

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

9-30-2014

# Legal and Ethical Issues of Information Service Delivery and Library Information Science Professionals in University Libraries in Nigeria

Ucha Mbofung mrs

*uchambofung@gmail.com, uchambofung@gmail.com*

Sunday Olanrewaju Popoola Dr

*University of Ibadan, drpopoolaso@gmail.com*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

Mbofung, Ucha mrs and Popoola, Sunday Olanrewaju Dr, "Legal and Ethical Issues of Information Service Delivery and Library Information Science Professionals in University Libraries in Nigeria" (2014). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 1183. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1183>

# **Legal and ethical issues of information service delivery and library information science professionals in University libraries in Nigeria**

## **Introduction**

Library service delivery involves individuals who have expectations of the library and information science professionals in such ways as how they relate and behave towards the users, colleagues, their organisations and entire society. A visible outcome of the recent trends in information service is that on daily basis, professional and technological developments create more serious challenges and opportunities to draw on for the library and information professionals. The challenges have necessitated drastic changes in legal knowledge and ethical skills acquisitions for older and newly employed librarians to enable them improve their capabilities. Library and information science professionals need to adapt, embrace the current changes and still be effective and survive or else become redundant. Therefore, the professionals' burden of being held to a heightened standard of care, if not well aligned with appropriate skills, poses challenges to information service delivery.

Ethical concerns for the information profession arose from the social responsibility debate of the 1960s (DuMont, 1991). Library and information science professionals, as providers of information, require awareness of the growing complexity in legal and ethical issues and values manifested through the relationship between the professional duties and the society. The values are often embedded in the numerous concepts of information and professional ethics. Knowledge of these values with a commitment to upholding individual and collective responsibilities towards knowledge access and provision; doing right and upholding professionalism form the foundation to quality service delivery.

This shift places a focus on identifying some of the principles, obligations and behaviours which cause workplace problems and dilemmas. Working with an ethical framework demonstrates an understanding of common laws relevant to work role and particularly information service delivery. The performance criteria expect rights of the clients are protected when delivering service regardless of personal values, beliefs and attitudes. These underpin the ability of the library and information science professional to apply effective problem solving techniques when exposed to competing value systems, and ensuring that legal and ethical dilemmas are recognised and discussed appropriately.

Studies on legal and ethical considerations of information provision and services have focused extensively on responsibilities, principles, professionalism but less on the actual workplace application that should sustain the actions and decisions taken by library professionals. Shachaf (2005) concluded in part that attention should be focused on the implementation of the codes of ethics in order to determine the extent the codes are known by professionals in each country and the influence of the codes on the practitioners. This study therefore, examines awareness of some of the principles endorsed in the professional codes that support a more legal and ethical workplace and

whether the library and information science professionals (LIS) in federal universities in Nigeria are practicing them in information service delivery

### **Literature Review**

Ethics is a branch of philosophy that is concerned with moral principles of behavior or conduct of individuals in society. Ethics defines and provides ideas that sustain action that is good and right in terms of obligation, fairness and benefits to society (Wengert 2001; Markkula Centre for Applied Ethics 2010). Laws are enacted to address the principles and values that regulate behaviour with respect to what is right or wrong (Pollack, and Hartzel, 2006). Therefore, in practice, these laws support a more legal and ethical workplace providing a clear guiding philosophy (Shachaf, 2005) especially when making decisions.

Good knowledge of legal and ethical issues of information service delivery is acquired through education. Courses in information ethics must be part of the education of information professionals (Fallis, 2007). According to Smith (1997), Halawi and Karkoulian (2006) information ethics investigates legal and ethical issues arising from the development and application of technologies in the creation, collection, recording, distribution, conservation, copyright and access of information. It provides a critical framework for considering moral issues concerning information privacy and new environmental issues. Information ethics for the library professional has also focused attention on censorship, collection development, and intellectual freedom, equitable access, information privacy, intellectual property and problem patrons (Mason, 1986; Hauptman, 1988; Fallis 2007). On the premise of the diversified content, Smith (1997) argued that information ethics may become the umbrella name that unifies network ethics, machine ethics, cyber ethics as well as areas of applied ethics in information science including library and information science. The outcome is that dilemma would also be created by these systems and LIS professionals would still take principle based decisions.

Hannabuss, 1996, Smith (2001), and Fallis, (2007) support the need to teach library and information ethics on the premise that professionalism in librarianship assumes the awareness and application of ethical standards. Secondly, dealing with information products and services implicate practitioners in ethical and legal issues that cause dilemma and require systematic decision-making. Therefore, teaching information ethics represents a number of intellectual and administrative challenges which are associated with possessing relevant knowledge in preparation to implementing legal and ethical principles in information service.

The relevance and awareness of legal and ethical principles of information service delivery is significant, particularly in Nigeria and Africa at large. Ochalla (2009) examined in-depth the stand of Africa information ethics education within over sixty library and information science schools. Partially, the study addressed who should be taught; the education course content and the duration of teaching. The findings support earlier reports which argue that because information ethics threads through all human activities that generate, process, store, disseminate and use information and knowledge, everyone working in the information and knowledge industry, including consumers of knowledge products and services should undergo information ethics education.

Apart from information ethics, international librarianship recognises the establishment and implementation of professional codes. IFLA's focus on professional

ethics has led to construction of distinctive body of specialised knowledge and skills, production of code of ethics which librarians and other information workers can use for policies and handle dilemmas. The code also encourages reflection on principles that improve professional awareness and providing transparency to users and society in general (International Federation of Library Associations, 2004). In many countries, library associations have developed and approved national codes ( Shachaf, 2005) to assist LIS professionals achieve a standard of behaviour that reflects their professional values, good governance, integrity and honest accountability (Botswana Library Association, 2010). These codes emphasise the same broad principles. Generally, the uses of the codes include: providing guidance for dealing with ethical issues that are not addressed by the domain of codified law but that should not be left to the domain of free choice (Shachaf, 2005); getting legal support intended to protect the profession, individual practitioners and their clients and ensure policies are legal; serving as a point of reference when dealing with disciplinary procedures against members by ensuring ethical treatment of employees and lastly, supporting personal self-development. Ford and Richardson, 1994; Luciano, 1999 opined that the usefulness of the professional codes seems to be effective when accompanied by good policies and clear sanctions as stimulus for ethical conduct to members.

However, as many as the uses may appear, the codes have their limitations depending on the type of codes of ethics (Froehlich, 1997). Many library association codes are both inspirational and educational as they tend to empower individuals to be ethical by presenting an ideal that individuals should attempt to reach (Koehler and Pemberton, 2000). Although the strengths of the codes are generally obvious and modest, the principles often expressed in broad guideline statements have elements of vagueness; at times relatively brief leading to a loss in the reasoning in the final version (Rubin, 1991), sometimes they prove controversial with employees voicing that they are too lengthy and over-prescriptive (Warren and Oppenheim, 2004). Attempts to interpret the code in the myriad situations or apply them in different locations create dilemmas arising from conflict in values (Symons and Stoffle, 1998; American Library Association, 2009) even for the professional. Therefore, one should bear in mind that legal and ethical standards may be universal, but not absolute and subject to modifications. They should be seen as end product for justifiable decision-making for well being of individuals and society.

Studies have indicated that there are difficulties discussing legal and ethical issues particularly so related to information service delivery and a discussion on a particular ethical concern draws on others (Fernandez-Molina, 2000). It becomes obvious that there will be many ways of examining legal and ethical issues of information service delivery of LIS professionals. The examination can be client expectations versus professional responsibilities to make sure that the information they are giving is accurate, reliable and that they are providing this information equally without biases to all clients (Smith, 2010). Another way can be examining the discrepancy between the LIS professional's knowledge of legal and ethical logistics to be able to handle dilemmas at the same time achieve a reasonable degree of expertise (Morgan, 1995). These studies have focused either on the content of information ethics or what relates specifically to professional principles that should sustain the actions and decisions taken by information professionals.

Ethical challenges of information service delivery have been examined from many perspectives including choice of material (selection), access, quality of information, equality of treatment, right, accuracy and censorship, copyright and data protection, intellectual freedom, reference services, protecting users' rights, information retrieval and dissemination, computer application, use and misuse of information, charging fees and profit making, conflict of interest, confidentiality, personal ethics and professional codes of ethics (Mason, 1986, Rubin 1991, 2001; Danielson, 1997; Froehlich, 1997; Bunge, 1999; Hauptman, 2000 and Smith 2010). Others are concealment of information, misinforming clients, divulging private information; disseminating false information (Milton, 2008; Kaddu, 2010). Disagreements appear with special circumstances and attempt to review any of these challenges impinges on several others.

As illustrated by Fernandez – Molina (2000) when those selecting information resources follow their own interest or that of a small but powerful group of users, they create tension by suppressing selection and the same time may be involved in censorship. Therefore, if selection decisions do not follow appropriate selection criteria, this may become a predicament in collection development and service delivery. The predicament is justifiable by the principles supporting selection or removal of materials considered harmful on the basis of religious, moral or other reasons.

Oppenheim and Smith (2004) explained that censorship has been used to prevent and control the creation and dissemination of ideas and information. But the difficult challenges lie in the conflicts between obligation the LIS professional has to serve the community, users and governing bodies for which they work and are funded. In response to such predicaments, LIS professionals can best defend themselves against any form of censorship pressure by establishing an acquisition policy which is well defined, detailed and explicit (Fernandez-Molina, 2000). At the individual level, self censorship of controversial materials must be addressed through public policy processes reflected in laws and regulation related to information access (Du Mont (1991).

Another principle of information service delivery is that accurate information must be supplied to the user regardless of the information professionals' stance to the content or finality of its use (Smith, 2010), at the right time, in the right quantity and in the right format (Mason (1986). These responsibilities involve a wide range of elements such as accepting those tasks that are within one's reach, providing the customer with a realistic forecast of what can be obtained and searching the best resources. For the client, maintaining the confidentiality of the material obtained and privacy to personal information are implicit. Since ethical problems intertwine there may be no clear way to resolve confidentiality as it relates to privacy. Smith (2010) suggested that decision should be made keeping in mind what consequences and if the decision is fair to all those involved.

These ethical considerations of information provision focus less on implications for actual service delivery. The service being considered include many of the traditional mechanisms for gathering and disseminating information in libraries such as photocopied journals, content pages, and current awareness bulletins, computer assisted information delivery services utilising telephones, e-mails, fax, online public access catalogues (OPAC) and web-based delivery services digital delivery of resources and services. Many of these are being replaced by electronic alerting devices, digital

imaging, ipads, ipods, web blogs and services (Moyo, 2002; Oguniola, 2004; ACRL, 2012; Dhawan, 2012). Their ethical impacts relate also to accessibility/inaccessibility, translations, integration of textual and graphical formats involving repackaging. Britz 2010 discussed ethical challenges to information profession from a socio-ethical perspective with specific emphasis on privacy in processing personal and private information. In handling the ethical challenges, the author proposed that practical guidelines can be formulated according to the norms of freedom, truth and human right.

In spite of all this, today technological innovations have modified workplace logistics. Information services and products are becoming more specialised and specific. It is this increasing computer power, storage and networking capabilities, that are creating new situations, new responsibilities and consequences which existing laws or rules of conduct may not be relevant or are disrupting the operable norms and values (Halawi and Karkoulian, 2006). Unfortunately, Osif (2005) reported a shortage of ethical and intellectual resources with which to understand and confront these changes. Similar to this opinion, Ball and Oppenheim, (2005) submitted that despite the existence of codes, library professionals encounter different circumstances they cannot solve in relation to access to information, internet usage and censorship. These reports call for assessment of the rules governing behaviour and developing matching procedures with actual workplace practices bearing in mind that the way LIS professionals address these challenges will vary according to individuals and common ethical and moral standards. The assessment generated two specific objectives which were: to examine extent of awareness of some of the legal and ethical principles endorsed in the professional codes and whether the library and information science professionals in federal universities in Nigeria are practicing them in information service delivery.

## **Methodology**

The authors used a questionnaire for data collection from 429 (census) practicing professionals in 24 federal universities in Nigeria. The questionnaire was prepared using excerpts from IFLA/FAIFE Intellectual Freedom Statements because none was available in literature. The period of data collection was February to May, 2013. Reliability of the instrument was determined through the use of Cronbach Alpha Statistics. Reliability coefficients were: legal issues 0.60 and ethical issues 0.86. The hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance. Descriptive statistics using frequency counts and percentages and Pearson r were used for data analysis.

## **Objectives of the study**

The specific objectives of the study were: to ascertain the extent to which the legal and ethical principles of information service delivery are known by the library and information science professionals in federal universities in Nigeria; and the influence on the service.

## **Hypotheses**

Two hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

- 1) There is no significant relationship between legal issues and information service delivery of library and information science professionals in federal university libraries in Nigeria and;

- 2) There is no significant relationship between ethical issues and information service delivery of library and information science professionals in federal university libraries in Nigeria and;

## **Findings**

### **Legal issues**

To determine awareness of the legal issues, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement on a three-ranging scale (True=3, False=2, Neutral=1; N=429). The results are displayed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Knowledge of legal issues of information service delivery in the university libraries.**

Table 1 presents the legal issues of information service in order of decreasing mean: privacy, absence of freedom of information bill, confidentiality of reference queries and litigation, censorship involving exclusion, removal and restriction of information materials, freedom and equality of access and freedom of enquiry, accuracy of information and lastly, copyright of information.

The results indicate that 66% of total respondents knew and upheld all the legal issues that affect information service delivery. By implication, this proportion of respondents is expected to be conversant with possible repercussions of their violation. Of particular note are the supporters of copyright of information (74.1%); freedom of enquiry (72.3%); freedom and equal access to information (70.4%) censorship involving exclusion, removal and restriction to provision of information (68.6%), litigation on inaccurate information provision. There were also neutral respondents (12.5%) forming the larger cluster of responses. In this category are: 27.7% neutral to privacy in providing personal information; and ignorance of the absence of information bill and its application to service delivery respectively. Being neutral can be an indication of ignorance, doubt or having personal bias.

### **Application of legal principles in information service delivery**

Assessment of respondents by frequency of application anchored on a four-point Likert scale from Always=4; Sometimes=3; Never =2 to I do not know =1.

**Table 2: Distribution of respondents by frequency of application of legal principles**

Table 2 shows that 33.7% of total respondents spread across those who did not know the legal principles guiding information services delivery This category includes the responses of (49.2%) respondents who lacked knowledge of the principles stipulating that library shall seek to provide accurate information regardless of the complexity of the queries, (38.2%) to denial or limiting access based on controversial content. There is equality in the responses of (34.0%) who did not know and those who

affirmed that librarians should always ensure that information laws are integrated into the methods of providing information.

Analysis of results show that 156 and 114 respondents always and sometimes respectively applied the freedom of information bill when faced with legal problems; 146 and 69 always and sometimes ensured the integration of information law into the methods used in providing information; 114 and 99 respondents always and sometimes respectively excluded library materials only so far as law properly required, furthermore, 120 and 88 respondents were always and sometimes respectively guided by the principle stipulating that access should not be restricted only so far as the law may properly require whereas 143 did not know about it. Overall, 30% of total respondents knew and applied always the legal principles and 33.7% did not know and as a result would not have applied them (Table 2). This has serious implication for service delivery.

### **Ethical issues that affect information services delivery of LIS professionals.**

A four-point Likert scale provided a series of statements to which participants could indicate degrees of agreement or disagreement. The responses are displayed in Table 3.

#### **Table 3: Frequency distribution of respondents by application of ethical principles of information service delivery.**

The result provides evidence of awareness to the following content categories of the principles: enforcement of restriction permitted by law (item 1); selection of library material representing all points of view, individual taste and void of personal interest (items 2 and 7); restriction of access or censorship involving use of filtering software (items 3); confidentiality, privacy and response to queries (items 6, 10, 15 and 18). Others are: exclusion of materials because of race, nationality, political, social, moral or religious views or partisan or doctrinal approval or pressure (items 8, 9 and 14); adherence to institutional policies (items 11 and 16) and lastly professional development (item 13).

The assessment determining the extent of application of the ethical guidelines shows that the highest single cluster of respondents (53.8%) “always” upheld and protected library users right to privacy and confidentiality with respect to information sought; 50.6% “always” considered each individual information query to be of equal merit regardless of the age, gender, ethnicity or status; 49.2% “always” respected and provided unbiased and courteous responses to all requests.

Among the responsibilities to colleagues, the profession, organisations and society (49.0% and 12.1%) respondents always and sometimes respectively, related respectfully with their colleagues and in the spirit of the profession (item 17); (46.2% and 10.5%) maintained that selection of library materials is governed solely by acquisition policies of the library (item 11), (42.7%+17.0%) did not advance private interest at the expense of the library users, colleagues or employing institution. On responsibilities to the society, 44.5% and 43.4% always followed the guideline stipulating that no library material should be censored, restricted or removed for any reason (items 9 and 8). The evidence supporting professional training and continued updating of professional knowledge shows that (43.3% and 16.6%) of respondents either always or sometimes kept abreast of development in librarianship in those branches of professional practice in



which qualification and experience proved to be inadequate. There were also minority respondents with negative responses. The largest cluster of respondents (20.5%) in this group is in item 16 and the respondents claimed they never provided the highest service using the most appropriate resources and consequently never maintained equitable service policies.

**Table 4: Test of significance for relationship between legal issues, ethical issues and information services delivery.**

Table 4 indicates that the mean score of legal issues of the respondents is 29.64 while the mean score of their information service delivery is 125.82. The test of the first hypothesis reveals that there was a significant relationship between legal issues and information service delivery ( $r = .131, p < 0.05$ ). The test of the second hypothesis reveals that there was no significant relationship between ethical issues and information service delivery ( $r = -.060, p > 0.05$ ). The mean score of ethical issues of the respondents is 43.80. The null hypothesis was accepted and the alternative rejected.

### **Discussion of findings**

The study established awareness and endorsement of legal issues of privacy, freedom of information bill, confidentiality, litigation, censorship, freedom and equal access, freedom of enquiry, accuracy of information and copyright of information. These are the major components of the legal principles which for the LIS professionals form the legal issues of information service delivery. Familiarity with these principles of law and ability to discover those additional rules of law which may not be common is essential (Diamond and Dragich, 2001). Thus the study provides evidence that a significant number of LIS professionals in federal universities in Nigeria provided services within the legally accepted boundaries having articulated principles and practices of service delivery.

There were noticeable disparities between the proportions of respondents who affirmed the legal principles and those who indicated neutral or negative. Overall, the affirmative responses attracted the largest averages of respondents. By implication, such respondents had good knowledge of the principles and these were applied in their service delivery. This awareness should eliminate or greatly control violation or infringement of rights in the areas of privacy, confidentiality, censorship, provision of accurate information, equal access and application of personal beliefs which can further complicate problems. Specifically, litigation on inaccurate information provision was highly endorsed. But whether or not litigation is sustained, Morgan (1995), Igbeka and Okoroma (2013) have reported that no action for negligence had been reported while Fernandez-Molina (2000) reported few occurrences of litigation.

The results have implications for LIS professionals in university libraries in Nigeria. There is authentic need for more enlightenment in legal issues of information management. Good practice, shaped significantly by legal and ethical values should anchor the standard against which LIS professionals in Nigeria provide effective services despite the complexity in discussing them and the ignorance of these principles exhibited a times by the professionals. Uncomfortable significant percentages of

respondents were ignorant of the principles projected in the statements thus incurring the implicating observation of Fernandez-Molina (2000) and Diamond and Dragich (2001) that being held to a heightened standard of care might be jeopardized by ordinary negligence resulting from ignorance. It is therefore not enough to articulate principles and practices, but rather possessing the ability to apply them (Shachaf, 2005) when in dilemma.

The study found that largest numbers of respondents always and sometimes applied principles of reference services stipulating that access should not be restricted and information must be supplied to the user regardless of the information professional's stance towards its content or finality of its use except when restricted by law. In practice, the intricacies in application can result to professional negligence, censorship, encroachment on privacy and the LIS professional is seen to have contravened the law thus incurs liability or faces legal consequences (Morgan, 1995). Similar argument can be applied to selection and acquisition of wide range of materials from all points of view which can result to denial or limiting access to information because of its being considered controversial.

The principles above emphasise the importance of implementing selection and acquisition policies, given that the mission of the library is determined by serving users. Furthermore, the results confirm a relationship between selection and censorship and lend credence to the submission of Fernandez-Molina (2000) that in theory the line between censorship and selection is a clear one but in practice it can become much "blurred" because of the influence of a host of norms though there is no perfect social consensus as to which is the norm. The suggested ways out would be ensuring that the selection and availability of library materials is governed solely by acquisition policies, and not influenced by private interest at the expense of library users, colleagues or employer. Adherence to the norm should ensure unbiased and reliable resources ready for users.

In practice, there may be situations when the library and information science (LIS) professional is asked to provide information that disagrees with personal moral values and beliefs. Personal ethics requires the professional's awareness that personal feelings should be put aside in order to effectively do the job (Smith, 2010). Either always or sometimes, majority of respondents provided the highest level of service using the most appropriate resources and maintained equitable access and equitable policies. A significant percentage of LIS professionals were committed to upholding intellectual freedom in the dissemination of information thereby sustaining the state of intellectual freedom in libraries, an important indicator of democracy in a nation and the citizen's right protected by law. The defence of intellectual freedom in libraries is part of the struggle to secure the peoples' right to know, pursue liberty, creativity and intellectual activity. These are necessary conditions of freedom of access to information (Arko-Cobbah, 2009). Endorsement should promote open and equal access within the scope permitted by the organisation void of unlawful discriminating practices. It should also eliminate personal bias and ensure credibility in service quality.

Quality service delivery through libraries is dependent on professional knowledge to information sources and services to which over fifty percent of the respondents kept abreast of development in librarianship in those branches of professional practice in which qualification and experience are required. The extent of implementation of the various legal and ethical principles further determines the quality

of service (Shachaf, 2004). Therefore, in consonance with recommendations in literature, staff should be allowed to participate in training to develop relevant skills and particularly in professional ethics and codes of ethics (Shachaf, 2005).

The test of significance revealed a positive relationship between the legal issues and service delivery. Ethical issues had zero percentage of relative contribution to the prediction of effective information service delivery of respondents. This is greatly accounted for by the largest percentages of respondents who did not know and never applied the ethical principles. Such respondents have negative perception of the relevance of ethical issues. Such may not seek help when in dilemma nor engage in training in ethical responsibilities. This manifestation negates the purposive significant relationship between legal, ethical issues of library and information science professionals and service delivery in libraries. The extent to which the principle is applied to quality service delivery underpins depth of awareness of its legal and ethical complexity. Consequently, constant upgrade of professional knowledge in these areas becomes imperative to balance the expectation that the more conversant in knowledge and regular application of these professional skills, the higher the level of services while fulfilling personal, organisational and professional obligations. Regarding the respondents who have knowledge of the legal and ethical principle, the services to clients are statutorily binding likewise the consequential effect on infringements of rights.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

Information service delivery of LIS professionals in federal universities in Nigeria is guided by legal and ethical principles that govern their behaviour with respect to what is right or wrong while ensuring fairness, equity and justice. The overall assessments tend to suggest low level of awareness of legal and ethical principles of service delivery, a situation capable of impacting negatively on the practitioners. This places importance on the significant responses of majority of professionals confirming the necessity for continuing professional development especially in legal and ethical responsibilities; and upheld and advocated application of the principles broadly embedded in intellectual freedom statements This should not be ignored. Therefore, the study recommends that application of legal and ethical issues of library environment and information management be considered by LIS professionals in Nigerian in relation to improved services delivery. Nigerian Library Association (NLA) and Librarians' Registration Council of Nigeria (LRCN) should take legal and ethical issues of information management very seriously in accrediting library and information education institutions in Nigeria. The library schools should consider integrating these areas into the curricula. Practitioners who are already working in libraries should be considered for personal and professional growth in relevant legal and ethical responsibilities .

## References

- ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee, (2012), "2012 top ten trends in academic libraries", Retrieved February 15, 2013 from <http://crln.acrl.org/content/73/6/311.full>
- American Library Association, (2009), "Code of ethics", Retrieved March 19, 2012 from <http://www.ala.org/ala/oif/statementspols/codeofethics.codeethics.cfm>
- Arko-Cobbah, A. (2008), "The right to access information: opportunities and challenges for civil society and good governance in South Africa". *IFLA Journal*, Vol.34 No.2, pp. 180 – 191.
- Ball, K. and Oppenheim, C. (2005), "Attitude of UK librarians and librarianship students to ethical Issues", *International Review of Information Ethics*, Vol.3 No.3, pp. 54-61.
- Botswana Library Association (2010), "Information is power: professional ethics", available at: <http://www.bla.0catch.com/Ethics.htm>.
- Britz, J. J. (2010), "Technology as a threat to privacy: ethical challenges to the information profession", available at: <http://web.simmons.edu/nichen/nit/NIT96/96-025-Britz.html>.
- Bunge, C. A. (1999), "Ethics and the reference librarian". *Reference Librarian*. Vol. 66pp. 25-44.
- Danielson, E. S. (1997), "Ethics and reference services". *Reference Librarian*, Vol 26 No.56 pp. 107 – 124.
- Dhawan, S. M. (2012). Information dissemination services. Pp. 659-668. Retrieved February 15, 2013 from [www.unesco.org/education/aladin/paldin/pdf/course02unit\\_06pdf](http://www.unesco.org/education/aladin/paldin/pdf/course02unit_06pdf)
- Diamond, R. and Dragich, M. (2001), "Professionalism in librarianship: shifting focus from malpractice to good practice", *Library Trends*, Vol.49 No.3, pp. 395 – 414.
- Du Mont, R. R. (1991), "Ethics in librarianship: a management model", *Library Trends*, Vol. 40 No.2, pp. 201 – 215.
- Fallis, D. (2007), "Information ethics for 21<sup>st</sup> century library professionals", *Library Hi Tech*, Vol. 25 No.1, pp. 23 – 36.
- Fernandez-Molina, J. C. (2000), "Ethical concerns and their place in the training of information professional", *Journal of Spanish Research on Information Science*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 1-8.

- Ford, R. C. and Richardson, W. D. (1994), "Ethical decision making: a review of the empirical literature", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 13 No.3, pp. 206 – 224.
- Froehlich, T. J. (1997), *Survey and analysis of the major ethical and legal issues facing library and information services*, UNESCO Report for International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA). Munich. G.K. Saur.
- Halawi, L. and Karkoulian, S. (2006), "Ethical attitudes of business information systems students: an empirical investigation", *Issues in Information Systems*, Vol.7No.1, pp. 175 – 178.
- Hannabuss, S. (1996), Teaching library and information ethics, *Library Management*. Vol. 17 No.2, pp. 24 – 35.
- Hauptman, R. (1988), *Ethical challenges in librarianship*, Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ.
- Hauptman, R. (2002), *Ethics and librarianship*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland
- IFLA/FAIFE, (2009), "Intellectual freedom statements", The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, available at: <http://www.clip.org.uk/default.cilip>
- Igbeka, J. U. and Okoroma, F. N. (2013), "Awareness and practice of professional ethics among librarians in Nigeria", *Educational Research and Review*. 8. 15: 1270-1293.
- Koehler, W. C. and Pemberton, J. (2000), "A search for core values: towards a model code of ethics for information professionals", *Journal of Information Ethics*, Vol. 9, pp. 27-54.
- Luciano, F. (1999), "Information ethics: on the theoretical foundation of computer ethics". *Ethics and Information Technology* Vol1 No1. pp37 – 56.
- Markkula Centre for Applied Ethics, (2010), "What is ethics" *Issues in Ethics*, Vol. No.1 1987 (revised 2010), available at <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/decision/whatisethics.html>
- Mason, R. O. (1986), "Four ethical issues of the information age", *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, Vol.10 No.I, pp. 5-12.
- Morgan, P. (1995), "Editorial: ethical and legal issues – dilemmas and duties", *Health Libraries Review*. 12: 71 – 79.
- Moyo, L. M. (2002), "Collections on the web: some access and navigation issues", *Library Collections, Acquisitions and Technical Services*, Vol. 26 No.1, pp. 47-59.
- Ochalla, D. (2009), "Information ethics education in Africa. Where do we stand?",

*International Information and Library Review*, Vol.41, pp. 79-88.

Ogunsola, L. A. (2004), "Nigeria university libraries and the challenges of globalization: the way forward", *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*.5:3,available at [http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v05n02/ogunsola\\_101.htm](http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v05n02/ogunsola_101.htm).

Oppenheim, C. and Smith, V. (2004), "Censorship in libraries", *Information Services and Use*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 159-170.

Osif, B. A. (2005), "Computer and internet ethics", *Library Administration and Management*, Vol. 19 No.3, pp. 149 – 154.

Pollack, T. A. and Hartzel, K. S. (2006), "Ethical and legal issues for the information system professional". Proceedings of the 2006 ASCUE Conference, June 11 – 15, 2006. Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. <http://www.ascue.org/files/proceedings/2006/p172.pdf>

Rubin, R. (1991), "Ethical issues in library personnel management". *Journal of Library Administration*, Vol. 14 No. 4 pp. 1 – 16.

Rubin, R. (2001), Ethical aspects of reference service. Reference and information services: an introduction. R.E.Bopp and L.C. Smith. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Libraries Unlimited, Englewood, Colorado, pp. 28 – 46.

Shachaf, P. (2005), "A global perspective on library association codes of ethics", *Library and Information Science Research*, Vol. 27 No.4, pp. 513-533.

Smith, M. (2010), "The Ethics of information provision", available at: <http://www.libsci.sc.edu/bob/class/cli724/SpecialLibrariesHandbook/Ethics.htm>

Smith, M. M. (1997), "Information ethics", *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, M.E.Williams. Ed. Medford, Information Today, New Jersey, pp.339 – 366.

Smith, M. M. (2001), "Information ethics", *Advances in librarianship*, Vol.25, pp. 29-66.

Symons, A. K. and Stoffle, C. J. (1998), "When values conflict", *American Libraries*, Vol. 29 No.5, pp. 56 – 58.

Warren, A. and Oppenheim, C. (2004), "Integration of roles? Implementing new law in UK public organisations", *Journal of Information Science*. 30.1: 48-59.

Wengert, R. (2001), "Some ethical aspects of being an information professional", *Library Trends*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 486-509, available at <http://findarticles.com/articles/mi/m/1387/15-3-349/91>

### Legal issues

**Table 1: Legal issues of information service delivery in the university libraries.**

S\N	Legal Issues	True =3	False=2	Neutral=1	Mean	S.D
1	Privacy (what information must be revealed or provided)	240 55.9%	70 16.3%	119 27.7%	1.72	87
2	Absence of freedom of information bill or ignorance in its application	253 59.0%	57 13.3%	119 27.7%	1.69	88
3	Confidentiality of reference queries	263 61.3%	49 11.4%	117 27.3%	1.66	88
4	Litigation on inaccurate, untimely information provision	234 54.5%	106 24.7%	89 20.7%	1.66	80
5	Censorship involving exclusion, removal and restriction in the provision of information	273 63.6%	47 11.0%	109 25.4%	1.62	.86
6	Freedom and equality of access as a fundamental right	302 70.4%	9 2.1%	118 27.5%	1.57	.89
7	Freedom of enquiry	310 72.3%	9 2.1%	110 25.6%	1.53	.87
8	Accuracy of information	322 75.1%	12 2.8%	95 22.1%	1.47	.83
9	Copyright of information	318 74.1%	24 5.6%	87 20.3%	1.46	.81
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>65.6%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>24.9%</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>.85</b>

**Table 2: Frequency distribution of respondents by application of legal principles**

<b>SN</b>	<b>Legal principles</b>	<b>Always=4</b>	<b>Sometimes=3</b>	<b>Never=2</b>	<b>Don't know=1</b>
1	The library shall seek to provide users with complete accurate answers to their information queries regardless of the complexity of these queries.	121 28.2%	55 12.8%	42 9.8%	211 49.2%
2	Librarians should not deny or limit access to information in any form because of its allegedly controversial content or because of the librarians personal belief or fear of confrontation.	124 28.9%	58 13.5%	83 19.3%	164 38.2%
3	Access should not be restricted on any grounds except that of the law.	120 28.0%	88 20.5%	78 18.2%	143 33.3%
4	Library materials should be excluded or restricted only so far as the law may properly require.	114 26.6%	99 23.1%	79 18.4%	137 31.9%
5	Librarians should ensure that information laws is integrated into the methods of providing information	146 34.0%	69 16.1%	68 15.9%	146 34.0%
6	Librarians should apply the freedom of information bill when faced with legal problems	156 36.4%	114 26.6%	90 21.0%	69 16.1%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>30.35%</b>	<b>18.77%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>33.7%</b>



**Table 3: Respondents perception of ethical issues affecting information service delivery.**

<b>SN</b>	<b>Ethical Principles</b>	<b>Always</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
1	Libraries shall enforce restriction when (a) human right or privacy of another person are violated (b) when a court decision prohibits certain materials as obscene.	175 40.8%	61 14.2%	38 8.9%	155 36.1%
2	Libraries shall select a wide range of materials representing all points of view concerning the controversy and issue.	148 34.5%	94 21.9%	58 13.5%	129 30.1%
3	Librarians should not endorse the use of filtering software in libraries to restrict or block access to materials on the internet.	127 29.6%	114 26.6%	83 19.3%	105 24.5%
4	Materials kept in the libraries shall not be discarded by social interference or pressure from individuals, organisation or groups.	164 38.2%	73 17.0%	54 12.6%	138 32.2%
5	Librarians shall not select materials in accordance with individual interests or taste.	184 42.9%	45 10.5%	57 13.3%	143 33.3%
6	Librarians shall not divulge for any purpose any format or administrative record which has been entrusted to them in confidence.	169 39.4%	71 16.6%	62 14.5%	127 9.6%
7	Libraries shall respond to every demand of people who need library materials.	173 40.3%	76 17.7%	54 12.6%	126 29.4%
8	No library materials should be excluded from the libraries because of the race, nationality or political, social, moral or religious views of their author.	186 43.4%	58 13.5%	61 14.2%	124 28.9%
9	No library materials should be censored, restricted or removed from libraries because of partisan or doctrinal approval or pressure	191 44.5%	59 13.8%	47 11.0%	132 30.8%
10	We respect and provide unbiased and courteous responses to all request.	211 49.2%	34 7.9%	47 11.0%	137 31.9%
11	We do not advance private interest at the expense of the library users, colleagues or our employing institutions.	183 42.7%	73 17.0%	50 11.7%	123 28.7%
12	Librarians ensure that the selection and availability of library materials is governed solely by acquisition policies	198 46.2%	45 10.5%	62 14.5%	124 28.9%
13	We keep abreast of development in librarianship in those branches of professional practice in which qualifications and experience entitle us to engage.	190 44.3%	71 16.6%	45 10.5%	123 28.7%
14	We uphold the principles of intellectual freedom.	196 45.7%	77 17.9%	26 6.1%	130 30.3%
15	The libraries should consider each individual information query to be of equal merit regardless of the age, gender, ethnicity, status.	217 50.6%	43 10.0%	45 10.5%	124 28.9%
16	We provide the highest level of service	192	62	88	87

	using the most appropriate resources, maintaining equitable service policies.	44.8%	14.5%	20.5%	20.3%
17	We relate to our colleagues with respect and in a spirit of cooperation.	210 49.0%	52 12.1%	55 12.8%	112 26.1%
18	We uphold and protect library users rights to privacy and confidentiality with respect to information sought or received, acquired or transmitted.	231 53.8%	37 8.6%	41 9.6%	120 28.0%

**Table 4: Test of significance for relationship between legal issues, ethical issues and information service delivery.**

Variable	x	Std. Dev.	N	r	Sig.p
Information Service Delivery	125.8 2	16.8	429		
Legal Issues	29.64	8.86		.131*	.000
Ethical issues	43.80	19.6		-.060	.216

**Sig. at p < 0.05 level**