



An Assessment of Academic Librarians' Knowledge about Resource Description and Access (RDA) in Selected States in South-western Nigeria

Ezekiel Tubosun Olatunji^{1*}; Kudirat Olawumi Salami^{2*};
Adeola Adesoji Arinola (Ph.D)^{2*}; Susan Funmilola Kolajo^{3*}

¹ Olusegun Oke Library, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.

² Department of Library and Information Science, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.

³ Department of Library and Information Science, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.

ARTICLE'S INFO

Article No.: 090425135

Type: Research

Full Text: [PDF](#), [PHP](#), [EPUB](#), [MP3](#)

DOI: [10.15580/gjss.2025.1.090425135](https://doi.org/10.15580/gjss.2025.1.090425135)

Accepted: 04/09/2025

Published: 18/09/2025

Keywords: Knowledge, Academic Librarians, Academic Library, Resource Description and Access (RDA)

*Corresponding Authors

Olatunji, ET; Salami, KO; Arinola, AA; Kolajo, FS.

E-mail: etolatunji@lautech.edu.ng,
kosalami@lautech.edu.ng,
aaarinola@lautech.edu.ng,
fskolajo@lautech.edu.ng

Article's QR code



ABSTRACT

This study investigated the knowledge of academic librarians about Resource Description and Access in selected states in South-western Nigeria. The study adopted a survey research design method using the descriptive approach. A purposive sampling technique was used in determining the sample size while total enumeration of the sample was used. One hundred and thirty-two copies of the questionnaire were administered out of which 90 (68.2%) were retrieved and certified to be valid for the analysis. The data of the study was collected with a structured questionnaire and interview designed by the researchers. Frequency counts and percentages were carried out using SPSS. The findings from the study revealed that the majority of academic librarians were aware of Resource Description and Access but were not familiar with RDA concepts, rules and vocabulary. It was therefore recommended that academic librarians should always visit the Joint Steering Committee for the development of the RDA (JSC) website for updates on RDA, they should also in addition, subscribe to the RDA online toolkit to familiarize themselves with RDA concepts, rules and vocabulary since it is free. Moreover, the umbrella bodies of information professionals in Nigeria such as the Nigeria Library Association, the Society for Information Science and Technology of Nigeria and the Librarians Registration Council of Nigeria should embark on workshops, conferences, seminars and other training programmes for library professionals to have broad knowledge of RDA.

INTRODUCTION

Document description and representation in academic libraries have long been the work of academic librarians, especially the cataloguers. Tihamiyu (2003) asserted that the overall objective of efforts to organise documents is to improve the ease with which information-seekers can identify, become aware of, and locate specific documents in a collection of documents. He further reiterated that the process of uniquely describing each document in a collection of documents is referred to as document description. On the other hand, the process of describing and relating documents in terms of their content is referred to as document representation. However, academic librarians are the professionals who are concerned with the collection, storage, processing and dissemination of information resources in academic libraries to the patrons for reading, study and consultation (Aina, 2003). Academic librarians are generally responsible for the description and organisation of information resources acquired by academic libraries for easy access, retrieval and dissemination.

For information seekers to satisfy their information needs in the library environment, the library information resources should be well described and organised for easy access and retrieval. In doing these, therefore, cataloguers must be highly informed and have an in-depth knowledge of a particular cataloguing scheme

being used in a particular library environment to describe documents and also relate same in terms of their contents. Guorkova (2007) averred that the roles of libraries and information professionals are subject to fundamental changes because the growing popularity of Web technology is now influencing all aspects of our lives in this digital age. A library may not be able to fulfil its functions efficiently and effectively without a catalogue which is the core of every library and a basic tool of retrieval in any document collection. Lending credence to this, Arinola, Adigun, Oladeji, and Adekunjo (2012) maintained that for a document that has been acquired in digital format, it is necessary to assign the identification number and to catalogue it. This according to them helps the digital library to manage the digital/electronic resources smoothly and for easy accessibility.

In the information world, a lot of changes have occurred since the release of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Second edition (AACR2) in 1978. AACR2 rules are designed for use in the construction of card catalogues and other lists in general libraries. It has been in use in library environments for the past three decades. In 1998, the International Federation of Library Association and Institutions (IFLA) published Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), which is an entity-relationship model, intended to support resource discovery and information retrieval for the end-users. Further IFLA activities toward updating and reaffirming the Paris Principles of cataloguing of 1961 were

recorded between 2004 and 2007 (Dunsire, 2007; Oliver, 2010; Stephens, 2010).

In the last three decades, the publishing of information resources has experienced technological revolutions that are having a serious impact on library collections and the efforts to catalogue them. New forms of information resources are emerging from the Internet and World Wide Web. There are new ways of providing access to information since there are proliferations of online information resources. It was clear that there were challenges with AACR2 because it is a scheme meant for describing print resources and there were increasing calls for fundamental revisions to the cataloguing standard (Dunsire, 2007; Oliver, 2010; Stephens, 2010).

Irrespective of concerted efforts made in updating and revising AACR2 on different occasions, there were still some challenges to the scheme. In 2004, the Joint Steering Committee for revision of AACR2 and its governing body, the Committee of Principals (COP) according to Stephen, (2010) proposed a new edition of AACR2 provisionally tagged "AACR3: Resource Description and Access". There was an extensive re-organisation of part 1 of AACR2 to give more emphasis to the content and allow for more flexibility in the format. It was also designed to align with the rules, concepts and terminology used in the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) model by IFLA. However, it was discovered that the challenges posed by electronic resources in the information environment could not be addressed by the underlined AACR structure; hence a whole new approach to resource organisation. Therefore, the AACR structure was abandoned in 2005 with a direct alignment with the FRBR model. To reflect the change of approach, the name was changed to Resource Description and Access (RDA). The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR also changed its name to the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (Stephen, 2010).

Resource Description and Access (RDA) as asserted by the Joint Steering Committee (2015), is the new standard for resource description and access, designed for the digital world. It was built on the foundations established by AACR2. RDA provides a comprehensive set of guidelines and instructions on resource description and access covering all types of content and media.

Furthermore, there are three parts to the Resource Description and Access cataloguing rules. The first part according to Gourkova (2007) concerns descriptive cataloguing and outlines general rules for the description of an item. This is followed by the supplementary rules for specific formats. An important feature of RDA is its independence from the presentation of data. It provides guidance on the recording of data, and the content, and not on how it might be organised on the screen.

Similarly, RDA as observed by Quintana (2013) has more minimal requirements for bibliographic records than AACR2. However, there are many options for additional information. RDA provides a framework to describe materials in a manner that allows users to find, identify, select and obtain the works. Resource Description and Access (RDA) according to Oliver (2010) is the new cataloguing standard that is replacing the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2). Though it has strong connections with AACR2, RDA is quite different because it is based on a theoretical framework and designed for the digital environment to accommodate all information resources that appear in multiple formats and has a broader scope than AACR2.

Furthermore, since locating and retrieving documents in academic libraries depend to a greater extent on the effective description and representation of that document by the library professionals, it is therefore, pertinent to investigate the librarian's level of knowledge about the new scheme which is replacing AACR2 that they are familiar with; and has been in use for the past three decades, which their counterparts in other parts of the world are presently switching to.

Related Empirical Research

In an empirical study by Sanchez (2010) on RDA, AACR and you: What cataloguers are thinking. Cataloguers were asked to respond to questions that attempted to identify the level of their understanding of RDA concepts. Most respondents ranked themselves in the middle category and average. In knowing why RDA was created and AACR2 was left behind, most cataloguers were not comfortable with the use of RDA as a cataloguing metadata application profile for non-library entities but still had little knowledge.

In another study by Mansor (2014) on RDA perceptions among Malaysian cataloguers. This study aimed to investigate Malaysian cataloguers' awareness, familiarity and understanding of the new bibliographic content standard. The result revealed that, though Malaysian cataloguers were aware of the RDA, they were only familiar with the basics of RDA and its related topics. They were mainly aware of topics regarding the overview and development of RDA and indicated a low understanding of other topics, such as Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), related to RDA. The study also found that respondents acknowledged the inadequacy of their basic understanding of RDA and also identified their preference for RDA training.

Ahonsi (2014) also researched on Resource Description and Access (RDA) handbook for facilitating the understanding of RDA rules by Librarians and Cataloguers in English-speaking countries in sub-Saharan Africa, using Kenya and Nigeria. The findings of the study revealed that the new cataloguing standard was

relatively unknown to many cataloguers in some of the English-speaking countries in sub-Saharan Africa. The findings also showed that some of the respondents from libraries in the two countries have heard about RDA and have seen RDA records but the percentage of the respondents that haven't thought about using RDA toolkit online was very high from Kenya and Nigeria. Also, from the findings; the majority of the respondents haven't read other resources about RDA as well.

Atilgan, Ozel, and Cakmak (2015) concluded in their study that, Turkey also had similar problems with other countries; the cataloguers had a lack of knowledge and experience about the new rules, standards and models. There is also training needed for cataloguers especially on the RDA element set and RDA vocabulary as well as their relationships with conceptual models among others. Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) investigated awareness, knowledge and implementation of RDA in academic libraries in Nigeria. A major finding from the study revealed that participants were only aware of the topics relating to the overview and development of RDA. Another finding of the study was that the participants lacked the nitty-gritty of RDA which could hamper its full adoption and implementation in Nigerian libraries. The study also confirmed that librarians in Nigeria did not have any formal training in RDA because there were no known local training opportunities on RDA in Nigeria at the time of embarking on the study.

Statement of the Problem

As a result of the emergence of web technologies, there has been an increasing flow of information resources published electronically thereby creating an online information world. These online information resources require new kinds of description and access. This is because AACR2, the scheme meant for describing print resources has been rendered less useful and there is the need for a new scheme that will cater for all information resources that are appearing in multiple formats (Ahonsi, 2014). Furthermore, despite the findings of the previous studies conducted on RDA, there exists a knowledge gap concerning the knowledge of academic librarians about RDA in developing countries, especially Nigeria. The literature search revealed that those previous studies were carried out in developed countries and Asia while few studies were carried out in sub-Saharan Africa. Besides that, the literature search also revealed scanty empirical studies on RDA from Nigeria; hence this study intends to investigate the level of knowledge of academic librarians about RDA in South-western state University libraries in Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to determine the level of knowledge of academic librarians about Resource Description and Access in selected states in South-western Nigeria while the specific objectives are:

1. To find out the level of awareness of academic librarians about Resource Description and Access (RDA) in selected university libraries in South-western Nigeria
2. To determine the familiarity of academic librarians with RDA in selected university libraries in South-western Nigeria
3. To investigate the level of knowledge of academic librarians about RDA in selected university libraries in South-western Nigeria
4. To offer suggestions for improvement.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted the survey research design using descriptive approach. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the three states in South-western zone of Nigeria. The selected states were Oyo, Osun and Ogun states respectively. These states were selected because of the proximity of the states to the researchers and limited resources at their disposal to complete the research work in time.

The target population in the selected states comprised all academic librarians from the public and private university libraries in these states. Osun states has one federal and one state university while Oyo and Ogun states have one federal and two state universities each as at the time of gathering data for this study. On the other hand, Oyo state has eight private universities, Osun state has eight private universities and Ogun state with sixteen private universities dully accredited by the National Universities Commission as at the time of gathering data for this study.

Since the purposive sampling technique was adopted, the three federal universities in all the states were eligible for this study. One state university from Oyo (Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho (LAUTECH), Osun (Osun State University, Osogbo (UNIOSUN) the oldest state universities in Ogun (Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye (OOU) was selected for the study. Besides that, the oldest private university in each of the three states was also selected for the study. The data presented in Table 2 below represent the sample of Nine (9) federal, state and private universities that were sampled from the three selected states in South-western Nigeria. The total enumeration of the librarians from the sample was used.

Table 2: Selected University Libraries and Academic Librarians

S/N	State	Library/University	Status	Date Established	Academic Librarians
1	Oyo	Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan	Federal	1948	32
2	Oyo	Olusegun Oke Library, LAUTECH Ogbomosho	State	1990	14
3	Oyo	University Library, Lead City University Ibadan	Private	2005	08
4	Osun	Hezekiah Oluwasanmi Library, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife	Federal	1962	20
5	Osun	University Library, Osun State University, Osogbo	State	2006	06
6	Osun	University Library, Bowen University Iwo	Private	2001	08
7	Ogun	University Library, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta	Federal	1988	23
8	Ogun	University Library, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye	State	1982	13
9	Ogun	University Library, Babcock University Ilisan-Remo	Private	1999	10
		Total			132

Source: Secretary to the University Librarian of the selected Universities.

The data of the study was collected through the administration of a questionnaire and structured interview. The university librarians and the heads of the cataloguing sections were interviewed because of their years of experience in librarianship and their major duty as creators of metadata on information resources in each university library. They were expected to be highly knowledgeable in the trends in the information profession and also in the cataloguing schemes used in their libraries. Out of 132 copies of questionnaires that were administered, 90 (68.2%) of them were retrieved and

certified fit for analysis. At the end of the interview, the researchers were able to interview four university librarians and eight heads of the cataloguing sections. The findings of the study are therefore presented in tables using frequency counts and percentages.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Name of University	Frequency	Percentage (%)
LAUTECH	12	13.3
FUNAAB	12	13.3
OOU	6	6.7
BABCOCK	8	8.9
UI	14	15.6
LEAD CITY	6	6.7
OAU	18	20.0
BOWEN	8	8.9
UNIOSUN	6	6.7
Total	90	100.0
Type of University		
FEDERAL	45	50.0
STATE	25	27.8
PRIVATE	20	22.2
Total	90	100.0
Gender		
MALE	40	44.4
FEMALE	50	55.6
Total	90	100.0
Educational Qualification		
BLS/ BLIS	8	8.9
MLS/ MLIS	61	67.8
M.Inf.SCI.	8	8.9
PHD	6	6.7
OTHERS	7	7.8
Total	90	100.0
Rank/ Designation		
ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN	13	14.4
LIBRARIAN 1	32	35.6
LIBRARIAN 2	22	24.4
SENIOR LIBRARIAN	10	11.1
PRINCIPAL LIBRARIAN	9	10.0
DEP. UNI. LIBRARIAN	2	2.2
UNI. LIBRARIAN	1	1.1
OTHERS	1	1.1
Total	90	100.0
Work Experience		
LESS THAN 10YRS	41	45.6
11-20YRS	33	36.7
21-30YRS	15	16.7
31YRS AND ABOVE	1	1.1
Total	90	100.0
Section /Unit		
ACQUISITION/COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT	6	6.7
CATALOGUING	34	37.8
CIRCULATION	13	14.4
REFERENCES	10	11.1
SERIALS	11	12.2
VIRTUAL/ E-LIBRARY	16	17.8
Total	90	100.0
LESS THAN 20YRS	5	5.6
Age of the Respondents		
21-30YRS	7	7.8
31-40 YRS	25	27.8
41-50 YRS	41	45.6
51YRS AND ABOVE	12	13.3
Total	90	100.0

Source: Field survey data

It can be deduced from the demographic characteristics of the respondents that, a higher percentage 18(20%) of the respondents were from OAU that is a federal government-owned university while the lowest percentage (6.7%) of the respondents were from OOU and UNIOSUN that are state-owned universities respectively. Besides, the federal government-owned institutions had the highest number of respondents with (50%) while privately owned institutions had the least with (22.2%) respondents. Furthermore, female respondents were the majority (55.6%) of the respondents while male respondents constituted (44.4%). Moreover, the majority (67.8%) of the respondents were master's degree holders in Library Science while PhD qualification was the least with (6.7%) respondents. Besides that, (7.8%) of respondents had another degree like a Master in Business Administration (MBA) and some also pursuing their Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.).

Furthermore, less than half (35.6%) of the respondents were in the rank of librarian 1, followed by those in the rank of Librarian 2 who were (24.4%) respondents while only one respondent (1.1%) was in the rank of University Librarian and other position. Besides that, less than half (45.6%) of the respondents had working experience of less than 10 years while a respondent with working experience of 31 years and above was the least with only (1.1%) of respondents. However, less than half (37.8%) of the respondents were working in the cataloguing section while the acquisition/collection development section constituted the least (6.7%) respondents. Not only that, less than half (45.6%) of the respondents were between 41 and 50 years age range while only (5.6%) of the respondents were less than 20 years old.

Awareness of the Respondents about RDA Concepts and Vocabulary

Table 4: Awareness of RDA Concepts and Vocabulary

Awareness of RDA Concepts and Vocabulary	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
I have heard about the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (the JSC).	59 (65.5%)	9 (10.0%)	22 (24.5%)
.I have heard about Resource Description and Access (RDA)	72 (80.0%)	6 (6.7%)	12 (13.3%)
I have heard about Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)	60 (66.7%)	10 (11.1%)	20 (24.5%)
I have heard about Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD)	53 (58.9%)	17 (18.9%)	20 (22.2%)
I have heard about RDA online toolkit.	65 (72.2%)	8 (8.9%)	17(18.8%)

Source: Field survey data

The results of the findings about the awareness level of the respondents about RDA concepts and vocabulary in Table 4 revealed a good number (65.5%) of the respondents agreed that they have heard about the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA. Majority (80%) of the respondents agreed that they have heard about RDA. A good number (66.7%) of the respondents agreed that they have heard about Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) while higher percentage 53 (58.9%) of the respondents agreed that they have heard about Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD). So also, good number (72.2%) of the respondents agreed that they have heard about RDA online toolkit. From the results of the findings, it can be deduced that majority of the respondents were aware of RDA concepts and vocabulary. This corroborated the findings of Mansor (2014) and Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) that, Malaysian and Nigerian cataloguers were aware of RDA.

Besides that, since Cataloguers were expected to be aware of RDA because of the nature of their job, their results were also computed. Out of the 34 respondents

from cataloguing section, majority (74%) of the respondents agreed that they have heard about the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA. Also, majority (94.1%) of the respondents have heard about Resource Description and Access while higher percentage (68%) respondents have heard about Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). Not only that, higher percentage (68%) of the respondents have heard about Functional Requirements for Authority Data while majority (79%) of the respondents have heard about RDA online toolkit. Therefore, it can be deduced from the results of the analysis that majority of the Cataloguers were aware of RDA concepts and vocabulary. The finding is also in agreement with the interviews conducted that, majority of the respondents were aware of RDA. A university librarian in a state-owned university said:

“Yes, I have heard and read about it. RDA is Resource Description and Access and I discover that it is going to be a replacement to AACR2. The reason for its development is to capture

electronic materials that cannot be easily catalogued by AACR2”.

Another respondent, head of cataloguing unit in a private owned university said:

“Yes, I have heard about RDA. The reason for its development is the need for something that will serve as an improvement on the scheme that we have been using to describe our materials before. It is as a result of evolution in knowledge and skills development that has actually brought about RDA”.

Another respondent, head of cataloguing section in a federal government owned university said:

“Yes, I have heard about it at the conference I attended, we discussed about RDA. Actually, I may not say the full reasons for the development of RDA but according to what we were told; RDA will be helpful to users to access information resources and retrieve them easily. I cannot remember RDA concepts and vocabularies because I have not been practicing it.”

Familiarity of the Respondents with RDA Concepts, Rules and Vocabulary

Table 5: Familiarity with RDA Concepts, Rules and Vocabulary

Familiarity with RDA concepts, rules and vocabularies	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
I have visited the joint steering committee for the development of RDA (JSC) Website	27 (30%)	15 (16.7%)	48 (53.3%)
I have read scholarly articles on RDA	56 (62.2%)	9 (10.0%)	25 (27.8%)
I have read about Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) Model.	44 (48.9%)	12 (12.3%)	34 (37.8%)
I have subscribed to RDA free access online toolkit to familiarize myself with RDA	29 (32.3%)	13 (14.4%)	48 (53.4%)
I have attended workshops/conferences on RDA	30 (33.3%)	12 (13.3%)	48 (53.4%)
I have attended seminars on RDA	23 (25.6%)	12 (13.3%)	55 (61.1%)
I have attended other training on RDA	21 (23.4%)	10 (11.1%)	59 (65.5%)
I have been taught RDA in library school	26 (28.9%)	9 (10.0%)	55 (61.1%)
I have read books on RDA	41 (45.6%)	10 (11.1%)	39 (43.3%)
AACR2 is a standard scheme for document description and access of information resources	73 (81.1%)	6 (6.7%)	11 (12.3%)
RDA is released to replace AACR2 for document description and access of information resources	63 (70%)	21 (23.3%)	6 (6.6%)
RDA bibliographic records require the provision of access point for the creator of a work while all other access point for name are optional	54 (60.0%)	29 (32.2%)	7 (7.8%)
There is no more rule of abbreviations, including Latin abbreviations in RDA bibliographic records unless they appear on the work itself	43 (47.8%)	41 (45.6%)	6 (6.6%)
RDA has replaced general material designation (GMD) element in AACR2 with three new fields.	42 (46.6%)	37 (41.1%)	11 (12.3%)
In RDA bibliographic records, we transcribe the typographical errors and inadequacies as they appear and then add a note	46 (51.1%)	38 (42.2%)	6 (6.6%)
Every work is required to have a unique authorized access point in RDA bibliographic records	55 (61.1%)	30 (33.3%)	5 (5.5%)
RDA has more minimal requirements for bibliographic records than AACR2	48 (53.4%)	32 (35.6%)	10 (11.1%)
We are encouraged to supply a possible place of publication and date in RDA bibliographic records when we can with a question mark if necessary	44 (48.9%)	39 (43.3%)	7 (7.7%)

Source: Field survey data

On familiarity of the respondents with RDA concepts, rules and vocabulary; most (53.3%) of the respondents disagreed that they have visited the joint steering committee for the development of the RDA website. On the other hand, a higher percentage (62.2%) of the respondents agreed that they have read scholarly articles on RDA while less than half (48.9%) of the respondents agreed that they have read about the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records model. Besides that, a good number (53.4%) of the respondents disagreed that they have subscribed to the RDA free access online toolkit to familiarize themselves with RDA while a little above half (53.4%) of the respondents disagreed that they have attended workshops/conferences on RDA. Similarly, the majority (61.1%) of the respondents disagreed that they have attended seminars on RDA while a higher percentage (65.5%) of the respondents disagreed that they have attended other training on RDA. Besides that, a higher percentage (61.1%) of the respondents disagreed that they have been taught RDA in library school while less than half (45.6%) of the respondents agreed that they have read books on RDA.

Furthermore, the majority (81.1%) of the respondents agreed that AACR2 is a standard scheme for document description and access to information resources while the majority (70%) of the respondents agreed that RDA was released to replace AACR2 for document description and access of information resources. Besides that, a higher percentage (60%) of the respondents agreed that RDA bibliographic records require the provision of an access point for the creator of a work while all other access points for names are optional. Also, less than half (47.6%) of the respondents agreed that there is no more rule of abbreviations, including Latin abbreviations in RDA bibliographic records unless they appear on the work itself. Less than half (46.6%) of the respondents agreed that RDA has replaced the general material designation (GMD) element in AACR2 with three new fields while more than half (51.1%) of the respondents also agreed that in RDA bibliographic records, we transcribe the typographical errors and inadequacies as they appear and then add a note. On the other hand, a higher percentage (61.1%) of the respondents agreed that every work is required to have a unique authorized access point in RDA bibliographic records. More than half (53.4%) of the respondents agreed that RDA has more minimal requirements for bibliographic records than AACR2 while less than half (48.9%) of the respondents agreed that we are encouraged to supply a possible place of publication and date in RDA bibliographic records when we can with a question mark if necessary.

The findings from Table 5 above revealed that the majority of the respondents were not familiar with RDA concepts and vocabulary even though the majority of them were aware of RDA concepts and vocabulary. They

were only familiar with some RDA rules. This also corroborated the findings of Mansor (2014) who concluded that, though Malaysian cataloguers were aware of RDA, they were only familiar with the basics of RDA and its related topics. They were mainly aware of topics regarding the overview and development of RDA and indicated a low understanding of other topics, such as Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), related to RDA.

Besides that, since cataloguers were also expected to be familiar with RDA because of the nature of their jobs, their results were also computed. Out of the 34 respondents from the cataloguing section, not many (41%) of the respondents agreed that they have visited the joint steering committee for the development of RDA (JSC) Website, majority (71%) agreed that they have read scholarly articles on RDA while a good number (52%) agreed that they have read about Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) model. On the hand, not many (26%) of the respondents agreed that they have subscribed to RDA free access online toolkit to familiarize themselves with RDA, only (35%) and (23%) respondents have attended workshops/conferences and seminar on RDA respectively. Not only that, not many (15%), (21%) and (44%) respondents have attended other training, taught RDA in library schools and read books on RDA respectively. Moreover, most (76%) of the respondents agreed that AACR2 is a standard scheme for document description and access and a good number (67%) agreed that RDA is released to replace AACR2 for document description and access while (65%) agreed that RDA bibliographic records require the provision of access point for the creator of a work while all other access point for name are optional. Furthermore, less than half (47%) of respondents agreed that there is no more rule of abbreviations, including Latin abbreviations in RDA bibliographic records unless they appear on the work itself and (47%) agreed that RDA has replaced general material designation (GMD) element in AACR2 with three new fields while more than half (52%) respondents agreed that we transcribe the typographical errors and inadequacies as they appear in RDA bibliographic records and then add a note. Besides that, a higher percentage (65%) of the respondents agreed that every work is required to have a unique authorized access point in RDA bibliographic records and more than half (56%) agreed that RDA has more minimal requirements for bibliographic records than AACR2 while (59%) respondents agreed that we are encouraged to supply a possible place of publication and date in RDA bibliographic records when we can with a question mark if necessary.

Therefore, from the findings above, it can be deduced that the majority of the cataloguers were not familiar with RDA even though they were quite aware of major RDA concepts and vocabulary. This is not unconnected with

their inability to attend workshops, conferences, seminars and other training on RDA. Many of them have not even subscribed to the RDA online toolkit. This is also corroborated by the finding of Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) that the cataloguers lacked the technical nitty-gritty of RDA while it also confirmed that many librarians in Nigeria did not have any formal training in RDA. The results of the interviews conducted also supported the findings of the study. A university librarian in a privately owned university said:

“You know, people don’t easily accept change but it is a good thing. With time, we should be able to cope with RDA as with AACR2”.

Another respondent, head of the cataloguing section in a state government-owned university also said:

“Although I have attended a workshop where RDA was introduced to us I have not sat down to study it. It is when it is being put into use that I can say whether it is better or not.”

Another respondent, head of the cataloguing section in a federal government-owned university said:

“I think RDA should be something that is user-friendly and should not be too difficult to understand. I think it will be a comprehensive scheme that will take both print and non-print into consideration especially online materials.”

Another respondent, the head of the cataloguing section in a state-owned university has this to say:

“Change is what is constant in life, there is nothing wrong in change but then, people should be adequately taught to put it into use.”

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that the majority of academic librarians including the cataloguers were aware of Resource Description and Access but some were not familiar with some RDA concepts and vocabulary. They were familiar with some of the RDA rules. Therefore, the findings revealed that the level of knowledge of academic librarians about RDA was low. This is a result of the fact that the majority of them were only aware of RDA concepts and vocabulary but not familiar with RDA concepts, rules and vocabulary. This implied that they were only familiar with the basics of RDA.

Recommendations

To improve and broaden the knowledge of RDA among academic librarians in South-western Nigeria Universities, it is therefore recommended that:

Academic librarians, most especially the cataloguers; should endeavour to visit the Joint Steering

Committee for the development of RDA (JSC) website for update on RDA.

They should also subscribe to RDA online toolkit without further delay since it is free in order to familiarize themselves with RDA concepts, rules and vocabulary.

Library schools in South-western state universities should incorporate RDA into their curriculum so that students will learn about RDA before their graduation.

The umbrella bodies of information professionals in Nigeria such as the Nigeria Library Association, the Society for Information Science and Technology of Nigeria and the Librarians Registration Council of Nigeria should without further delay embark on workshops, conferences, seminars and other trainings programmes for library professionals to have broad knowledge of RDA.

REFERENCES

- Acedera, A. P. (2014). Are Philippine librarians ready for Resource Description and Access (RDA)? The Mindanao experience. *Cataloguing and Classification Quarterly*, 52 (6-7): 600-607. Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01639374.2014.891164>
- Ahonsi, A. (2014). Resource Description and Access (RDA) handbook for facilitating the understanding of RDA rules by librarians and cataloguers in English speaking countries in sub-Saharan Africa. (Certificate of advanced study thesis), Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois, USA. Available at: https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/50025/A.Ahonsi_CAS_Project.pdf?sequence=2
- Aina, L. O. (2003). *Library and Information Science Text for Africa*. Ibadan: Third world information services.
- Arinola, A. A., Adigun, G. O., Oladeji, B. O. & Adekunjo, O. A. (2012). Impact of ICT on cataloguing and classification of library materials: case study of some selected university libraries in South-western Nigeria. *America International Journal of Contemporary Research* 2 (6): 122-127. Available at: http://www.ajcrnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_6_June_2012/15.pdf
- Atilgan, D., Ozel, N. & Cakmak, T. (2015). RDA in Turkey: perceptions and expectations on implementation. *Italia Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*. 6 (2): 179. Available at: <http://www.ilis.it/article/view/10953/10434>
- Ceaser, I. & Eichel, D. (2009). Challenges for the implementation of RDA: case study of Germany. *Bobcatss*. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/28810053>

- Dunsire, G. (2007). RDA and library system. Available at: [http://www.caval.edu.au/assets/files/Research and Advocacy/Current and imerging trend in cataloguing by Helen Gourkova 2007.pdf](http://www.caval.edu.au/assets/files/Research_and_Advocacy/Current_and_imerging_trend_in_cataloguing_by_Helen_Gourkova_2007.pdf)
- Guorkova, H. (2007). Current and emerging trends in cataloguing. Available at: [https://www.caval.edu.au/assets/files/Research and Advocacy/Current and emerging trends i n cataloguing by Helen Gourkova 2007.pdf](https://www.caval.edu.au/assets/files/Research_and_Advocacy/Current_and_emerging_trends_i_n_cataloguing_by_Helen_Gourkova_2007.pdf)
- Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA, (2015). Resource Description and Access. Available at: <http://www.rda-jsc.org/rda.html>
- Lambert, F. & Gracy, K. F. (2014). Who's ready to surf the next wave? A study of perceived challenges to implementing new and revised standards for archival description. *American Archivist* 77 (1): 96-132. Available at: <http://americanarchivist.org/doi/pdf/10.17723/aarc.77.1.b241071w5r252612>
- Mansor, Y. (2014). RDA perception among Malaysian cataloguers. *Library Review*, 63 (3): 176-188. Available at: <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/LR-06-2013-0085>
- Martin, K.E. (2007). ATG special report on cataloguing e-book: an overview of issues and challenges. *Against the Grain*, 19 (1): 43-47. Available at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5233&context=atg>
- Microsoft Encarta Dictionary, (2009). Redmond WA: Microsoft Corporation
- National Universities Commission, (2015). Accredited Universities in Nigeria. Available at: www.nuc.edu.ng
- Oguntayo, S. & Adeleke A. A. (2016). Awareness, knowledge and implementation of RDA in academic libraries in Nigeria. A paper presented at the 36 annual workshop of NLA/cataloguing, classification & indexing section held at University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria between October 24 and 28, 2016. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/search.Search.html?type=publication&query=Awareness.%20knowledge%20and%20implementation%20of%20RDA%20in%20academic%20libraries%20in%2pl;.0Nigeria> Accessed on February 13, 2018
- Oliver, (2010). *Introducing RDA: A guide to the basics*. ALA edition, Chicago: America Library Association. Available at: <http://www.npc.edu/sites/files/shared/library/Introducing%20RDA.pdf>
- Pazooki, F.; Zeinolabedini, M.H. & Arastoopoor, S. (2014). Acceptance and viewpoint of Iranians regarding RDA: the case of National Library and Archives of Iran. *Cataloguing and Classifications Quarterly*, 0:1-20. 20 Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01639374.2014.900840>
- Quintana, I. (2013). Differences in bibliographic records created in RDA and in AACR2. Available at: <https://anssacr.wordpress.com/publication/cataloguing-qa/rda-bib-records2013-march>
- Sanchez, E.R (2010). RDA, AACR2 and you: what cataloguers are thinking. Available at: <https://digital.library.txstate.edu/bitstream/handle/10877/2625/fulltext.pdf?sequence=1>
- Stephens, J. (2010). From AACR2 to RDA - National library of Australia. Available at: http://www.nla.gov.au/sites/default/files/from_aacr_2_to_rda_history.pptx
- Tiamiyu, M. (2003). *Organisation of data in information system (A systhesis for the information Profession)*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers.

Cite this Article: Olatunji, ET; Salami, KO; Arinola, AA; Kolajo, SF (2025). An Assessment of Academic Librarians' Knowledge about Resource Description and Access (RDA) in Selected States in South-western Nigeria. *Greener Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(1): 271-281, <https://doi.org/10.15580/gjss.2025.1.090425135>.