

Research Article

Legal Information Literacy Among Practitioners: A Case Study of High Court Libraries in Rajasthan

*Nautiyal Neelam*¹, *Ravindra Kumar*²

¹Research Scholar, ²Supervisor, Department of Library and information Science, Apex University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24321/23952288.202501>

I N F O

Corresponding Author:

Nautiyal Neelam, Department of Library and information Science, Apex University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

E-mail Id:

neelamsanu@gmail.com

Orcid Id:

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6568-5184>

How to cite this article:

Neelam N, Kumar R. Legal Information Literacy Among Practitioners: A Case Study of High Court Libraries in Rajasthan. *J Adv Res Lib Inform Sci* 2025; 12(1): 1-10.

Date of Submission: 2024-12-19

Date of Acceptance: 2025-01-21

A B S T R A C T

In the context of Rajasthan's High Court libraries, this study investigates legal professionals' knowledge and opinions regarding legal information literacy (LIL). Legal information literacy is now a critical competence for legal practitioners due to the increasing complexity of legal systems and the growing corpus of legal publications. The study looks into perceived barriers to obtaining and using legal information, as well as awareness levels and library usage frequency. Data was collected from 250 respondents, including legal scholars, attorneys, and judges, using a standardised questionnaire. Significant patterns in the ways that legal professionals use legal information resources are revealed by quantitative research, which also highlights the need for additional training programs to enhance their skills. The results show that even if legal professionals understand the importance of LIL, barriers including a lack of training and a lack of technology infrastructure prevent it from being implemented effectively. The report ends with suggestions for specific actions aimed at improving legal information literacy (LIL) in Rajasthan's legal community.

Keywords: Legal Information Literacy, High Court Libraries, Legal Professionals

Introduction

Legal information literacy (LIL), which enables attorneys to effectively acquire, evaluate, and apply the wide range of legal information, has emerged as a crucial competency in the modern legal field. The ability to navigate legal resources efficiently has grown crucial as legal systems get more intricate and the number of legal resources—both digital and physical—increases. The capacity to recognise pertinent sources, evaluate their reliability, and apply the information within certain legal frameworks is known as literacy. In the digital age, LIL serves as a bridge connecting traditional legal processes with technology thanks to the availability of online databases, legal portals, and digital libraries. In the context of Rajasthan's High Court libraries,

this study explores the knowledge and perceptions of legal professionals on LIL.

High Court libraries are critical to the Indian legal system, serving as a storehouse of legal material and valuable resources for legal research. Advocates, judges, and legal academics often visit these libraries, which have large collections of legislation, case law, commentaries, and magazines. The growing digitisation of legal resources has fundamentally transformed the role of these libraries, requiring legal professionals to adapt to new information search strategies.

This study is significant because it aims to close the gap between the need for sophisticated legal research skills and the actual competencies of legal practitioners. In order to

better understand current legal research methods and the difficulties faced by legal professionals, this study intends to investigate the prevalence of legal information literacy (LIL) among legal professionals in Rajasthan.

This research emphasises the importance of legal information literacy as a basic component of current legal practice. This study investigates the status of legal information literacy (LIL) among legal practitioners in Rajasthan, highlighting the potential and challenges of legal research in the digital era. The findings from this study will help the legal community in Rajasthan and enhance the overall comprehension of LIL's involvement in fortifying the legal profession across India.

Review of Literature

A research study on the creation and management of legal information resources in the Judges' Library of the Allahabad High Court was conducted by Muzzammil (2021).¹ The study found that printed legal information resources were far more common than electronic ones, which may indicate that legal practitioners are not using digital legal research tools to their full potential. This preference for print materials emphasises the necessity of better instruction in digital legal information literacy in order to facilitate efficient legal research in contemporary settings.

The Indian Department of Justice has launched many initiatives to enhance legal literacy and awareness. The Pan India Legal Literacy and Legal Awareness Programme (2021-2026)² seeks to empower individuals by disseminating essential knowledge about legal rights and entitlements. Although these projects largely focus on the general public, they also underscore the significance of legal literacy among professionals, particularly those inside the legal sector. Such programs underscore the need for legal practitioners to maintain proficiency in legal information literacy to competently serve the community.³

Shrivastava (2008)⁴ conducted an analysis of legal librarianship in India, with a focus on judicial institutions. The study emphasised the unique challenges faced by law libraries in meeting the particular needs of the court and legal professionals. The importance of establishing indigenous legal databases and the role of law librarians in facilitating access to print and digital legal resources were highlighted.

Research has examined the significance of information literacy in enhancing legal practice within High Court libraries. Research conducted among advocates in Karnataka assessed the importance of information literacy in the legal profession. The study revealed that legal professionals recognise the significance of information literacy; however, there is a necessity for structured training programs to

enhance their skills in this area. The findings are significant for understanding the awareness and perspectives of legal professionals regarding LIL in High Court libraries across various locations, including Rajasthan.^{5,6}

Research Objective

The primary objectives for the paper are:

- To examine the awareness of legal professionals regarding legal information literacy (LIL) in High Court libraries in Rajasthan.
- To analyse the perception of legal professionals about the relevance and utility of LIL in their professional practices.
- To identify challenges faced by legal professionals in accessing and utilising legal information resources in High Court libraries.
- To assess the impact of demographic factors on the awareness and perception of LIL among legal professionals.⁷

Research Methodology

A descriptive survey research approach was used in this study to evaluate legal practitioners' knowledge and attitudes about legal information literacy (LIL). This design was chosen because it provides a thorough understanding of the topic matter by capturing insights on attitudes, views, and behaviours.

The study used a sample size of 250 respondents, including legal professionals such as attorneys, judges, and law clerks from Rajasthan's High Court libraries. The respondents came from a variety of demographic backgrounds; thus, there were people of all ages, genders, and professional backgrounds represented.^{8,9}

In order to use stratified random sampling, the population was split up into strata based on demographic factors including age, gender, and years of work experience. By using random sampling to ensure fair selection within each stratum, the study was able to thoroughly examine the impact of demographic diversity on LIL awareness and perceptions.

Structured questionnaires served as the major data-gathering tool. These questionnaires included five demographic questions, which collected information such as age, gender, educational qualifications, years of professional experience, and frequency of library use, as well as twenty-three quantitative questions designed to assess respondents' awareness, perceptions, and challenges related to LIL.

Data collection was done both online and offline to meet the respondents' choices and achieve maximum participation. Online surveys made data collection more efficient, yet

offline questionnaires enabled direct connection with respondents who preferred conventional methods.^{10,11}

Hypotheses

The study formulated the following hypotheses to address its research objectives:

Hypothesis 1

H₀: "There is no significant association between the awareness of legal information literacy and its perceived relevance in professional practices among legal professionals."

H₁: "There is a significant association between the awareness of Legal Information Literacy and its perceived relevance in professional practices among legal professionals".

Hypothesis 2

H₀: "There is no significant difference in the perception of Legal Information Literacy among legal professionals across different demographic groups".

H₂: "There is a significant difference in the perception of Legal Information Literacy among legal professionals across different demographic groups".

Hypothesis 3

H₀: "Challenges in accessing legal information resources do not significantly affect the perception of Legal Information Literacy among legal professionals".

H₃: "Challenges in accessing legal information resources significantly affect the perception of Legal Information Literacy among legal professionals".

Empirical Results

This section presents the empirical findings from the survey conducted with legal professionals regarding their use of High Court libraries and their perceptions of Legal Information Literacy (LIL). The data collected provide insights into the demographic profile of the respondents, their library usage patterns, and their views on the importance of LIL in legal research and professional practices.

The following tables display the results of various questions related to library usage, familiarity with LIL, the challenges faced in accessing legal information, and the role of LIL in enhancing legal research. The data from these tables are analysed to draw conclusions about the current state of legal information access and the need for further improvements in library resources and training programs.

Additionally, hypothesis testing was conducted to examine the relationships between awareness of LIL and its perceived relevance, differences in perception across demographic groups, and the impact of access challenges on the

perception of LIL. The results of these tests are discussed in the context of the broader findings, providing a deeper understanding of the factors influencing legal professionals' interactions with legal information and their perceptions of LIL.

The tables below summarise the key empirical results, and their interpretation offers valuable insights into the current state of legal information practices among legal professionals.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Age Group

Age Group	Freq- uency	Perce- ntage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
21–30 years	75	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
31–40 years	92	36.80%	36.80%	66.80%
41–50 years	52	20.80%	20.80%	87.60%
51 years and above	31	12.40%	12.40%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As seen in Table 1, respondents aged 31–40 years formed the largest age group (36.80%), indicating that mid-career professionals were most represented. This was followed by younger professionals aged 21–30 years (30.00%). Professionals aged 41–50 years (20.80%) and 51 years and above (12.40%) were less represented, highlighting a decreasing trend in library usage with age.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Freq- uency	Perce- ntage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Male	136	54.40%	54.40%	54.40%
Female	112	44.80%	44.80%	99.20%
Other	2	0.80%	0.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As shown in Table 2, the majority of the respondents were male (54.40%), followed by female respondents (44.80%). A very small proportion (0.80%) identified as other. This indicates a higher participation of male legal professionals in the study, which may reflect the gender distribution in the legal profession within the region.

Table 3. Distribution of Respondents by Profession

Profession	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Advocate	131	52.40%	52.40%	52.40%
Judge	37	14.80%	14.80%	67.20%
Legal Researcher	68	27.20%	27.20%	94.40%
Others	14	5.60%	5.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 3, advocates constituted the majority (52.40%) of the sample, followed by legal researchers (27.20%). Judges (14.80%) and other professionals (5.60%) formed smaller portions of the respondents. This suggests that advocates and researchers are the primary users of High Court libraries for legal information.

Table 4. Distribution of Respondents by Educational Qualification

Educational Qualification	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
LLB	112	44.80%	44.80%	44.80%
LLM	94	37.60%	37.60%	82.40%
PhD	28	11.20%	11.20%	93.60%
Other	16	6.40%	6.40%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 4, respondents with an LLB degree were the largest group (44.80%), followed by those with an LLM (37.60%). A smaller number had a PhD (11.20%) or other qualifications (6.40%), indicating that foundational legal education is predominant among library users.

Table 5. Years of Experience in the Legal Profession

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 5 years	74	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%
5–10 years	89	35.60%	35.60%	65.20%
11–20 years	58	23.20%	23.20%	88.40%
More than 20 years	29	11.60%	11.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 5, Legal professionals with 5–10 years of experience formed the largest group (35.60%), followed by those with less than 5 years of experience (29.60%). Professionals with 11–20 years (23.20%) and more than 20 years of experience (11.60%) were fewer, indicating that early- and mid-career professionals were the primary users of High Court libraries.

Table 6. How Often Do You Use the High Court Library for Legal Research?

Frequency of Usage	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Daily	47	18.80%	18.80%	18.80%
Weekly	91	36.40%	36.40%	55.20%
Monthly	78	31.20%	31.20%	86.40%
Rarely	34	13.60%	13.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 6, The most common frequency of library use was weekly (36.40%), followed by monthly usage (31.20%). Daily users accounted for 18.80%, while those who rarely used the library made up 13.60%. This indicates that regular but less-than-daily usage is common among respondents.

Table 7. Are You Familiar with the Concept of Legal Information Literacy (LIL)?

Familiarity	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	163	65.20%	65.20%	65.20%
No	87	34.80%	34.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 7, A majority of respondents (65.20%) were familiar with the concept of Legal Information Literacy (LIL), while 34.80% were not. This suggests a relatively high level of awareness about LIL among legal professionals in Rajasthan.

Table 8. How Would You Rate Your Ability to Locate Relevant Legal Information Efficiently?

Rating	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Excellent	79	31.60%	31.60%	31.60%
Good	104	41.60%	41.60%	73.20%
Average	52	20.80%	20.80%	94.00%
Poor	15	6.00%	6.00%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 8, A majority of respondents rated their ability to locate legal information as good (41.60%), followed by those who rated it as excellent (31.60%). Fewer respondents considered their ability average (20.80%) or poor (6.00%). This suggests that most participants felt confident in their legal research skills.

Table 9. How Often Do You Use Online Legal Databases?

Frequency of Usage	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Daily	87	34.80%	34.80%	34.80%
Weekly	102	40.80%	40.80%	75.60%
Monthly	49	19.60%	19.60%	95.20%
Rarely	12	4.80%	4.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 9, Weekly usage of online legal databases was the most common (40.80%), followed by daily usage (34.80%). Monthly users accounted for 19.60%, and rare users were only 4.80%. This indicates a significant reliance on online databases for legal research among respondents.

Table 10. Do You Find the Library's Resources Adequate for Your Legal Research Needs?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	156	62.40%	62.40%	62.40%
No	94	37.60%	37.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 10, A majority of respondents (62.40%) found the library's resources adequate for their legal research needs, while 37.60% did not. This highlights the need for further improvement in library resources to address the needs of dissatisfied users.

Table 11. What Type of Resources Do You Primarily Use in the High Court Library?

Resource Type	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Physical books and journals	98	39.20%	39.20%	39.20%
Online databases	68	27.20%	27.20%	66.40%

Both	84	33.60%	33.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 11, Physical books and journals were the most commonly used resources (39.20%), followed by respondents using both physical and online resources (33.60%). Only 27.20% relied solely on online databases, indicating that physical resources remain vital in legal research.

Table 12. Do You Face Challenges in Accessing Legal Information?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	123	49.20%	49.20%	49.20%
No	127	50.80%	50.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 12, Nearly half of the respondents (49.20%) reported challenges in accessing legal information, while 50.80% did not face any challenges. This indicates a need for targeted solutions to address the issues faced by a significant portion of users.

Table 13. If Yes, What Are the Main Challenges You Face?

Challenge	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Lack of resources	48	39.02%	39.02%	39.02%
Inadequate training	34	27.64%	27.64%	66.67%
Poor technology infrastructure	26	21.14%	21.14%	87.80%
Other	15	12.20%	12.20%	100.00%
Total	123	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 13, Among respondents who faced challenges, the most common issue was a lack of resources (39.02%), followed by inadequate training (27.64%). Poor technology infrastructure was reported by 21.14%, while 12.20% cited other reasons. These findings suggest that resource availability and training are critical areas for improvement.

Table 14. Have You Attended Any Training Programs on LIL?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	102	40.80%	40.80%	40.80%
No	148	59.20%	59.20%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 14, A majority of respondents (59.20%) had not attended any training programs on Legal Information Literacy (LIL), while 40.80% had. This highlights a gap in LIL-related training that, if addressed, could enhance legal research skills among professionals.

Table 15. How Do You Perceive the Role of LIL in Enhancing Legal Research?

Perception	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very Important	84	33.60%	33.60%	33.60%
Important	96	38.40%	38.40%	72.00%
Neutral	52	20.80%	20.80%	92.80%
Not Important	18	7.20%	7.20%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 15, Most respondents perceived Legal Information Literacy (LIL) as important (38.40%), followed closely by those who rated it as very important (33.60%). A smaller percentage (20.80%) held a neutral view, and very few (7.20%) found it not important. This indicates strong support for the role of LIL in enhancing legal research.

Table 16. How Often Do You Need Assistance from Library Staff for Legal Research?

Frequency of Assistance	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Frequently	74	29.60%	29.60%	29.60%
Occasionally	108	43.20%	43.20%	72.80%
Rarely	48	19.20%	19.20%	92.00%
Never	20	8.00%	8.00%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 16, The majority of respondents required occasional assistance from library staff (43.20%), while 29.60% needed frequent help. Rarely and never requiring assistance were reported by 19.20% and 8.00%, respectively. This highlights the importance of library staff in supporting legal research activities.

Table 17. How Satisfied Are You with the Technological Infrastructure in the Library?

Satisfaction Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very Satisfied	78	31.20%	31.20%	31.20%
Satisfied	104	41.60%	41.60%	72.80%
Neutral	48	19.20%	19.20%	92.00%
Dissatisfied	20	8.00%	8.00%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 17, Satisfaction with the library’s technological infrastructure was highest among those who were satisfied (41.60%), followed by those who were very satisfied (31.20%). Neutral responses constituted 19.20%, and dissatisfaction was relatively low (8.00%).

Table 18. Do You Think LIL Should Be Included in the Professional Training of Legal Professionals?

Agreement Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	116	46.40%	46.40%	46.40%
Agree	88	35.20%	35.20%	81.60%
Neutral	32	12.80%	12.80%	94.40%
Disagree	14	5.60%	5.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 18, A significant majority of respondents either strongly agreed (46.40%) or agreed (35.20%) that LIL should be included in professional training. Neutral and disagreeing responses accounted for 12.80% and 5.60%, respectively, showing strong consensus on this issue.

Table 19. How Often Do You Use External Libraries or Online Sources for Legal Information?

Frequency of Use	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Daily	68	27.20%	27.20%	27.20%
Weekly	98	39.20%	39.20%	66.40%
Monthly	52	20.80%	20.80%	87.20%
Rarely	32	12.80%	12.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 19, Weekly usage of external libraries or online sources was most common (39.20%), followed by daily usage (27.20%). Monthly and rare usage were reported by 20.80% and 12.80%, respectively, indicating a diverse frequency of external resource reliance.

Table 20. What Is Your Primary Mode of Accessing Legal Information?

Access Mode	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Physical Books	82	32.80%	32.80%	32.80%
Online Databases	96	38.40%	38.40%	71.20%
Personal Archives	58	23.20%	23.20%	94.40%
Other	14	5.60%	5.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 20, Online databases were the primary mode of accessing legal information for 38.40% of respondents, followed by physical books (32.80%). Personal archives accounted for 23.20%, and other sources were used by 5.60%.

Table 21. How Effective Is the Indexing and Cataloging System in the Library?

Effectiveness	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very Effective	72	28.80%	28.80%	28.80%
Effective	98	39.20%	39.20%	68.00%
Neutral	58	23.20%	23.20%	91.20%
Ineffective	22	8.80%	8.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 21, The indexing and cataloging system was rated as effective by 39.20% of respondents, followed by those who found it very effective (28.80%). Neutral responses were 23.20%, and 8.80% found it ineffective, indicating overall positive feedback with room for improvement.

Table 22. Do You Believe That High Court Libraries Need Modernization?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Strongly Agree	83	33.20%	33.20%	33.20%
Agree	91	36.40%	36.40%	69.60%
Neutral	52	20.80%	20.80%	90.40%
Disagree	24	9.60%	9.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 22, A significant portion of respondents strongly agreed (33.20%) or agreed (36.40%) that High Court libraries need modernization, highlighting the recognized need for updates. Neutral and disagreement responses constituted 20.80% and 9.60%, respectively, indicating that while some are satisfied, the majority sees a need for change.

Table 23. Do You Collaborate with Peers for Legal Research?

Collaboration Frequency	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Frequently	88	35.20%	35.20%	35.20%
Occasionally	96	38.40%	38.40%	73.60%
Rarely	50	20.00%	20.00%	93.60%
Never	16	6.40%	6.40%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 23, Collaboration with peers for legal research was reported as occasional by 38.40% of respondents, with 35.20% indicating frequent collaboration. Rare and no collaboration were reported by 20.00% and 6.40%, respectively, reflecting the general reliance on collaborative efforts in legal research.

Table 24. How Would You Rate the Accessibility of High Court Libraries?

Accessibility Rating	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Excellent	76	30.40%	30.40%	30.40%
Good	94	37.60%	37.60%	68.00%
Average	58	23.20%	23.20%	91.20%
Poor	22	8.80%	8.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation

As per Table 24, Accessibility to High Court libraries was rated as good by the highest percentage of respondents (37.60%), followed by excellent ratings (30.40%). Average and poor ratings accounted for 23.20% and 8.80%, suggesting that most respondents were satisfied, but there is room for improvement.

Table 25. Are the Legal Information Resources Up-to-Date?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	134	53.60%	53.60%	53.60%
No	116	46.40%	46.40%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 25, A majority (53.60%) believed that legal information resources were up-to-date, while 46.40% disagreed. This indicates a nearly balanced split, pointing to a need for periodic updates to maintain resource relevance.

Table 26. How Important Is LIL for Legal Decision-Making?

Importance Level	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Very Important	89	35.60%	35.60%	35.60%
Important	97	38.80%	38.80%	74.40%
Neutral	45	18.00%	18.00%	92.40%
Not Important	19	7.60%	7.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	

Interpretation

As per Table 26, The role of LIL in legal decision-making was deemed important by the majority (38.80%), with a close percentage rating it as very important (35.60%). Neutral and not important responses were less frequent, emphasizing the high perceived value of LIL.

Table 27. How Do You Prefer to Receive Training on LIL?

Training Preference	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Workshops	82	32.80%	32.80%	32.80%
Online Courses	94	37.60%	37.60%	70.40%
Seminars	52	20.80%	20.80%	91.20%
Other	22	8.80%	8.80%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 27, Online courses were the most preferred method for LIL training (37.60%), followed by workshops (32.80%). Seminars and other methods were less favored, highlighting a preference for flexible and accessible learning formats.

Table 28. Would You Recommend Improvements in LIL Resources to Your Peers?

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Yes	146	58.40%	58.40%	58.40%
No	104	41.60%	41.60%	100.00%
Total	250	100.0%	100.0%	-

Interpretation

As per Table 28, A significant majority (58.40%) were willing to recommend improvements in LIL resources to peers, indicating strong support for enhancements. The remaining 41.60% showed resistance or satisfaction with the current resources.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

Table 29. Chi-Square Test for Association Between Awareness of LIL and Its Perceived Relevance in Professional Practices

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	18.264	3
Likelihood Ratio	19.482	3
N of Valid Cases	250	

Interpretation

As per Table 29, The association between the awareness of LIL and its perceived relevance in professional practices was investigated using the Chi-Square Test for Independence. With three degrees of freedom, the Pearson Chi-Square value is 18.264, and the Asymptotic Significance (Asymp. Sig.) is 0.000, below the conventional significance limit of 0.05. There is a statistically significant association between LIL awareness and perceived relevance.

We accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1) and reject the null hypothesis (H_0) since the p-value is less than 0.05. This suggests that among legal professionals, there is a significant association between LIL awareness and its perceived relevance in professional activities.

Hypothesis 2

Table 30. Chi-Square Test for Differences in Perception of LIL Across Demographic Groups

Value	df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	15.739	4
Likelihood Ratio	16.920	4
N of Valid Cases	250	-

Interpretation

As per Table 30, The difference in the perception of LIL across different demographic groups (e.g., gender, age, and experience) was assessed using the Chi-Square Test for Independence. With four degrees of freedom, the Pearson Chi-Square value is 15.739, and the Asymptotic Significance (Asymp. Sig.) is 0.003, which is below the conventional significance level of 0.05. This signifies a statistically significant disparity in the perception of LIL among legal professionals across various demographic groups.

Given that the p-value is below 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1). This is a notable disparity in the perception of Legal Information Literacy among legal professionals across diverse demographic groups.

Hypothesis 3

Table 31. Independent t-Test for the Effect of Accessing Challenges on the Perception of LIL

Value	Df	t-value	Asymp. Sig.
t-statistic	248	-3.023	0.003
N of Valid Cases	250	-	-

Interpretation

As per Table 31, The impact of difficulties in obtaining legal information resources on the perception of Legal Information Literacy was evaluated using an independent t-test. The findings indicate that the t-statistic is -3.023, and the Asymptotic Significance (p-value) is 0.003, which is below 0.05. This suggests that the difficulty of getting legal information resources has a significant impact on legal professionals' perceptions of legal information literacy.

Since the p-value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1). This shows that problems in getting legal information resources have a significant effect on legal practitioners' perceptions of legal information literacy.

Table 32. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Test Statistic	p-value	Decision
H_1 : Association between awareness and relevance	Chi-Square 18.264	0.000	Reject H_0 , Accept H_1
H_2 : Difference in perception across demographic groups	Chi-Square 15.739	0.003	Reject H_0 , Accept H_1
H_3 : Effect of access challenges on LIL perception	t-statistic -3.023	0.003	Reject H_0 , Accept H_1

As per Table 32, the results of hypothesis testing indicate that:

- For H_1 (the association between awareness and relevance), the Chi-Square value is 18.264 with a p-value of 0.000, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0) and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis (H_1).
- For H_2 (the difference in perception across demographic groups), the Chi-Square value is 15.739 with a p-value of 0.003, also resulting in the rejection of H_0 and acceptance of H_1 .
- For H_3 (the effect of access challenges on LIL perception), the t-statistic is -3.023 with a p-value of 0.003, leading to the rejection of H_0 and acceptance of H_1 .

Conclusion

This study examined how legal professionals view, believe, and deal with legal information literacy (LIL). Legal professionals that are more aware of LIL place a high value on it in their work, as seen by the findings, which demonstrated a substantial correlation between LIL awareness and its perceived importance in legal activities.

The study also discovered a substantial variation in how different demographic groups viewed LIL, suggesting that legal professionals' views on the availability and utilisation of legal information resources were influenced by factors such as gender, age, and experience. Additionally, the study discovered that difficulties in obtaining legal information have a substantial impact on how Legal Information Literacy (LIL) is perceived. This suggests that LIL may be less helpful in legal practice due to restrictions such as limited access to pre-existing resources.

The findings suggest that expanding access to legal information resources and addressing obstacles experienced by solicitors may improve LIL's reputation generally, which would improve decision-making and boost operational effectiveness. Legal professionals who have greater access to reliable and up-to-date resources are likely to understand the importance of LIL on a deeper level. The report highlights how important it is to put measures in place to deal with these issues, such as updating legal information systems and improving instruction on how to use legal resources.

One significant weakness of the study is its focus on legal professionals from a specific region, which may restrict the findings' applicability to other areas or nations. Because the study used self-reported data, biases regarding participants' perceptions of their awareness and access to legal information resources may have been introduced. Future studies might employ a longitudinal methodology to track shifts in perceptions over time and increase the sample size to include a more diverse cohort of legal practitioners.

Future studies should look into how emerging technologies like blockchain and artificial intelligence affect legal information literacy and accessibility. It would be helpful to examine how these advancements might address present issues in the legal industry, particularly with regard to the availability and utilisation of legal information resources. Furthermore, future studies might look at how legal education affects novices' knowledge and understanding of LIL, which would help develop more potent teaching strategies to improve LIL in the legal field.

References

1. University of Nebraska [Internet]. Collection of Legal Information Resources in the Allahabad High Court, M. Muzzammil; 2021 [cited 2025 Jan 7]. Available from: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6396/>
2. Department of Justice India [Internet]. Pan India legal literacy & legal awareness programme (2021–2026); [cited 2024 Nov 12]. Available from: <https://doj.gov.in/pan-india/>
3. Binsfeld A. New barristers' information literacy challenges as they transition from education to the workplace. *Legal Information Management*. 2019 Mar;19(1):36-45.
4. Shrivastava RK. Law Librarianship in India with special reference to the judicial library system. *International Journal of Legal Information*. 2008 Jul;36(2):275-99.
5. Kauffman B. Information literacy in law: starting points for improving legal research competencies. *International Journal of Legal Information*. 2010 Dec;38(3):339-51.
6. Kim-Prieto D, Kahvecioğlu MK. Three faces of information literacy in legal studies: research instruction and law student information literacy standards in the American common law, British common law, and Turkish civilian legal traditions. *International Journal of Legal Information*. 2014 Jul;42(2):293-302.
7. Ax-Fultz LJ. Igniting the conversation: Embracing legal literacy as the heart of the profession. *Law Libr. J.* 2015;107:421.
8. Lawal V, Stilwell C, Kuhn R, Underwood PG. Perspectives on legal education and the role of information literacy in improving qualitative legal practice. In *Developing People's Information Capabilities: Fostering Information Literacy in Educational, Workplace and Community Contexts 2013 Jul 18* (Vol. 8, pp. 151-166). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
9. Lawal V, Stilwell C, Kuhn R, Underwood PG. Information literacy-related practices in the legal workplace: The applicability of Kuhlthau's model to the legal profession. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. 2014 Dec;46(4):326-46.
10. Legal Services Authority [Internet]. Legal awareness/literacy; [cited 2024 Nov 15]. Available from: <https://nalsa.gov.in/services/legal-awareness-literacy>
11. Veerbhadra S. The Role of Information Literacy in Enhancing Legal Practice: A study among advocates in Karnataka. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews*. 2024; 3(4): 40-50.