not
meeting the needs of the lawyers due to lack of up-to-date resources in their collections, hence lawyers were not visiting the for legal resources.

This created an environmental barrier (Wilson, 1999) hence it was suggested that these libraries should improve their services to meet the lawyers’ needs. They should further market their service to lawyers. It was suggested that the LSS should establish an online resource centre and further market the Law Society library which the lawyers were not aware of its existence. In addition, it was suggested that they should be improve in its collection, which was challenge faced by the LSS library.

The study also revealed that the lawyers used the SWAZILII most as their reference for unreported cases, yet the barrier in this case was the lack of timely updates of the same. The lawyers were not using legal databases like Lexis Nexis, West law or Juta or other such database, which may be because these are expensive, hence the need for some form of collective efforts to improve legal information access. As mentioned, this could be done through the Law Society. Another barrier noted was the proximity of the Law Society library which could be dealt with through the decentralising of services through the online resource centre. The lack of resource was a major barrier for legal information access for lawyers, hence the need for the Society to take a stand just like other international counterparts like the Law Society of South Africa.

The study also noted that the lawyers need to get involved and support their Society in order for it to be vibrant and for the integrity of the profession. The lawyers as per the Legal Practitioners’ Act provisions in relation to membership could do this through full subscription and fundraising.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Informed Consent- Lawyers

Dear Respondent,

Invitation to participate in a survey

My name is Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela, a PhD candidate in Information Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg Campus, South Africa. I am conducting this study as part of the requirements for the Doctoral degree. The purpose of this study is to investigate “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland: the case of the Law Society”.

You are invited to participate in the research which will be conducted at your office. The purpose of this study is to investigate the information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland. To fully comprehend the information seeking behaviour of lawyers, it is important to understand their information needs. The study will assist in determining whether the information services that are available meet your information needs. It will also help to identify problems you encounter as you seek information. The findings may be able to assist the Law Society and Swazi Government improve on information delivery systems and at the same time, contribute to ensuring the efficient services of lawyers in Swaziland.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Please note that your name will not be included in the report and confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study. Your participation in answering the questions is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time during the study. I appreciate the time and effort it would take to participate in this study.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher: Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nnmathabela@gmail.com or
215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.z /
Tel: 033 260 5093 (tel.)

HSSREC Research Office: Ms P Ximba
Institution: University of KwaZulu-Natal
Telephone number: +27 (0) 31 260 3587
Email address: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za
Please complete this form

Title of study: “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland: the case if the Law Society of Swaziland”.

I……………………………………………………………………………………………, hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participate in the research project as outlined in the document about the study.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of the purpose of this survey. I am aware that participation in the study is voluntary and I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

Participant

Signature ………………………………………...

Date: ……………………………………………

Email: ………………………………………..

Researcher

Signature ………………………………………

Date: ………………………………………

Email: ………………………………………
Appendix 2: Lawyers’ Questionnaire

Legal practitioners’ questionnaire

I am Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela, of University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am conducting research on “Information needs and information seeking behaviour for legal practitioners in Swaziland”. The aim of this study is to investigate information needs and information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland.

I would like to request you to please assist me by completing this questionnaire in the data collection process. Any information you provide will be used for this study only and will be treated with confidentiality and utmost care to uphold your privacy. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Instructions for completing the questionnaire
a. Unless otherwise instructed, please place a tick or a cross in the space provided.
b. Where you are required to answer in your own words, please use the space provided.
c. Should you require more space use the back of the page and indicate the question number.

Section A: Demographic details of legal practitioners in Swaziland
1. Name of your law firm/Organization .................................................................
2. Please indicate your region
   Hhohho [ ] Manzini [ ] Shiselweni [ ] Lubombo [ ]
3. Current status /position..........................................................
4. Duration in your current position:
   0-5 [ ] 6-10 [ ] 11-15 [ ] 16-20 [ ] 21 and above [ ]
5. Highest academic qualification .................
6. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]
7. Age range
   21-25 [ ] 26-30 [ ] 31-35 [ ] 36-40 [ ] 41-45 [ ] 46-50 [ ] 51-55 [ ] 56 or over [ ]
8. Please indicate your work activities/roles in your legal practice (Please tick all that apply):
   (a) Representing clients in court
   (b) Drafting documents and pleadings [ ]
   (c) Disputes settlements and negotiating [ ]
   (d) Rendering legal advice [ ]
   (e) Administration of Estates [ ]
   (f) Conveyancing [ ]
   (g) Administrative duties [ ]
   (h) Management of law firm [ ]
   (i) Research [ ]
   (j) Lecturing [ ]
   (j) Others (Please specify _________________________________)
Section B: Information needs of legal practitioners in Swaziland

9. For what purpose do you need legal information? (Please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for legal information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To defend cases and case presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To advise clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For administrative activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For writing reports/research paper for consultancies (not for publication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For continuing education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For answering colleagues’ queries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For case law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For current state and national statutes and amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To keep up-to-date professionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve my legal practice role (Law Reference)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For laws of other countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For attending conferences and workshops and presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Access and use of legal information resources by legal practitioners in Swaziland

10. How/where, do you normally access your legal information? (Please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask other colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Society library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal collection (e.g. books, journal and reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library (SNLS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Swaziland library (UNISWA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law firm library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send an assistant to search for you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online database (Please specify): e.g. SWAZILII, Juta, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. State how often you consult the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask other colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a librarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Society library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal collection (books, journal and reports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public library (SNLS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. How would you rate yourself with regard to the ability to seek and find the information you need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Section D: Information resources used by legal practitioners in Swaziland**

13. Which information resources do you **use** to find legal information? (Please tick all the resources that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal information resources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Text Books and Practice books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes/Legislation/Decrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported decisions of the superior courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers/proceedings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Journals, periodicals, magazines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Indexes and Abstracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials (dictionaries/encyclopedias)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law databases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROMs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Legal Databases (mention them)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews, Newsletters and Circulars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Seminars, Conference papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. If you use the internet to find legal information, what **search engines** do you use? (Please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Engines</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. List the legal information resources/websites used when accessing the internet.


(Proceed to Question 16 even if you use these from the internet)

16. Indicate how often you use the resources listed in question 13 above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Information resources</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Text Books and Practice books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes/Legislation/Decrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported decisions of the superior courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers/proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Journals, periodicals, magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Indexes and Abstracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials (dictionaries/encyclopedias)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD ROMs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Legal Databases (mention them) …</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews, Newsletters and Circulars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Seminars, Conference papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please specify) ………………</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. In relation to satisfying your legal information needs, what format of information resources do you prefer (Please tick all that apply)

[ ] Print resources   [ ] Electronic resources   [ ] Audio/visual   [ ] Microform
[ ] Others, (please specify) …….
18. Indicate if the information resources mentioned in questions 16 are available to you in the following libraries and collections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Law Society library</th>
<th>UNISWA Library</th>
<th>Public library</th>
<th>Law firm library</th>
<th>Personal collection</th>
<th>Court library</th>
<th>Senior colleagues</th>
<th>Databases (Specify)</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Others (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Text Books and Practice books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes/Legislation/Decrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported decisions of the superior courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers/proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Journals, periodicals, magazines,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Indexes and Abstracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials (dictionaries/encyclopedia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Legal Databases (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews, Newsletters and Circulars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Seminars, Conference papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section E: Challenges affecting legal practitioners’ information seeking

19. What challenges do you encounter when searching for and accessing legal information from the following libraries and collections? (Please tick all that apply)

20. What challenges do you encounter when searching for the following legal information resources in the above libraries? (Please tick all that apply)
Section F: Strategies to overcome the challenges faced in satisfying your information needs

21. In your opinion, what are the strategies that can be used to overcome the challenges that you face?

22. In your opinion, how can the Law Society improve and provide access to comprehensive range of legal information for lawyers? Please explain your answer.

23. How can access to legal information services for legal practitioners be improved at the Law Society of Swaziland library?

24. What should be done to improve legal information services for legal practitioners in other libraries or information services centers in Swaziland?

25. Any other comments or suggestion? Please elaborate.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix 3: Informed Consent- Librarians

Dear Respondent,

Invitation to participate in an interview

My name is Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela, a PhD candidate in Information Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg Campus, South Africa. I am conducting this study as part of the requirements for the Doctoral degree. The purpose of this study is to investigate “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland: the case of the Law Society”

You are invited to participate in the research which will be conducted at your office. The purpose of this study is to investigate the information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland. To fully comprehend the information seeking behaviour of lawyers, it is important to understand their information needs. The study will assist in determining whether the information services that are available meet your information needs. It will also help to identify problems you encounter as you seek information. The findings may be able to assist the Law Society and Swazi Government improve on information delivery systems and at the same time, contribute to ensuring the efficient services of lawyers in Swaziland.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Please note that your name will not be included in the report and confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study.

Your participation in answering the questions is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time during the study. Your permission is required for audio-recording. I appreciate the time and effort it would take to participate in this study.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher: Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nnmathabela@gmail.com or 215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.z /
Tel: 033 260 5093 (tel.)

HSSREC Research Office: Ms P Ximba
Institution: University of KwaZulu-Natal
Telephone number: +27 (0) 31 260 3587
Email address: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za
Please complete this form

Title of study: “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland: the case if the Law Society of Swaziland”.

I..............................................................., hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I agree to participate in the research project as outlined in the document about the study. I consent / do not consent to have this interview recorded.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of the purpose of this interview. I am aware that participation in the study is voluntary and I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

Participant

Signature .................................................

Date: ....................................................

Email: ...............................................

Researcher

Signature ..........................................

Date: ................................................

Email: .............................................
Appendix 4: Librarians’ Interview Schedule

Semi structured interview guide for librarians

I am Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela, of University of KwaZulu Natal. I am conducting a research on “Information needs and information seeking behaviour for legal practitioners in Swaziland”. The aim of this study is to investigate information needs and information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland.

I would like to request you to assist me by participating in the interview in data collection process. Any information you provide will be used for this study only and will be treated with confidentiality and utmost care to uphold your privacy. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

____________________________________________________

Section A: Demographic details of Law Librarians

1. Name of you Institution: _______________________________
2. Designation: _________________________________________
3. Gender: _____________________________________________
4. Highest qualification: _________________________________
5. Age: __________________
6. How long have you been a librarian: ____________________?
7. How long have you served as librarian in this organization: ____________?
8. What are your roles/responsibilities in this position?

Section B: Information needs and information provision for legal practitioners

9. What are the information needs of legal practitioners using the library?

10. Is the library open to legal practitioners?
    If no, why? If yes, how?

11. Are legal practitioners charged a fee for membership in this library?
    If yes, what is the cost of membership fee?

Section C: Access and use of legal information by legal practitioners in Swaziland

12. What type of information and services do you provide for legal practitioners in your library?
13. Do you have policies guiding the information services delivery in your library? If so, what are the main aspects of the policy? If such policy is not in place how do you manage the information services?

Section D: Information resources used by legal practitioners

14. Describe the frequency of library visits made by legal practitioners to access resources in your library?

15. Of the resources you provide, describe which are frequently used?

16. What information searching and use skills training do you provide for legal practitioners in your library?

17. What formats of legal information resources is available in your library?

18. What are the relevant databases subscribed to by your institution's library for use by legal practitioners?

19. How up-to-dates are your library’s subscriptions to the library materials needed by legal practitioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscriptions</th>
<th>Up-to date</th>
<th>Not up-to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners’ books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes/Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. If not, why are they not up-to date? (Please elaborate)

21. What options do you use to satisfy the legal information needs of legal practitioners for materials you do not have in your collection?

22. Do you have adequate computers in your library for legal practitioners to use online or electronic resources?

23. Do you have sufficient bandwidth in your library?

24. Do you have sufficient staff in your library?

Section E: Challenges and suggestions in providing legal information

25. What are the major challenges faced by your library in providing legal information services to lawyers?
26. How can such challenges be overcome?

27. Are you satisfied with the legal information services supplied by your library to legal practitioners?
   WHY? (Provide reasons for your answer)

28. How can the information services provided by the library to legal practitioners be improved?

Section F: General

29. Are there any other services planned by your library to be offered to legal practitioners that you would like to comment on? Please specify.

30. Do you have any other comments relating to legal practitioners’ information needs in your library? Please elaborate.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix 5: Informed consent- Law Society Executive

Dear Respondent,

Invitation to participate in an interview

My name is Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela, a PhD candidate in Information Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg Campus, South Africa. I am conducting this study as part of the requirements for the Doctoral degree. The purpose of this study is to investigate “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland: the case of the Law Society”

You are invited to participate in the research which will be conducted at your office. The purpose of this study is to investigate the information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland. To fully comprehend the information seeking behaviour of lawyers, it is important to understand their information needs. The study will assist in determining whether the information services that are available meet your information needs. It will also help to identify problems you encounter as you seek information. The findings may be able to assist the Law Society and Swazi Government improve on information delivery systems and at the same time, contribute to ensuring the efficient services of lawyers in Swaziland.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Please note that your name will not be included in the report and confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study.

Your participation in answering the questions is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time during the study. Your permission is required for audio-recording. I appreciate the time and effort it would take to participate in this study.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher: Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nnmathabela@gmail.com or 215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
hoskinr@ukzn.ac.za / Tel: 033 260 5093 (tel.)

HSSREC Research Office: Ms P Ximba
Institution: University of KwaZulu-Natal
Telephone number: +27 (0) 31 260 3587
Email address: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za

Please complete this form
Title of study: “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland: the case if the Law Society of Swaziland”.

I,................................................................. hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I agree to participate in the research project as outlined in the document about the study. I consent / do not consent to have this interview recorded.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of the purpose of this interview. I am aware that participation in the study is voluntary and I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

Participant

Signature ..........................................

Date: ................................................

Email: ...............................

Researcher

Signature ..........................................

Date: ................................................

Email: .............................
Appendix 6: Law Society Executives interview schedule

Semi-structured interview for Law Society of Swaziland Executive

I am Ntombikayise Nomswa Mathabela, of University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am conducting research on “Information needs and information seeking behaviour for legal practitioners in Swaziland”. The aim of this study is to investigate information needs and information seeking behaviour for legal practitioners in Swaziland.

I would like to request you to assist me by participating in the interview data collection process. Any information you provide will be used for this study only and will be treated with confidentiality and utmost care to uphold your privacy. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Section A: Demographic details of legal practitioners in Swaziland

1. Designation: ______________________
2. Gender: __________________________
3. Highest qualification: ________________
4. Age: _______
5. How long have you been a normal member of the Law Society: -
   ________________
6. How long have you been a member of the Law Society Executive:
   ________________
8. Describe your tasks and goals in your position in the executive.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Section B: Information needs of legal practitioners in Swaziland

9. What are the legal information needs of lawyers?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …
10. What legal information services are provided by the Law Society of Swaziland to the members in relation to legal information access and use? (Library resources/ Professional training opportunities/ professional practice and ethics, organization and conduct conferences/ etc.)
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……
11. Are the legal practitioners aware of such services?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
12. If yes, how are they made aware of such services? (Channels of communication, membership, etc.).
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Section C: Access and use of legal information resources by legal practitioners

13. How are the legal information needs of legal practitioners met?
14. Do you have a policy document that guides the library and information services you provide to legal practitioners? Please elaborate (avail it if it is there).

15. In your opinion is this policy relevant for the current needs of legal practitioners? Please elaborate.

16. Do legal practitioners utilize the library services of the Law Society? (Please elaborate)

17. In your opinion what library resources are most utilized by legal practitioners? (Give reasons)

18. In your opinion which services do you think are under-utilized by legal practitioners?

19. In your opinion why are these services under-utilized by legal practitioners?

20. In your opinion is your office sufficiently funded to deliver an efficient library and information service to legal practitioners? (Please elaborate)

21. In your opinion is your office sufficiently staffed to deliver an efficient library and information service to lawyers? (Please elaborate.)

22. Are the library staff qualified to run the library?

23. Is on-going training provided for library staff?

24. Is user education provided for legal practitioners in your library? 

25. Does your office have appropriate amenities/facilities (e.g. building space and office equipment, library etc.) to deliver an efficient library and information service to legal practitioners? Please elaborate.

26. Do you have a website which provides information on the library and information services you provide to legal practitioners? (if it exists, provide the link)

27. Are there any new initiatives planned regarding library and information services for legal practitioners? Please elaborate.
28. Is there anything else you would like to comment on regarding the library information services you offer to legal practitioners?

Section D: Challenges in providing legal information and strategies to overcome them

29. What are the problems experienced by legal practitioners in obtaining legal information in Swaziland?

30. How do you think these problems can be minimized in terms of accessibility of legal information for legal practitioners?

31. Do you cooperate (either formally or informally) with any other organizations in Swaziland, e.g. Government ministries and libraries with regard to access to legal information for legal practitioners?
   If yes, please could you explain the nature of this cooperation? And which organizations?

32. If No, please could you specify the reasons for this non-cooperation?

33. What problems do you experience when assisting the legal practitioners to obtain information needed?

34. Is anything being done to address these problems? Please elaborate.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix 7: Application for permission to conduct research

The President
Swaziland Law Society
P.O. Box 512, Mbabane
Swaziland

Dear Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH

My name is Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela (215081598), a PhD student in Information Studies in the School of Social Sciences, College of Humanities at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg. As part of my doctoral studies I am undertaking research on the ‘information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland.”

My supervisor is Prof Ruth Hoskins. Some of the methods that will be used in gathering data for the research include an interview for the Law Society Librarian, focus group discussion and questionnaire for Lawyers registered with the Swaziland Law Society. The outcomes of this study will be beneficial to the legal fraternity of Swaziland in serving all legal practitioners in the country in terms of meeting their information needs. These surveys will also contribute to ensuring a positive contribution of the society to its members in the future and help the society to reach its maximum professionalism in the field of legal information.

The purpose of this letter is to request permission to conduct these interviews, distribute the questionnaire, and to request any other information that could assist this research. I intend to collect data from November 2016 to April 2017. The data collected will be treated with confidentiality and anonymity. I shall be very grateful for your assistance and I appreciate your cooperation in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nnmathabela@gmail.com or 215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor:
Professor Ruth Hoskins
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
University of KwaZulu-Natal
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.z /or 033 260 5093
Appendix 8: Application for permission to conduct research

The Registrar
University of Swaziland
Private Bag 4, Kwaluseni
Swaziland

Dear Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH

My name is Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela (215081598), a PhD student in Information Studies in the School of Social Sciences, College of Humanities at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg. As part of my doctoral studies I am undertaking research on the “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland.”

My supervisor is Professor Ruth Hoskins. Some of the methods that will be used in gathering data for the research include in-depth interviews and questionnaires for librarians and lawyers in Swaziland. The outcomes of this study will be beneficial to the legal fraternity of Swaziland and the government in serving legal practitioners in meeting their information needs. These surveys will also contribute to ensuring a positive contribution of the librarians in Swaziland to reach maximum professionalism in the field of legal information services provision.

The purpose of this letter is to request permission to conduct these interviews, distribute the questionnaires, and to request any other information that could assist this research. I intend to collect data from November 2016 – April 2017. The data collected will be treated with confidentiality and anonymity. I shall be very grateful for your assistance and I appreciate your cooperation in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher: Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nnmathabela@gmail.com or 215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.z / Tel: 033 260 5093 (tel.)
Appendix 9: Application for permission to conduct research

The Librarian
University of Swaziland Libraries
Private Bag 4, Kwaluseni
Swaziland

Dear Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH

My name is Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela (215081598), a PhD student in Information Studies in the School of Social Sciences, College of Humanities at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg. As part of my doctoral studies I am undertaking research on the “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland.”

My supervisor is Professor Ruth Hoskins. Some of the methods that will be used in gathering data for the research include in-depth interviews and questionnaires for librarians and lawyers in Swaziland. The outcomes of this study will be beneficial to the legal fraternity of Swaziland and the government in serving legal practitioners in meeting their information needs. These surveys will also contribute to ensuring a positive contribution of the librarians in Swaziland to reach maximum professionalism in the field of legal information services provision.

The purpose of this letter is to request permission to conduct these interviews, distribute the questionnaires, and to request any other information that could assist this research. I intend to collect data from November 2016 – April 2017. The data collected will be treated with confidentiality and anonymity. I shall be very grateful for your assistance and I appreciate your cooperation in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher: Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nnmathabela@gmail.com or 215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.z
Tel: 033 260 5093 (tel.)
Appendix 10: Application for permission to conduct research

The Director
Swaziland National Library Service
Mbabane
Swaziland

Dear Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH

My name is Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela (215081598), a PhD student in Information Studies in the School of Social Sciences, College of Humanities at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg. As part of my doctoral studies I am undertaking research on the “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland.”

My supervisor is Professor Ruth Hoskins. Some of the methods that will be used in gathering data for the research include in-depth interviews and questionnaires for librarians and lawyers in Swaziland. The outcomes of this study will be beneficial to the legal fraternity of Swaziland and the government in serving legal practitioners in meeting their information needs. These surveys will also contribute to ensuring a positive contribution of the librarians in Swaziland to reach maximum professionalism in the field of legal information services provision.

The purpose of this letter is to request permission to conduct these interviews, distribute the questionnaires, and to request any other information that could assist this research. I intend to collect data from November 2016 – April 2017. The data collected will be treated with confidentiality and anonymity. I shall be very grateful for your assistance and I appreciate your cooperation in advance.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Researcher: Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nnmathabela@gmail.com or 215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.za / Tel: 033 260 5093 (tel.)
Appendix 11: Application for permission to conduct research

The Attorney General
Ministry of Justice
Mbabane
Swaziland

Dear Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH

My name is Ntombikayise Nomse Mathabela (215081598), a PhD student in Information Studies in the School of Social Sciences, College of Humanities at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg. As part of my doctoral studies I am undertaking research on the “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland.”

My supervisor is Professor Ruth Hoskins. Some of the methods that will be used in gathering data for the research include in-depth interviews and questionnaires for librarians and lawyers in Swaziland. The outcomes of this study will be beneficial to the legal fraternity of Swaziland and the government in serving legal practitioners in meeting their information needs. These surveys will also contribute to ensuring a positive contribution of the librarians in Swaziland to reach maximum professionalism in the field of legal information services provision.

The purpose of this letter is to request permission to conduct these interviews, distribute the questionnaires, and to request any other information that could assist this research. I intend to collect data from November 2016 – April 2017. The data collected will be treated with confidentiality and anonymity. I shall be very grateful for your assistance and I appreciate your cooperation in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Researcher: Ntombikayise Nomse Mathabela
University of KwaZulu Natal
Information Studies
Email: nntmathabela@gmail.com or 215081798@stu.ukzn.ac.za
Cell: +268 76051539

Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.z /
Tel: 033 260 5093 (tel.)
Appendix 12: Research Clearance from Law Society of Swaziland

The Law Society of Swaziland

P.O. Box 512
Mbabane
Swaziland
Telephone No. (+268) 2404-4153
Fax No.: (+268) 2404-9945

2nd Floor, High Court
Hospital Hill
Mbabane

Email address: lawsociety@swazinet

23rd February 2016

To Whom It May Concern

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: NTOMBIKAYISE NOMSA MATHABELA - RESEARCH

Please be advised that Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela is undertaking a research study on the “Information Seeking Behaviour of Legal Practitioners in Swaziland” for her PhD Studies through the University of Kwazulu - Natal.

The aforesaid person has the authority and the permission of the Law Society of Swaziland to solicit information from Legal Practitioners in Swaziland for purposes of her studies as aforementioned. Your kind assistance and co-operation will be appreciated.

Yours faithfully
The Law Society of Swaziland

Per:

President: J. Rodrigues, Vice President: S. V. Mdladla, Secretary: N. S. Manzini, Treasurer: L. Howe
Members: C. Simulane, L. Dlamini, B. Tsabedze, Thabiso Mavuso
University of Swaziland

Private Bag No. 4 Kwaluseni M201, Swaziland
Tel: (+268) 2517 0000 ext. 70131 Fax: 2517 0001
E-mail: depregistrar@uniswa.sz

DEPUTY REGISTRAR (CORPORATE AFFAIRS)

30th May, 2016

University of KwaZulu-Natal
Department of Information Studies
P/Bag X01
Scotsville
5209

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Permission to conduct research on “information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland” at the University of Swaziland libraries is granted to Ms. Ntombikayise N. Mathabela.

She will conduct interviews, distribute questionnaires and be assisted with any other information that could assist her in this research.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

A.V. GAMA
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

[Stamp: UNIVERSITY OF SWAZILAND
2016-05-30]

DEPUTY REGISTRAR
Appendix 14: Research Clearance from University of Swaziland Library

UNIVERSITY OF SWAZILAND
Private Bag No. 4 Kwaluseni M201, Swaziland
Tel. (+268) 25185886 Fax (+268) 2517 0001
E-mail: mmavuso@uniswa.sz

LIBRARIAN
Ms. M.R. Mavuso, B.A. + CCE (UBLS), PDL, M.Lib. (Wales)

University of KwaZulu-Natal
Department of Information Studies
P/Bag X01
Scottsville, 3209

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Permission is granted to Ms. Ntombikayise N. Mathabela to conduct research on ‘information seeking behaviour of legal practitioners in Swaziland’ at the University of Swaziland libraries.

She will conduct interviews, distribute questionnaires and be assisted with any other information that could assist in this research.

Yours sincerely

Ms M. Mavuso
LIBRARIAN

Ce: Prof. Ruth Hoskins
Information Studies
School of Social Science
Appendix 15: Research Clearance from Swaziland National Library Services

31st May, 2016

University of KwaZulu-Natal
Pietermaritzburg
Private Bag X01
Scottsville
3209

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH**

Miss Ntombikayise Nomsa Mathabela is granted permission to conduct research on information seeking behavior of legal practitioners in Swaziland.

She will be given permission to do interviews and questionnaires on the research and given any assistance needed for the research.

Sincerely,

J.G. Dlamini
DIRECTOR

Cc: Professor Ruth Hoskins
Information Studies
University of KwaZulu Natal
Pietermaritzburg

P.O. Box 1461
Mbabane
Swaziland

Telephone: +268 2404 2633
Fax: +268 2404 3863
Appendix 16: Research Clearance from Ministry of Justice

Your Ref: 26 February 2016

Our Ref:

Ntombikayise N. Mathabela
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
University of Kwazulu-Natal
Kwazulu-Natal
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Dear Ms. Mathabela

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH

Your letter dated 19th February 2016 in connection with above subject matter refers.

Even though we cannot guarantee adequate facility for the purpose, be kindly advised that you would be free to visit our Chambers and help yourself on what we have useful to your research. We must inform you, however, that we do not have a Law Library to boast about nor a law librarian as such. I have no doubt that our law officers will be willing to help you where practicable. We do not speak for the legal fraternity in general.

Ms Mathabela you are accordingly permitted to conduct the interviews, etc, relevant to your study when ready to begin.
Wishing you well in your academic endeavour.

Yours Faithfully

[Signature]

J. M Dlamini
ATTORNEY GENERAL

cc Prof. Ruth Hoskins
Information Studies
School of Social Sciences
University of KwaZulu Natal
hoskinsr@ukzn.ac.z
0332605093
Appendix 17: Full Approval Ethical Clearance

18 October 2016

Ms Ntombikayise Nomusa Mathabula 215081798
School of Social Sciences
Pretoria Campus

Dear Ms Mathabula

Protocol reference number: HSS/1327/016D
Project title: Information needs and information seeking behaviour of lawyers in Swaziland: The case of the Law Society of Swaziland

Full Approval – Expedited Application

In response to your application received 22 August 2016, the Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee has considered the abovementioned application and the protocol has been granted FULL APPROVAL.

Any alteration(s) to the approved research protocol i.e. Questionnaire/Interview Schedule, Informed Consent Form, Title of the Project, Location of the Study, Research Approach and Methods must be reviewed and approved through the amendment/modification prior to its implementation. In case you have further queries, please quote the above reference number.

PLEASE NOTE: Research data should be securely stored in the discipline/department for a period of 5 years.

The ethical clearance certificate is only valid for a period of 3 years from the date of issue. Thereafter, recertification must be applied for on an annual basis.

I take this opportunity of wishing you everything of the best with your study.

Yours faithfully

Dr Shamila Naidoo (Deputy Chair)
Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

cc Supervisor: Professor Ruth Hoskins
cc Academic Leader Research: Professor Maheshvari Naidu
cc School Administrator: Ms Nancy Mudau & Shulika Stella