PREPAREDNESS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIES IN NIGERIA FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOURCE DESCRIPTION AND ACCESS (RDA)

Rita Chinelo John-Okeke (Ph.D)
(Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies)
Email: rita.johnokeke@gmail.com

Abstract
Resource Description and Access is a content standard that was recently developed by the library community to harness the advantages of the semantic web by supporting the creation of robust cataloguing data capable of integrating with other information repositories. Many countries from the developed world have deployed this code in their cataloguing process. Some countries in Africa have also started using RDA. This study investigated the preparedness of academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria for the implementation of RDA. Descriptive survey research method was employed and data was collected through questionnaire from twenty-one cataloguers in eleven academic libraries. Data collected was analysed using simple percentage. Result from the analysis show that academic libraries from Southeast Nigeria are not yet prepared to implement the RDA rules. Technological infrastructure is inadequate in these libraries whereas training for RDA implementation is almost non-existent. The study recommends that library schools should update their curriculum to include training in the use of RDA rules while the National Library of Nigeria and the Nigerian Library Association should play a lead role in the implementation of RDA.

Keywords: RDA, Academic Libraries, Cataloguers, Digital Natives, Digital Migrants, Southeast Nigeria.

Introduction

Advances in Information and Communication Technology brought about a globalised way of doing business. Cataloguers who have been in the business of creating access points for retrieving and using information in different types of libraries across the globe use tools like AACR which was compatible with the print world. The information environment then was basically composed of print resources, and the cataloguing rules were designed around creating catalogue cards (Blythe, Gunther and Spurgin cited in Ahonsi, 2014). Presently, information is packed and disseminated over a large network of interconnected computer network across the globe. A lot of information resources are in electronic format such as web pages, online databases and programmes. Moreover, information users are now digital natives and digital migrants. This has necessitated the imperative for the creation of new tools that will enhance global access to information.

The idea of a new cataloguing rule started around mid-1990. The Joint Steering Committee (JSC) for the development of AACR2 hosted the International Conference on the "Principles and Future Development of AACR" in Toronto, Canada in 1997. The recommendations made at the conference led to some amendment in the AACR2. However in 2002, it was discovered that there was serious need for an extensive reorganisation of at least Part 1of the AACR2. In 2004, the JSC and its governing body, (the Committee of Principles) decided to produce the third edition of AACR called AACR3. They started with an extensive reorganisation of Part 1 to give emphasis to content with regard to format as the rule had to be compatible with the concept and terminology used in Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), a new model developed by IFLA in the 1990s. It was discovered that the structure of AACR did not allow for changes that could fully address the challenges posed by digital resources. The decision to abandon AACR3 for a new code that has same principle with FRBR was reached in 2005. The new code is Resource Description and Access (RDA).

RDA Toolkit is an online web accessible instruction which was launched in 2010 based on FRBR and FRBD conceptual model. It is a content standard with set of instruction for describing information resources both in print and digital format. While it replaced AACR2, it is not just a set of updated instructions but a new way of thinking about cataloguing data (Oliver, 2011). Describing information resources with RDA instruction creates robust access points which enable information users to select and obtain enough information. It also allows for visibility of institutions through share-ability of information. The main idea of RDA is to provide a set of guideline and instructions for formulating data to support resource discovery unlike AACR which provide rules for use in the construction of library catalogues (Miksa, 2009; Oliver, 2011). RDA provides a comprehensive set of general instruction and guideline that are logically defined, easier to use, and more adaptable in describing all types of resources designed for the digital and non-digital environment while simplifying cataloguing rules and minimizing special rules for describing specific types of materials (Tosaka and Park, 2013). Moreover, RDA is more international and beyond Anglo-American; data created by RDA is visible on the web and is compatible with metadata standards of other resource description communities beyond the library "silos" (Oliver, 2011). Thus, library data created by cataloguing and metadata professionals now have the potential for interconnecting with related data distributed across the web, thereby improving resource discovery for information seekers beyond the traditional silos of library catalogues (Tosaka and Park, 2013). This means that RDA is breaking down the barrier that hitherto existed between library catalogues and other information repositories thus opening up the way for library catalogues to become integrated with the semantic web (Beilharz, 2013).

RDA was launched as an online Toolkit, an integrated browser-based online product that allows users to interact with a collection of cataloguing-related documents and resources. The Toolkit includes RDA, AACR2 (to help a user know where to begin), Library of Congress Policy Statements (LCPS), Workflows and other procedural documentation that is created by subscribers and can be shared within an organisation or with the entire community of subscribers and Mappings of RDA to various schemas, including MARC21 (Carlton, 2012). RDA Toolkit can be accessed from http://www.rdatoolkit.org/and can be encoded using different encoding schema such as MARC21, MODS, and Dublin Core and can be displayed using different display conventions such as ISBD, label display and so on.

The preparation for the implementation of RDA started long before it was launched in 2010. In 2007, the national libraries of Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States published an announcement that they would work together to coordinate the implementation of RDA. The implementation of RDA was made after the US national libraries- the Library of Congress (LC), the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and National Agricultural Library (NAL) tested RDA to ensure the operational, technical and economic feasibility (Oliver, 2010). Presently, many countries implemented RDA and have started converting their cataloguing records from AACR2 to RDA standards. For instance, the Library of Congress has successfully completed the conversion of its records from AACR2 to RDA formats in 2013. Other libraries like the National Library of South Africa is also using RDA (Ahonsi, 2014).

Statement of Problem

Resource Description and Access is a standard for descriptive cataloguing which in the recent time intends to replace the Anglo American Cataloguing Rules because of its obvious advantages. Many libraries across the globe have started using it. Available studies reveal that no library in Nigeria has started using the RDA. However, a more recent study by Ifijeh, Segun-Adeniran and Igbinola (2018) reported poor implementation of RDA in Nigeria. This study is focused on the use of RDA in academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria. The reason for choosing academic libraries being that they have more professional librarians who can easily adapt to

change. Secondly, academic libraries are more likely to source for funds to acquire needed infrastructure and to train their staff for RDA implementation. Southeast Nigeria is made up of five states namely Anambra, Abia, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo with robust academic activities.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study therefore was to investigate the preparedness of Southeast Nigerian academic libraries for the implementation of RDA. Specifically, the study sought to find out:

1. the level of awareness of RDA in academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria,
2. adequacy of technological infrastructure for RDA implementation in these libraries,
3. the level of professional preparedness for RDA implementation in academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria,
4. challenges that may arise during the implementation of RDA in academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of awareness of RDA in the academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria?
2. What is the adequacy of technological infrastructure for RDA implementation in these libraries?
3. What is the level of professional preparedness for RDA implementation in academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria?
4. What challenges could arise during RDA implementation in academic libraries in Southeast Nigeria?

Literature Review

The imperative for the implementation of RDA is obvious. The AACR2 which has been in use in libraries for over thirty years show serious compatibility problem when applied in the digital environment. Many business ventures have taken the advantage of the semantic web and are extending their services to the global community. Libraries are not left out; the implementation of RDA rules in resource description processes provide efficient and interactive presentation of bibliographic records by highlighting links and relationships with other information resources (Cakmak, 2018). This is made possible because of the flexibility of RDA data which can be stored and used in databases of bibliographic and authority records and can also be used in the current web and in the newly emerging semantic web. Thus, bibliographic records are no longer confined to the library catalogue but are widely visible and usable everywhere. Another remarkable advantage of RDA is its primary focus on the user based on FRBR and FRAD models. The previous standards were more concerned with the document and the presentation of library data but RDA rules were designed to enable the user find, identify, select and obtain bibliographic data in line with FRBR entity relationship and to also find, identify, clarify and understand authority data based on FRAD. RDA principles underscore the tenets of libraries and the library profession.

RDA is being implemented in libraries since it was launched in 2010. The Library of Congress has fully implemented RDA in 2013. Cakmak (2018) detected ten libraries in Turkey that are using RDA rules for their information description. Ahonsi (2014) reported that National Library of South Africa has also implemented RDA in their cataloguing processes. One thing that is remarkable about libraries that have implemented RDA is that there were concerted efforts and a well-coordinated preparation toward the implementation. RDA Toolkit consists of databases and software; is also a browser based instruction; as such a lot of familiarization activities are needed to acquaint cataloguers with changes both in platform and terminology. Those libraries that have successfully implemented RDA started preparing for the implementation from when the first draft of RDA was produced in 2008.The preparation was mainly to train cataloguers and other professionals who are interested in implementing RDA.

The implementation of RDA in libraries requires a set of planning and strategic decision making phases including infrastructure improvements and staff training (Cakmak, 2018). This is usually and better carried out by authority institutions like national libraries which pioneer the implementation of RDA rules in their collections. A good point of reference is the Library of Congress which released a training plan for its 400 cataloguing staff. The training plan consists of no less than 35 hours of classroom instructions limited to 20 trainees each and delivered over 4 weeks (Tasaka and Park, 2013). Another national effort toward RDA implementation is the activities of Turkey National Library which organised meetings for scholars, cataloguing librarians and decision makers. Decisions were made related to terminological studies, creation of national authority files, infrastructure developments and training activities. Several awareness raising activities (seminars, training and conferences) were carried out with the collaboration of Ankara University, Hacettepe University and Turkish LIS associations between 2012 and 2014 (Cakmak, 2018). In South Africa, the Bibliographic Services Programme at the National Library of South Africa was tasked to form a professional committee to inform the South African cataloguing community about RDA after the publication of the full draft of RDA in 2008. Subsequently in July 2009, RDA lecture series was hosted by the National Library of South Africa in Pretoria.

The activities of the Nigerian Library Association/Cataloguing, Classification and Indexing Section is noteworthy. It was in its national workshop/seminar in 2010 that RDA was first mentioned to Nigerian cataloguers. The second attempt made by the association was more strategic but failed because of lack of funds to pay ITOCA the sum of $21,900 charged for the training (Oguntayo and Adeleke, 2016). Apart from these efforts made by the Cataloguing, Classification and Indexing Section, no other initiative or programme has been organised on the issue of RDA implementation in Nigeria. Most academic libraries, if not all are still using AACR2 despite that most of them copy their catalogue records largely from the Library of Congress Online Catalogue. This is because the National Library of Nigeria (NLN) has not yet provided the leading role as the apex library in Nigeria. Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) noted that the NLN has not made any move towards institutionalizing the replacement of AACR2 records with RDA records either through copy cataloguing or original cataloguing. The implication of the inactivity of NLN is that majority of Nigerian cataloguers are not aware of the global changes in cataloguing rules.

Lack of coordinated efforts by the authority institution in Nigeria has left Nigeria behind the scene of RDA implementation. Both Ahonsi (2014) and Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) studies on the implementation of RDA revealed non-implementation of RDA in Nigerian academic libraries. Oliver (2010) made a remark on the issue of coordinated activities for the implementation of RDA saying that RDA was developed through international initiatives, so its implementation is also a collective activity that cut cross national boundaries. Implementation is made easier through the coordination of decisions and the sharing of training documentation at the national library level. This enables libraries to update their authority files, create interactive platforms that allow the use of open data resources, and assess their existing infrastructure facilities to improve them for meeting technical requirements of RDA (Cakmak, 2018). Lack of subject authority headings and name authority specific to Turkey caused problems in the application of principles, rules and standards (Atilgan, Ozel and Cakmak, 2014). This is likely to happen in Nigeria since the National Library of Nigeria has not produced the National Union Catalogue let alone name authority files. However, Nigerian university libraries have made some effort towards making their OPACs visible on the web. For instance, Covenant University Library, University of Nigeria, University of Jos and others have searchable Web-OPACs (WebPAC).

Cakmak (2018) articulated some steps that libraries who implemented RDA took to include: updating existing infrastructure; improving human resources with in-service training and other awareness raising activities; developing policies to manage transition processes effectively; and implementing RDA rules in all their collections. Also, Atilgan, Ozel and Cakmak (2014) gave some fundamental components for RDA implementation such as educational needs, individual and institutional requirements, sufficiency of integrated library systems and cataloguing environments. On the issue of awareness creation on RDA implementation, not much has been done in Nigeria. In countries that have implemented RDA both the university libraries and Library and Information Science departments were actively involved in creating awareness. Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) study found a non-inclusion of RDA topic in the curricula of some library schools in Nigeria. Similarly, Nwosu, Eyisi and Ekene (2013) observed the absence of some important courses in the curricula of library schools in the Southeast and proposed the inclusion of MARC21 and RDA in their curricula. Moreover, Orbh and Aina (2014) discussed issues, benefits and challenges of original cataloguing versus copy cataloguing among Nigerian cataloguers and no mention was made about RDA instead AACR2 was mentioned as the standard rule for cataloguing.

Education and training are the most important aspects of RDA implementation. Tosaka and Park (2013) rightly observed that training issues are the single most paramount concern for working cataloguers as they begin preparing for implementation of RDA. Most of the studies carried out on the implementation of RDA reveal great need for education and training. Atilgan, Ozel and Cakmak (2014) report on the survey conducted by RDA Turkey Working Group, URLA, and the faculty members in the Departments of Library and Information Science in June, 2012 revealed the need for education and training activities for all topics on RDA. Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) reported that the only source of awareness available for Nigerian cataloguers are attendance at workshop/conferences and that overseas training are almost non-existent. This method of training for RDA is insufficient to impart the kind of knowledge needed for RDA implementation.

Infrastructural issues have been identified as major hindrance in the implementation of RDA. Cakmak (2018) found out that automation systems which do not comply with international standards create difficulties for RDA transition. According to the study, the most preferred ILS in use in Turkish libraries that have implemented RDA are Sirsi Dynx and Millennium with only one library using Koha automation system. Idiegbeyan-ose, Ifijeh, Adebayo and Segun-Adeniran (2016) lamented that only few libraries in Nigeria are fully automated with functional OPAC/WEBPAC. Also, Okongwu and Achebe (2018) identified cost of acquiring equipment and network infrastructures, cost of subscription and staff training as the most challenging factor in the acquisition of electronic resources by libraries in Southeast Nigeria. The cost of acquiring RDA Toolkit for one user stands at 191 dollars. Converting 191 dollars to naira amounts to about N69,142.00 naira (annual subscription). High cost of acquiring RDA Toolkit was found as a constraint towards the implementation of RDA in most academic libraries in Nigeria (Oguntayo and Adeleke, 2016). The study recommended that academic libraries could pool their resources together in a consortium arrangement to acquire the online RDA Toolkit and then share among themselves.

Methodology

A descriptive survey design was chosen for this study and the instrument used for collecting data was questionnaire. All the academic institutions in the Southeast were chosen for the study. Online questionnaire was distributed through e-mail to all cataloguers working with academic institutions in Southeast, Nigeria. A total number of twenty-one (21) cataloguers from eleven (11) academic institutions responded to the questionnaire and the data collected from them was

used for the analysis. The list of academic institutions that participated in the study was tabulated below:

Table 1

Library	**State**	**Academic Status**
A.	Anambra	
1. Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka (NAU) 2. Chukwu Emeka Odimagwu Ojukwu University, Igbaria (COOU) 3. Alex Ekwueme Federal Polytechnic, Oko 4. Nwafor Orizu Coll. of Education, Nsugbe 5. Federal College of Education (Technical)), Umunze		Federal university State university Federal polytechnic State college of education Federal college of education
B.	Abia	
6. Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike (MOUAU)		Federal university
C.	Ebonyi	
7. Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu- Aliko (AEFUNAI)		Federal university
D.	Enugu	
8. University of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN) 9. Enugu State University (ESUT) of Science and Technology 10. Institute of Management and Technology (IMT)		Federal university State university State polytechnic
E.	Imo	Federal university
11. Federal University of Technology (FUTO) Owerri		Federal university

Level of Awareness of RDA in the Academic Institutions in Southeast Nigeria

Table 2

	Items	**Yes**	**No**
1	Have you heard about RDA?	19 (90.5%)	2 (9.5%)
2	Does your library use RDA?	0 (0%)	21 (100)
3	Have you seen RDA records?	5 (23.8%)	16 (76.2%)
4	Is your library planning to implement RDA?	10 (47.6%)	11 (52.4%)

Items in Table 2 shows that majority of the cataloguers, 19 (90.5%) have heard about RDA. However, none of the eleven libraries where the cataloguers work use RDA in their cataloguing processes. On whether the cataloguers have seen RDA records, the data shows that 16(76.2%) have not seen RDA records. 11(52.4%) of the cataloguers also indicated that their libraries are not planning to implement RDA while 10(47.6%) indicated that their libraries are planning to implement RDA.

Adequacy and Use of Technological Infrastructure for RDA Implementation

Table 3

SN	Items	Very Stable	Stable Sometimes	Not Stable	
1	Power Supply	1	12	8	
		No Internet	**Stable Internet**	**Unstable Internet**	
2	Internet Connectivity	4	-	17	
		Most times	**Sometimes**	**No**	
	Work dependability on Internet usage	8	6	7	
		Regularly	**Occasionally**	**Never**	
	Frequency of use	9	10	2	
		Office only	**Home only**	**Both**	**Don't use computer**
3	Availability and use of computers	4	1	15	1
		Regularly	**Occasionally**	**Not at all**	
	Frequency of use	13	**7**	**1**	

The cataloguers were asked to show the state of power supply in their libraries and 12 of them revealed that power supply is stable sometimes; 8 indicated that power supply is not stable while only 1 indicated that the power supply is stable. On Internet connectivity, 17 cataloguers revealed unstable Internet while 1 cataloguer indicated no Internet. 8 cataloguers indicated that their work depend on Internet usage most times, 6 revealed that their work depend on Internet usage sometimes while 7 indicated that their work does not depend on Internet usage. On the frequency of use of the Internet, the result shows that 9 cataloguers use the Internet regularly, 10 use it occasionally while 2 never used the Internet. The respondents were also asked to show availability and use of computers. The data show that 15 use computers both in the office and at home, while 4 use it only in the office. Only 1 cataloguer uses computer at home whereas 1 does not use computer at all. Further analysis revealed that 13 cataloguers use computers regularly, 7 use it occasionally while 1 does not use it at all.

Availability and Use of Integrated Library Systems (ILS)

Table 4

SN	Institutions	ILS
1	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka (NAU)	Koha
2	Chukwuemeka Odimegwu Ojukwu University, Igboariam (COOU)	-
3	Alex Ekwueme Federal Polytechnic, Oko	-
4	Nwafor Orizu College of Education, Nsugbe	-
5	Federal College of Education (Technical), Umunze	Koha
6	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike (MOUAU)	-
7	Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu- Alike, Ebonyi State (AEFUNAI)	ADLIB
8	University of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN)	Koha
9	Enugu State University (ESUT)	VTLS
10	Institute of Management and Technology (IMT)	-
11	Federal University of Technology (FUTO), Owerri	-

The table above shows the availability and use of Integrated Library Systems in the eleven academic institutions surveyed. Koha is used by NAU, Federal College of Education (Technical), Umunze and UNN; AEFUNAI uses ADLIB while ESUT uses VTLS. COOU, MOUAU, IMT, FUTO, Alex Ekwueme Federal Polytechnic, Oko and Nwafor Orizu College of Education, Nsugbe do not have ILS.

Level of professional preparedness for RDA implementation

Qualifications of the librarians
Table 5

SN	Highest Degree	Percentage
1	PhD	2 (9.5)
2	MLIS	16(76.2)
3	BLIS	2(9.5)
4	OND	1(4.8)

The table above shows that majority of the cataloguers (16, 76.2) have MLIS, 2 have PhD and BLIS respectively while 1 has OND.

Experience in Cataloguing
Table 6

SN	Years of Experience	Percentage
1	1-5	9(42.9)
2	6-15	5(23.8)
3	16 and above	6(28.6)
4	None	1(4.8)

The cataloguers were asked to indicate their cataloguing experience. The table above shows that majority of the cataloguers fall within the range of 1-5 years, 6 have 16 years and above experience, 5 have 6-15 years while 1 cataloguer do not have any experience.

Training on RDA
Table 7

SN	Training Types	Frequency (%)
1	Cataloguing and Classification Section, NLA workshops\conferences	5(23.8)
2	In-house training on RDA	-
3	Overseas training on RDA	-
4	Colleagues	2(9.5)
5	Library school	3(14.3)
6	Online tutorial	1(4.8)
9	None	10 (47.7)

The table above shows the different training methods available for RDA. The cataloguers were asked to indicate the form of training they have received on RDA. The data revealed that majority of the cataloguers 10 (47.7%) have not received any training on RDA, 5(23.8%) have received training on RDA through attending Cataloguing and Classification Section, NLA

workshops\conferences, 3(14.3%) were trained in the library schools, 2(9.5%) received training from colleagues while 1 received online Tutorial on RDA.

Challenges that might arise in the implementation of RDA
Table 8

SN	Challenges	Frequency
1	Unstable power supply	14
2	Lack of funds to purchase RDA Toolkit/ printed format	14
3	Poor Internet bandwidth	18
4	Lack of training on the use of RDA Toolkit	17
5	Lack of ICT skills	11
6	Converting AACR2 records to RDA	16
7	Shortage of professional staff	12
8	Inadequate functional computer systems	15
9	Still operating manual card catalogue	14
10	Have not implemented ILS	10

The respondents were asked to indicate challenges that might arise during RDA implementation in their libraries. The result in table 8 shows that the ten items listed were challenges that will likely hinder the implementation of RDA in the eleven libraries under survey. Poor Internet bandwidth received the highest rating in the implementation of RDA. While non-implementation of ILS was the least that may hinder RDA implementation as indicated by the cataloguers.

Discussion

Awareness of RDA is a necessary prerequisite for RDA rules implementation. Table 1 of this study has shown that 90.5% of the cataloguers have heard about RDA. However, implementation and use of RDA is still non-existent. The implication of this is that the level of awareness of RDA is still at the periphery and knowledge of RDA is lacking among librarians in Nigeria. Similar to lack of in-depth knowledge of RDA was also found among Malaysian cataloguers (Mansor and Ramdzan, 2014). In many countries where RDA has been successfully implemented, several awareness strategies were employed that led to implementation of RDA rules. Such awareness programmes are lacking in Nigeria. This is evident from the number of cataloguers 10(47.7%) that have not received any training on RDA. However, lack of training for RDA implementation is not common with the Nigerian situation; Cakmak (2018) reported that some libraries in Turkey implemented RDA rules without any training activities. This study found that three (3) cataloguers received training on RDA from the library school. A discussion with a lecturer from the Department of Library and Information Science, Federal Polytechnic, Oko, Anambra State in the course of the study revealed that the Department has included RDA in their curriculum. It is expected that all library schools should as a matter of urgency include the teaching of RDA in their curricula. This will increase awareness and knowledge of RDA which will advertently push forward its implementation.

Provision of technological infrastructure for RDA implementation was found as a source of strength in Turkish libraries Cakmak, (2018). This is not the case with Southeast Nigeria academic libraries as all the technological infrastructures were found inadequate, from power supply to Internet connectivity. RDA toolkit is online cataloguing rules, so with unstable power supply and Internet connectivity, it will be impossible to implement RDA rules. The issue of non-automated system is a critical concern for Nigeria RDA implementation. Out of the eleven (11) academic libraries surveyed, six (6) do not have ILS. This means that the level of

automation is very low and that they are still operating manual systems. This finding corroborates Atilgan, Ozel and Cakmak (2014) study which found technological infrastructure for RDA implementation among Turkish libraries to be poor.

The level of professional preparedness of the cataloguers proves to be very high as 2, (9.5%) of the cataloguers possess Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degrees in Library and Information Science while 16 (76.2%) cataloguers possess Masters in Library and Information Science degrees (MLIS). This is a great improvement from Ahonsi (2014) study which found 10% of cataloguers possessing MLIS in Benue State and 25% in Kaduna State. Their cataloguing experience was also rated high as 11 of the cataloguers have above 6 years of cataloguing experience. In terms of computer skills acquisition, the cataloguers use computer occasionally and frequently while only one cataloguer indicated non-use of the computer. From the analysis, one can conveniently conclude that the non-implementation of RDA rules in the Southeast academic libraries is basically national and institutional issue and not much of professional problem.

Conclusion

Implementation of RDA in Nigeria will no doubt bring visibility to the libraries and their collections and will enable the libraries to share their resources and provide more robust information resources based on the entity relationships and linked data model. Countries who have implemented RDA rules are already benefiting from the numerous benefits RDA brings. However, Nigerian libraries are not yet prepared to implement RDA rules. The issues around electricity supply in Nigeria is perennial and seem to defy every plan made in the past. Libraries must seek for alternative power supply to enable them benefit from RDA. Besides poor power supply is the issue of automation. Semantic web (Web 3.0) deals with digital data, so any library that is not automated cannot fully benefit from RDA. The libraries that are not automated should implement ILS. They can employ open source ILS such as Koha which is widely used among Nigerian university libraries. Another area where preparation is needed is in the training of librarians for the implementation of RDA. Studies have shown that poor sponsorship to conferences and workshops, overseas training and even local training are the bane of continuous professional development. The library schools should include the teaching of RDA in their organisation of knowledge courses both at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. This will create awareness and knowledge needed to implement RDA. More researches on RDA issues including conceptual and empirical studies in Nigeria are needed to improve knowledge of RDA and its implementation. The inactivity of the National Library of Nigeria towards producing the National Union Catalogue and the Authority Records is a minus to the implementation of RDA. In this regard, the National Library of Nigeria and the Nigerian Library Association should be more focused to implement RDA rules in Nigeria.

References

Ahonsi, A. (2014). Resource Description and Access (RDA): handbook for facilitating the English Speaking countries in sub-Saharan Africa. A Theses submitted to the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Anunobi, C. V. & Nwakwuo, O.B. (2008). The state of ICT in universities libraries in South Eastern Nigeria. *Samaru Journal of Information Studies* 8(1):35-43

Atilgan, D., Ozel, N. & Cakmak, T. (2014). Awareness, perceptions and expectations of academic libraries in Turkey about Resource. *Description and Access. Cataloguing & Classification Quarterly* 52:6-7

Beilharz, R. (2013). Cataloguing is riding the waves of change. ALIA National Library and Information Technician Symposium. Retrieved from: https://.alialibtech2013.wordpress.com

Cakmak, T. (2018). RDA transition in Turkey: perspectives and experiences of the libraries. *JLIS.it* 9(1):31-43

Carlton, T. & Zoom, J. (2012). Library of Congress training for RDA: Resource Description & Access. Cooperative and Institutional Programs Division, Library of Congress RDA Training. Retrieved from: https://www.loc>LC

Idiegbeyan-Ose, J., Ifijeh, J., Adebayo, O. & Segun-Adeniran, C. (2016). New paradigms in cataloguing in the 21st century: a review of implications and adoption of new strategies for Nigerian libraries. *BilgiDünyasi* 17(1):120-134

Ifijeh, G, Segun-Adeniran, C & Igbinola, A. (2018). Imperatives and challenges of Resource Description and Access (RDA) implementation in libraries in developing countries. *International Information and Library Review*

Mansor, Y.& Ramdzan, E. (2014). RDA perceptions among Malaysian cataloguers. *Library Review* 63(3):176-188

Miksa, D. S. (2009). Resource Description and Access (RDA) and new research potentials. *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 35(5):47-51

Nwosu, O., Eyisi, G.& Aghauche, E. E. (2013). Comparative study of library and information science curricula in tertiary institutions in South-East Nigeria. *IOSR - Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering (IOSR-JMSC)* 5(5):33-41

Oguntayo, S.& Adeleke, A. (2016). Awareness, knowledge and implementation of RDA in academic libraries in Nigeria. Paper presented at the 36th Annual Workshop of NLA/Cataloguing, Classification & Indexing Section held at University of Calabar, Nigeria from: 24 -28 October.

Okogwu, F. I. & Achebe, N. E. (2018). Selection and acquisition of electronic resources in university libraries in Southeast Nigeria: challenges. *Library Philosophy and Practice.* Retrieved from: http//digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1833

Oliver, C. (2010). *Introducing RDA: A guide to the basics*. Chicago: American Library Association. Retrieved from: https://www.tandfonline.com

Oliver, C. (2011). RDA: A quick introduction. Retrieved from: https://slideplayer.com>slide

Orbih, D. & Aina, A. (2014). Issues, benefits and challenges of original cataloguing versus copy cataloguing: the experience at the Lagos State University. *International Journal of Library and Information Science* 6(5):88-97

Tosaka, Y. & Park, J. (2013). RDA: Resource Description and Access—a survey of the current state of the art. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 64(4):651–662