COPYRIGHT

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval format or transmitted in any form or by any means such electronic, mechanical, photocopying and recording or otherwise, without prior permission from the author or the University of Zambia. ©Chembe Kaluba, 2018. All rights reserved.

DECLARATION

| I, Chembe Kaluba do hereby declare tr | hat this dissertation represents my own work and that it has |
|--|--|
| never been submitted by anyone else at | the University of Zambia or at any other University for the |
| purpose of acquiring a diploma, degree | or any other qualification. |
| Si | ign: |
| D | Pate: |

APPROVAL

This dissertation of **Chembe Kaluba** has been approved as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master of Library and Information Science by the University of Zambia.

| Examiner 1: | .Signature | Date |
|---------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Examiner 2: | .Signature | Date |
| Examiner 3: | .Signature | Date |
| Chairperson Board of Examiners: | Signature | . Date |
| Supervisor: | Signature | . Date |

ABSTRACT

Understanding the information needs and seeking behaviour of users is imperative in developing effective information systems and services to meet their information needs. Lawyers and Judges heavily depend on appropriate and reliable evidence in the administration of sound justice. However, little is known about the information needs and seeking behaviour of Layers and judges in Africa and Zambia in particular. The purpose of this study was to investigate the information needs and seeking behaviour of judges and lawyers at the four superior courts of judiciary in Lusaka, Zambia. Specifically, the study investigated the information needs of lawyers and judges; their sources of information; the challenges they faced to access needed information. A survey approach was adopted for this study and employed quantitative method. Simple random sampling techniques was used to select judges and lawyers. Forty-five legal practitioners that included 22 judges and 23 lawyers participated in the study. Data was analyzed using the SPSS 23.0 software The study revealed that judges and lawyers have varied information needs and included information on case preparation (67%), administration of justice (60%), modern trends in law (87%), statutes (71%), current awareness (69%), general knowledge (47%) and job presentation (76%). Respondents indicated that court libraries (98%), personal libraries (79%), online databases (76%), offline databases (76%) and colleagues in the profession (73%) were main sources of information they consulted to make decisions. However, judges and lawyers reported to encounter a number of problems in their quest for information which included difficult to find latest information (82%), information not readily available (69%), lack of information diversity (67%), information not easily accessible (62%) and poor internet connectivity (60%). The study recommended for well-stocked court libraries, with up-to-date varied forms of information and improved Internet connectivity. It was concluded that judges and lawyers' information needs should be effectively met for them to make sound legal decisions.

Keywords: Information needs, information seeking behavior, legal information, administration of justice, Judges, Lawyers, Zambia.

DEDICATION

| I | dedicate this | s work to my | grandmother | Diana N | Vyamu l | Nyirenda | for l | being th | iere for | me. |
|---|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------|---------|----------|-------|----------|----------|-----|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to several people who contributed to this document. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to Mrs. F Zulu my principal supervisor and co supervisor Dr. Akakandelwa for having guided me from the identification of the research topic up to the conclusion of the study.

The progress of this dissertation saw the involvement of the Judiciary judges, lawyers (Research Advocates) and library staff. Without their involvement in providing data, this study would not have been a success.

I also wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor at work for granting me permission to attend classes during my first part of my masters' programme.

Profound gratitude goes to my family for their patience and sacrifice during my studies.

Above all I want to thank the almighty God for his mercies and favour for the provision of the grace to successfully accomplish of my studies. To Godbeall the glory!!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| COPYRIGHT | i |
|-----------------------------|------|
| DECLARATION | ii |
| APPROVAL | iii |
| ABSTRACT | iv |
| DEDICATION | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | vi |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xi |
| LIST OF TABLES | xii |
| LIST OF ACRONYMS | xiii |
| | |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Overview | 1 |
| 1.2 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.3 Background of the study | 2 |
| 1.3.1 Judiciary of Zambia | 3 |
| 1.3.2 Court structure | 4 |
| 1.3.3 Superior courts | 4 |
| 1.3.4 Lower courts | 4 |
| 1.3.5 Supreme Court | 5 |
| 1.3.6 Constitutional Court | 5 |
| 1.3.7 Court of Appeal | 6 |
| 1.3.8 High Court | 6 |
| 1.3.9 Judge | 7 |
| 1.3.10 Lawyer | 8 |

| 1. 4 Statement of the problem | 8 |
|---|------|
| 1.5 Purpose of the Study | 9 |
| 1.6 Research questions | 9 |
| 1.7 Significance of the study | 9 |
| 1.8 Delimitation of the study | . 10 |
| 1.9 Limitations of the study | . 10 |
| 1.10 Theoretical framework | . 10 |
| 1.11Definition of Operational Terms | . 14 |
| 1.12 Summary of chapter one | .15 |
| | |
| CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW | . 16 |
| 2.1 Overview | . 16 |
| 2.2 The information needs of judges and lawyers | . 16 |
| 2.3 The information seeking behavior of judges and lawyers | . 18 |
| 2.4 Sources of information needs used by judges and lawyers | . 21 |
| 2.5 Challenges faced by Judges and lawyers in acquiring information | . 23 |
| 2.6 Summary of the reviewed literature | . 24 |
| | |
| CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY | . 26 |
| 3.1 Overview | . 26 |
| 3.2 Research Design | . 26 |
| 3.3 Population | . 27 |
| 3.4 Sample size and sampling procedure | . 27 |
| 3.5 Sampling | .27 |
| 3.6 Data collection | . 27 |
| 3.7 Validity of the Instruments | 27 |

| 3.8 Data analysis | 28 |
|--|-------|
| 3.9 Ethical considerations | 28 |
| 3.10 Summary of Chapter three | 29 |
| | |
| CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS | 30 |
| 4.1 Overview | 30 |
| 4.2 Demographic characteristics of respondents | 30 |
| 4.3 Information needs of judges and lawyers | 33 |
| 4.4 Information seeking behaviour of judges and lawyers | 35 |
| 4.5 Challenges faced by judges and lawyers in accessing information | 49 |
| 4.6 Summary of Chapter four | 40 |
| | |
| CHAPTER FIVE: INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESI | EARCH |
| FINDINGS | 42 |
| 5.1 Overview | 42 |
| 5.2 Information needs of judges and lawyers | 42 |
| 5.3 Information seeking behavior of judges and lawyers | 43 |
| 5.4 Sources of information used by judges and lawyers | 43 |
| 5.4.1. Personal libraries | 44 |
| 5.4.2 Decided cases from judicial records | 44 |
| 5.4.3 Online databases as the source of information | 45 |
| 5.4.4 Other libraries | 45 |
| 5.4.5 Other colleagues in the profession | 45 |
| 5.4.6 Offline database | 46 |
| 5.5 Challenges faced by judges and lawyers in accessing information | |
| one channel gos made of Judges and manyers in decessing made in the control of th | 46 |

| 5.5.2 Information not readily available | 47 |
|--|----|
| 5.5.3 Lack of diversity in terms of information | 48 |
| 5.5.4 Poor internet connectivity | 48 |
| 5.5.5 Information not easily accessible | 48 |
| 5.6 Suggestions to the mitigations of challenges | 49 |
| 5.7 Chapter summary | 59 |
| | |
| CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 51 |
| 6.1 Overview | 51 |
| 6.2 Conclusions | 51 |
| 6.3 Recommendations | 52 |
| 6.4 Suggestions for further research | 53 |
| REFERENCES | 54 |
| LIST OF APPENDICES: QUESTIONNAIRE | ~0 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1: Leckie et al.'s Model of information seeking of professionals | | 1. | 3 |
|---|--|----|---|
|---|--|----|---|

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 1: | Demographic characteristics of respondents | 31 |
|-----------|--|----|
| Table 2: | Courts of operation of respondents | 32 |
| Table 3: | Professional status of respondents | 32 |
| Table 4: | Information needs of respondents | 33 |
| Table 5: | Kinds of information formats preferred. | 33 |
| Table 6: | Formats versus professional status of respondents | 34 |
| Table 7: | How respondents sought for information | 35 |
| Table 8: | What respondents depended on when looking for information | 35 |
| Table 9: | what respondents did if information needed was not readily | |
| | available at the libraries | 36 |
| Table 10: | Sources of their information | 36 |
| Table 11: | Extent to which their information needs were met | 37 |
| Table 12: | Respondents responses to the reasons given in table 10 | 38 |
| Table 13: | Challenges faced by judges and lawyers | 39 |
| Table 14: | Mitigation to challenges faced | 40 |

ACRONYMS

BSAC: British South African Company

ICT: Information and Communication Technology

IT: Information Technology

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences