Knowledge Sharing and Organisational Learning as Correlates of Service Delivery in Private University Libraries in South-west, Nigeria.

Abiola Modupeola OMOTOSO[1], S.O. POPOOLA[2]

McPherson University, Seriki - Sotayo, Ogun State, Nigeria[1], Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria[2].
abiolamodupeola6@gmail.com[1], drpopoola@gmail.com[2]

Abstract

Purpose: *This study, therefore, examined knowledge sharing and organisational learning as correlates of service delivery in private university libraries in South-West, Nigeria.*

The essence of a library is to be able to meet its users' needs and expectations; and where this is compromised, service delivery therein is tagged poor and inefficient. Studies have identified several factors as major determinants of service delivery in libraries, but very few of such studies have been able to recognise and appreciate the relevance of knowledge sharing and organisational learning in improving the level of service delivery among the personnel of Nigerian universities libraries.

Methodology: *Survey design of correlational types was adopted in the study and total enumeration method was used to select librarians and library officers in these universities. In all, 246 personnel participated in the study. Self-structured questionnaire tagged "Service Delivery in Private University Libraries (SDPUL)" was used to elicit responses from the respondents.*

Findings: *Findings showed that the rate of services delivery, knowledge sharing and organisational learning among the observed personnel were high and that a significant relationship exists between knowledge sharing, organisational learning and service delivery.*

Value/Originality: *University library personnel should constantly update their skills, ability and knowledge in order to meet up with the demands of the knowledge economy and that of the operations of the library.*

Keywords: Service delivery, knowledge sharing, organisational learning, private university libraries

Introduction

Libraries are agencies socially established with the intention of providing needed information for both individuals and groups in the society so as to enhance personal and national development. Therefore, an academic library is expected to ensure strict compliance and adherence to serving its parent institution like colleges, polytechnics and university to support scholarship through the provision and preservation of information resources and services. Users services describe the processes and procedures of disseminating information to users including and not limited to current awareness services, electronic document delivery, OPAC, reference services etc. The conglomeration of all these activities describes service delivery of the libraries in the university system.

Over the years, service delivery had gone through difficulties caused by the present digital revolution affecting all university libraries around the world. University libraries are expected to be staffed with competent managers that are adept to innovation, efficiency, and imbued with leadership skills and styles that could enable effective and efficient management of subordinates and being able to meet the demands of library users. However, this revolution has changed service delivery due to its adverse consequences on the nature and the diversity of information needs, the number of personnel that can attend to users, heavy user traffic on collections, size of the collections and the longevity of the information materials in the university libraries. This development requires the services of vast librarians with well-managed strategies to ensure quality services and maximise the competencies of librarians in university libraries. Compounding this is the problem of information explosion, increased competition from other information providers like internet search engines.

Nevertheless, with quality research and knowledge management (KM), these problems can be addressed and improved upon. Performance of libraries and the competitive advantages in the information and communication sector is a function of the efficacy of knowledge application. Knowledge sharing by librarians without policies, resources and

infrastructure that help promotes viable information sharing in the library is insufficient. This implies that knowledge sharing by librarians can only be worthwhile when it is accomplished with conscious efforts geared towards exploring and harnessing the tacit knowledge of personnel. Knowledge sharing among library personnel basically should encourage accomplishing results adapted towards collective learning. Learning and KS are linked to an organisation's effectiveness, such that increased learning enhances KS (Skinnarland and Sharp, 2011). Thus, organisational effectiveness encompasses both KS and organisational learning (OL).

Organisational learning (OL) describes the role of individuals in the acquisition of knowledge through the two-way processes between individuals, groups and the organisation, and which provides new insights and understanding to improve performance. Organisational learning facilitates the understanding of the dynamics through which organisations adapt to environmental (internal and external) complexity, uncertainty and change. In recent times, service delivery in Nigeria university libraries seems to have become grossly inefficient in meeting users' information needs. Reason for this could have been as a result of the ever-emerging technologies, information explosion, and funding of university libraries.

Knowledge sharing and organisational learning are an integral aspect of knowledge management and human resource management which university libraries in advanced countries have officially included in their operations and which have enhanced their service delivery. This, however, seems not to be so in Nigeria as most Nigerian university libraries are still struggling for survival so as to be able to cope with the pace of the emerging world. Due to lean finances, these institutions have not been able to prioritise personnel competence and development through training and development in both the technical and soft skills. This negligence among other things has prompted this researcher to examine the knowledge sharing and organisational learning as correlates to service delivery in private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria. The objectives of this study are to find the types of services delivered by the personnel of the private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria; the level of knowledge sharing among personnel in private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria; methods of knowledge sharing often employed by personnel in private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria; level of organisational learning that takes place in the private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria; and the significant relationship between knowledge sharing, organisational learning and service delivery in private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria.

Literature Review
Organisational learning and Knowledge Sharing as Correlates of Service Delivery
Every organisation, both academic and otherwise, places much importance on the efficiency of service delivery in their efforts at meeting up with the users' demands of their products and services. This is because service delivery encompasses a series of activities that help improve upon the interactions between a client and service employees, and which provides solutions to the client's problems. As such, various technologies are bee introduced on a daily basis that will increase the efficiency of service delivery.

Nonetheless, regardless of technologies introduced into libraries, trained, skilled and competent personnel still play crucial roles in effective and efficient service delivery. Therefore, the interaction between library personnel and library users in the provision of information resources for teaching, learning and research is still very essential.

Knowledge sharing becomes indispensable as organisations are moving away from the culture of routine operation to an era of knowledge-based economy. Knowledge sharing practices among individuals, groups and units are vital to resource structuring and capacity development in an organisation (Rehman, Ilyas, and Asghar, 2015). Tan, Wong, Lam, Ooi, and Ng (2010) defined Knowledge Sharing (KS) as an act of sharing information, values and ideas about the perception between two parties to agree or disagree. Knowledge resource is well-thought of as a key determinant of corporate success due to its contribution to innovation (Lopez and Esteves, 2013). However, Lawal et al. (2014) identified the following major constraints to the use of knowledge sharing among the academic staff: inadequate awareness about the importance of knowledge sharing in academic community and poor attitude of academic staff to ideal of sharing knowledge with one another.

Knowledge sharing helps in combining various levels of know-how to create new organisational knowledge and acquisition of deeper levels of understanding leading to better business performance (Bollinger and Smith, 2001). Okonedo and Popoola (2012) posited that knowledge sharing practices are fundamental to librarians in higher educational institutions as it enables employees (including librarians) to share their insights and experiences efficiently and effectively in the provision of information services to library users. Asogwa (2012) suggested that competence of

librarians should be valued and shared through meetings, conferences and seminars; the outcomes of which should be stored for future use. To this effect, Awodoyin, Osisanwo, Adetoro, and Adeyemo (2016) found that the high level of knowledge sharing activity in Nigerian libraries is in several areas, cutting across scholarly communication, staff issues, library use and user issues, as well as cataloguing and classification of materials. Similarly, Akparobore (2015) found that, despite the existence of knowledge sharing in Nigerian universities, its rate was quite low and unsatisfactory.

Service Delivery and Organisational Learning

It is not more news that we now live in an information society where the development of information technology and telecommunication networks is accompanied by a corresponding increase in knowledge, with a rapidly growing flow of information. This new information environment requires new skills in seeking, processing, and using information. Thus, the process through which these set of information and knowledge are been created, retained and transferred best describes organisational learning (OL).

OL is broadly defined by most literature as a learning process within organisations that involves the interaction of multiple levels of the analysis-individual, group, organisational, and inter-organisational (Örtenblad, 2002, 2004; and Tsang, 1997). Argote (2013) defined organisational learning as dynamic methods for knowledge creation, its acquisition, dissemination and its application in organisations. Lim, Song, and Yoon (2014) further elaborated that a learning organisation is a structural and cultural system in which sustained organisational learning takes place. From these definitions, we can infer that effective learning and transfer of knowledge cannot take place outside a well-planned procedure and process where learners, teachers and leaders can flourish effectively. To this effect, Gilaninia, Rankouh, and Gildeh, (2013)

opined that learning involves knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing, knowledge use and a form of accomplishment to the recipients; which is provided for by organisation learning through a team of organised members that facilitate the process and outcome of learning activities.

1. Methodology

This study adopted a survey research design of correlational type. This is considered appropriate for this study because the set of variables used in the study were examined and presented in their true forms devoid of any manipulation. The population of the study were drawn from the 29 private university libraries and 246 library personnel located in Southwest, Nigeria. Due to the limited size of the population, total enumeration method was used to select librarians and library officers in these universities. In all, the total numbers of 246 personnel participated in the study.

Data were collected through a self-structured questionnaire tagged "Service Delivery in Private University Libraries (SDPUL)". The questionnaire was structured in three sections; section one dealt with demographic characteristics of the respondents, section two focused on the knowledge sharing in university libraries and the last section captured the organisational learning in the university.

To be able to ensure the reliability of the instrument, it was pilot tested on 30 participants (library personnel) from the library at the University of Benin (whose area lies outside the study area). The following Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients results were obtained: Section B (knowledge sharing among library personnel) r = 0.83; methods for knowledge sharing r = 0.64; Section C (organisational learning) r = 0.90.

Results

RQ 1: What are the types of services delivered by the personnel of the university libraries?

The response rates on the types of services delivered by the personnel of the university libraries in South-west, Nigeria are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Service Delivery by Personnel in Private University Libraries

S/N	Items	VHD %	HD %	RD %	ND %	Mean	Std. Dev.
1	Virtual reference services	34.4	32.1	25.5	8.0	2.93	.957
2	Reference service by e-mail or Web Technology to assist patrons with disabilities	29.3	40.1	29.7	.9	2.98	.791
3	Documents digitized by library personnel	46.8	42.8	10.5	-	3.36	.664
4	Electronic theses and dissertations produced by students and made available for consultation by library personnel	54.3	14.0	31.8	-	3.23	.901
5	Virtual reference materials	43.6	20.8	31.8	3.8	3.04	.953
6	E-mail references	49.2	15.0	35.8		3.13	.913
7	Chat reference, commercial service	24.4	17.3	40.7	17.6	2.49	.045
8	Instant messaging applications	20.2	23.2	44.7	11.9	2.52	.945

No	Service	VHD	HD	RD	ND	Mean	Sig
9	Short message service (SMS) or text messaging	23.7	26.0	38.4	11.9	2.62	.975
10	Serial back files and other paper materials (including government documents)	23.9	26.9	31.8	17.5	2.57	.036
11	Information literacy	30.9	32.5	24.8	11.9	2.82	.001
12	Inter-library loans and documents to other libraries	36.3	39.3	12.6	11.9	3.00	.982
13	Electronic collection	53.8	20.4	14.0	11.9	3.16	.062
14	Hybrid collection	1.0	55.5	26.4	17.1	2.40	.778
15	Subscription to electronic serials	48.2	34.6	15.5	1.7	3.29	.789
16	Document delivery service	40.9	45.9	8.9	4.9	3.42	.608
17	Photocopying	43.8	27.2	21.8	7.2	3.08	.969
18	Current Awareness	41.0	19.7	31.2	8.0	2.94	.021
19	Usage statistics	40.3	39.1	14.5	6.1	3.14	.880
20	Telex/ Telephone service	66.0	21.8	6.5	5.8	3.48	.852
21	Bibliographic and Compilation service	60.4	12.4	23.4	3.8	3.29	.952
22	Translation service	41.0	20.9	30.9	7.2	2.96	.003
23	Technical Writing service	45.5	29.0	15.4	10.1	3.10	.003
24	Bindery	45.9	15.7	25.3	13.1	2.94	.111
25	Facsimile service	2.6	28.1	20.4	48.9	1.84	.923
26	Online/C.D ROM Database searching	51.0	23.0	24.1	1.9	3.23	.881
27	Internet / E-mail service	51.5	19.9	19.5	9.1	3.14	.028
28	Audio/visual materials provision	48.7	32.1	12.9	6.3	3.23	.903
29	Section where patrons can sit, listen and view audio/visual material	52.2	18.0	16.8	13.1	3.09	.098
30	Microforms material provision	44.5	34.6	9.8	11.2	3.12	.988
31	Subscription to databases and maintenance of the access	43.8	17.1	33.7	5.4	2.99	.996
32	Campus wide data communication network	39.8	32.6	23.7	3.8	3.08	.885
33	Web-based services	38.7	46.4	10.1	4.7	3.19	.801
34	Instructions and training to users for better use of Web Services	42.1	25.3	26.9	5.8	3.04	.959
35	Collaborative Services	51.3	16.6	24.4	7.7	3.12	.026
	Weighted Mean = 3.00						

Where VHD =Very Highly Delivered; HD = Highly Delivered; RD = Rarely Delivered and ND = Not Delivered

respectively.

Result in Table 1 showed that the weighted mean of all services delivered by the private universities library personnel was at 3.00 out 4.00 which showed that the rate of services delivery among these universities was high. Similarly, the result showed that most of the respondents indicated that to a very high extent, they delivered Telex/ Telephone service (mean = 3.48), followed by Document delivery service (mean = 3.42). The least response rate shows that very few respondents indicated that they delivered Facsimile service (mean = 1.84), followed by Hybrid collection (mean = 2.40). It can, therefore, be inferred that the majority of the respondents delivered Telex/ Telephone service, Document delivery service, Documents digitised by the library personnel, Bibliographic and Compilation service, Subscription to Electronic serials, Audio/visual materials provision, Online/C.D ROM Database searching, Electronic Theses and dissertations produced by students and made presented in Table 2.

available for consultation by library personnel, Web-Based Services, Internet / E-mail service, E-mail reference, among others.

The result is buttressed by the work of Afolabi and Abidoye (2011), which maintained that the various services provided in the libraries are complemented by available facilities, some of which are technology driven. In a modern library, technology application in the provision and performance of library services are provided by libraries to patrons. Similarly, the result on service delivery bears out Nwalo's (2012) opinion that libraries provide bibliographic services which give a list of publications that are related to each other.

RQ 2: What is the level of knowledge sharing among personnel in private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria?

Information on the status of knowledge sharing of private university library personnel in South-west, Nigeria is

Table 2: Level of knowledge sharing among library personnel

S/N	Items	SA %	A %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std.Dev
1	I gain new ideas through social events in the library	31.4	61.8	3.5	3.3	3.21	.661
2	Staff improve their knowledge and ideas by learning from other organisations and institutions	34.6	60.4	2.4	2.6	3.27	.635
3	Individuals are committed to professional development	33.3	61.6	3.7	1.4	3.27	.595
4	Conferences, workshops, training and development are held from time to time to help gain new knowledge	35.8	57.6	5.2	1.4	3.28	.624
5	Staff gain new ideas through social gatherings	31.8	59.0	4.2	5.1	3.17	.730
6	Whenever I want to share knowledge, I prefer to use social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, wikis and books in my library	23.2	59.9	13.6	3.3	3.03	.708
7	I use videoconferencing to share knowledge with my co-workers	21.1	47.8	28.4	2.6	2.87	.765
8	I use intranet and knowledge repositories to share knowledge with my colleagues	19.9	59.3	15.2	5.6	2.94	.756
9	I prefer to share knowledge through storytelling	19.5	27.7	45.7	7.0	2.60	.879
10	There are guidelines that encourage knowledge sharing in the library	27.2	37.2	27.7	7.9	2.84	.916
11	Knowledge sharing supports staff development in my library	23.9	45.5	29.1	1.4	2.92	.762
12	Knowledge sharing improves quality of staff	26.4	66.5	6.3	.9	3.18	.573
13	knowledge sharing keeps staff up to date with current trends	25.0	50.8	22.7	1.6	2.99	.735
14	Knowledge sharing retains individual knowledge through codification of tacit knowledge	28.3	55.5	9.2	7.0	3.05	.808
15	There is KS culture in my organisation	20.2	60.2	18.2	1.4	2.99	.664
16	My colleagues share their working experience and knowledge in my library	20.6	63.0	12.2	4.2	3.00	.705
17	I communicate/and share knowledge with my colleagues in teams or groups	26.0	52.9	19.5	1.6	3.03	.720
18	I share knowledge with other library staff	39.6	40.1	16.9	3.3	3.16	.821
19	My UL encourages everyone to speak their mind.	22.5	54.6	11.2	11.7	2.88	.890
20	My UL analyses relevant data before coming to a decision	32.5	44.5	8.9	14.1	2.95	.989
21	My UL considers different perspectives before making decisions	21.3	56.4	10.6	11.7	2.87	.879
22	My UL seeks feedback to improve interaction with others.	19.9	57.2	11.2	11.7	2.85	.871
23	My UL precisely depicts how personnel act their parts in cultivating collaboration to share thoughts	23.6	53.4	11.3	11.7	2.89	.898
24	My UL involves personnel to proffer ideas to work-related problems	27.4	56.9	10.6	5.1	3.07	.761
25	Through knowledge sharing; innovation and discovery increases.	30.5	49.0	18.0	2.4	3.08	.760
26	Knowledge sharing is important to service delivery	31.2	44.7	20.6	3.5	3.04	.811
	Weighted Mean = 3.02						

Result in Table 2 revealed that the weighted mean of the level of knowledge sharing among library personnel was at 3.02 out 4.00 which show that the level of knowledge sharing among them was high. Similarly, mean scores of 13 out of the 26 items were found to be higher than the weighted mean justifying the claim that they significantly help to increase the level of knowledge sharing was among the library personnel examined.

This result is supported by the findings of Awodoyin, Osisanwo, Adetoro, and Adeyemo (2016) which reported that there was a high level of knowledge sharing activity among Nigerian university librarians. It also corroborated with the findings of the study conducted by Okonedo and Popoola's (2012) which reported that Nigerian librarians share knowledge and that the extent to which librarians in the selected libraries share knowledge is high in spite of the myriads of challenges prevalent in African and Nigerian university libraries.

RQ 3:
Table 3: What are the methods of knowledge sharing in the university libraries?

S/N	Items	SA %	A %	D %	Mean	Std.Dev
1	Departmental meetings	29.1	1.9	68.9	1.94	.241
2	Library blogs	11.5	1.9	86.6	1.86	.352
3	Communities of practice	15.2	4.0	19.2	1.79	.409
4	Mobile phones	8.4	4.0	87.6	1.68	.471
	Weighted Mean = 1.81					

Results in Table 4.3 showed that the majority of respondents indicated that they shared knowledge during departmental meetings (mean = 1.94); through library blogs (mean = 1.86); through communities of practice (mean = 1.79); and through mobile phones (mean = 1.68). The result of this study agrees with those of Anna and Puspitasari (2013) conducted in Indonesian who found out that a large number of electronic tools were used as methods of knowledge sharing in an organisation; they include Email, internet, intranet, web portal, e-mail mailing list, social media such as Facebook, Google; collaboration technology tools such as audio-visual tools, wikis, bulletin boards, and newsgroups. Similarly, Charnigo and Barnett-Ellis (2013) posit that social media, especially Facebook is popular among librarians in the U.S.A. According to him, they use Facebook as a knowledge sharing tool to reach out to diverse users.

Table 4: RQ 4: What is the level of organisational learning that takes place in the private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria?

S/N	Items	SA %	A %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std.Dev
1	The University librarian (UL) encourage initiative towards creativity	29.1	35.8	32.1	3.0	2.91	.851
2	UL does not ask for anything aside from what I should know to achieve my work	23.2	31.2	39.3	6.3	2.71	.892
3	The UL is not interested in my work details	19.7	26.0	48.2	6.1	2.59	.871
4	I am expected to inform the UL of impromptu schedule	14.0	33.9	47.5	4.7	2.57	.787
5	UL worries about staff who exhibit negligence on duty	16.1	34.4	44.9	4.7	2.62	.808
6	UL is highly supportive in achieving personal professional goals	17.8	44.5	29.7	8.0	2.72	.848
7	UL is keen to give impressive appraisal staff with good achievement	17.1	45.0	29.7	8.2	2.71	.844
8	UL is a role model for all personnel in the library	19.0	54.3	20.4	6.3	2.86	.792
9	UL instructions help me with critical logical reasoning in executing my job responsibilities.	19.9	42.8	31.8	5.6	2.77	.830
10	UL understands individual difference among library personnel	22.2	45.9	20.4	11.5	2.79	.918
11	UL delegates power for staff development	21.1	43.8	26.2	8.9	2.77	.882
12	UL encourages every personnel to perform tasks assigned to them.	21.8	45.2	29.3	3.7	2.85	.798
13	UL is highly competent securing the loyalty of library personnel	31.9	32.8	31.4	3.8	2.93	.885
14	UL has unwavering support and loyalty of the staff	27.7	36.3	31.2	4.7	2.87	.874
15	UL inspires innovation of ideas	26.4	49.0	20.6	4.0	2.98	.794
16	UL gives me better approaches to build up my point of view on things.	24.3	33.0	23.2	19.5	2.62	.055
17	UL encourages employees to provide new ideas.	24.3	36.5	23.2	16.1	2.69	.011
18	Library personnel take responsibility for their own learning.	29.5	38.9	15.5	16.1	2.82	.030
19	Library personnel share information and skills (librarianship) and participate in 'knowledge networks' or communities of learning within	28.1	38.6	14.5	18.8	2.76	.060

20	UL encourages others to share their information and skills.	29.3	38.9	12.9	18.8	2.79	.064
21	UL actively and regularly seeks feedback on personnel performance and development needs	23.0	40.1	18.0	18.8	2.67	.029
22	Library personnel participate in any kinds of learning at least 2 times a year	25.7	39.4	14.1	20.8	2.70	.068
23	There is job rotation exercise in the university library	24.6	41.0	30.5	3.8	2.86	.829
24	Personnel engage in Community of Practice	22.2	54.6	19.4	3.8	2.95	.753
25	Organisational learning is important to service delivery	24.8	51.0	22.3	1.9	2.99	.741
Weighted Mean = 2.78							

Result in Table 4 revealed that the weighted mean of the level of organisational learning among library personnel was at 2.78 out 4.00 which showed that the level of organisational learning among them was relatively high. Similarly, mean scores of 12 out of the 25 items were found to be higher than the weighted mean justifying the claim that those set of items significantly help to improve on the level of organisational learning among the library personnel examined.

This result corroborated the empirical study carried out by Oakleaf (2011) who provides an overview of organisational learning and justifies its relevance to academic library service delivery as very important. It also related with the study of Sivadas (2012) which explained that training and education is one of the most critical ingredients in providing quality services and that regular training leads to high staff performance at optimum levels.

RQ 5: Are there significant relationship among knowledge sharing, organisational learning and service delivery in private university libraries in South-west, Nigeria?

Table 5: Correlation Table showing the relationship between knowledge sharing, organisational learning and service delivery in private universities

Variables	Mean	St. Dev	df	r	P	Sig
Knowledge sharing	2.84	.868	242	.474**	.006	S
Organisational learning	2.78	.917	242	.450**	.000	S
Service delivery	3.45	.624				

Table 5 revealed that a significant relationship exists between knowledge sharing and service delivery (N=243, r= .474, p<0.05). This implies that with effective and efficient knowledge sharing among library personnel, service delivery therein will be greatly improved.

Similarly, the same table (Table 5) explained that a significant relationship exists between organisational learning and service delivery (N=243, r= .450, p<0.05). This implies that with efficient and highly organised learning activities, both knowledge sharing and service delivery will be greatly improved among the library personnel.

The result of this study aligned with Ajegbomogun and Diyaolu (2018) who stated that knowledge sharing serves as a means for accelerated development, performances, and activities. Similarly, Findings from Emasealu and Umeozor (2017) found training and re-training of personnel to be an essential part of every organisation and has become paramount in all aspects of operations in the modern world.

RQ 6: What is the joint contribution of knowledge sharing and organisational in predicting service delivery in private University libraries in South-West, Nigeria.

Table 6: Joint contribution of knowledge sharing and organisational learning in predicting service delivery in Private University Libraries in South-West, Nigeria.

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.P
1	Regression	6421.924	2	16053.981		
	Residual	149622.289	568	263.420		
	Total	213838.213	570		60.945	0.000[b]

Model 1
Adjusted R= 0.8062
Adjusted R Square = 0.6500
Std. Error of the Estimate = 16.230

Table 6 showed that the joint contribution of the independent variables (knowledge sharing β=.331; t=6.095; P< 0.05) and organisational learning (β= .064; t=2.103; P<0.05) towards service delivery among Nigerian private university libraries. As revealed by this result in explaining the service delivery of the private university libraries in South-West, Nigeria.

This result is supported by the findings of Milway and Saxton (2011) who found out in their study that more than 90% of the non-profit leaders surveyed reported that they care deeply about learning and actively strive to model knowledge capture and sharing within their organisations. Also, Anna and Puspitasari (2013) opined that adoption of knowledge sharing in academic libraries enhances knowledge creation and service delivery in Indonesian university libraries.

Conclusion

Service delivery among library users and personnel can be greatly improved upon if effective knowledge sharing is encouraged and learning activities, as well as resources, are properly organised and available. Based on this, this study concluded that the roles and relevance of both knowledge sharing and organisational learning in promoting effective service delivery cannot be overemphasised. As such, management of university libraries must ensure that knowledge sharing and organisational learning are greatly encouraged among the library personnel and users by initiating policies in private universities in South-West, Nigeria.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are hereby put forward that; university libraries can do better in their practice of knowledge sharing by utilising every available means, tool and opportunity to maintain the culture of knowledge sharing by instituting policies, provision of rewards, recognition and so on. Also, university library personnel should constantly update their skills, ability and knowledge in order to meet up with the demands of the knowledge economy, the ever-emerging trends in technologies and other competitive situations that challenge the existence and the operations of university libraries. These can be achieved through regular training, mentoring, conference attendance-learning and other learning platforms.

References

Afolabi A. F., Abidoye, J. A. (2011) Integration of information and communication technol. in Lib. operations towards effective Lib. services. J. Edu. and Soc. Res. Ondo: Dept. of Edu. Tech. Retrieved from http://www.hrmars.com/admin/pics/267.pdf

Ajegbomogun, O. F. and Diyaolu, O. B. 2018. Availability of library facilities, knowledge sharing as determinants of job performance of library staff in Southwest Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*

Akparobore, D. 2015. Knowledge sharing among librarians in University Libraries in Nigeria. *Information and Knowledge Management* 5.2. Retrieved from IISTE online Journal.

Anna, N., and Puspitasari, D. 2013. Knowledge sharing in libraries: A case study of knowledge sharing strategies in Indonesian University Libraries. Paper presented at the IFLAWLIC, Singapore.

Argote, L. 2013. *Organisational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Asogwa, B. 2012. Knowledge management in academic libraries: librarians in the 21st century. *Journal of knowledge management practice*, 13.2: 1-11. Retrieved 30 March 2014 from http:// www. tlainc. com/ articl 301.htm.

Awodoyin, A., Osisanwo, T., Adetoro, N., and Adeyemo, I. 2016. Knowledge Sharing Behaviour Pattern Analysis of Academic Librarians in Nigeria. *Journal of Balkan Libraries Union*, 4.1: 12-19.

Awodoyin, A., Osisanwo, T., Adetoro, N., and Adeyemo, I. 2016. Knowledge Sharing Behaviour Pattern Analysis of Academic Librarians in Nigeria. *Journal of Balkan Libraries Union*, 4.1: 12-19.

Beauregard, N., Lemyre, L. and Barrette, J. 2015.The domains of organisational learning practices: An agency-structure perspective. *Societies*, 5(4): 713-733.

Bollinger, S., and Smith, R. (2001). Managing organisational knowledge as a strategic asset.

Journal of Knowledge Management, 5 (1): 8 – 18.

Charnigo, L., and Barnett-Ellis, P. 2013. Checking out Facebook. com: the impact of a digital trend on academic libraries. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 26.1: 23-34.

Emasealu, H. U., and Umeozor, S. N. (2016). Training librarians for 21st century repository services: Emerging trends. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 13, 187-194. Retrieved from http:// www. informingscience.org/Publications/3495

Gilaninia, S., Rankouh, M.A.A., and Gildeh, M.A.P. 2013. Overview on the importance of organisational learning and learning organisation. *Journal of Research and Development* 1.2.

Lawal,W. O., Agboola, I. O., Aderibigbe, N.O., Owolabi, K.A., Ibrahim, R.O., Bakare, D.O., and Jimada, A. 2014 .Knowledge Sharing Among Academic Staff in a University of Agriculture: A Survey. *International Journal of Library Science,* 11(2).

Lim, D. H., Song, J. H., and Yoon, S. W. (2014). Trends and issues in integrating knowledge management and organisational learning for workplace performance improvement. In N. E. Chalofsky, T. S. Rocco, and M. L. Morris (Eds.), Handbook of human resource development (pp. 369-385). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley

Lopez, V. and Esteves, J. (2013). Acquiring external knowledge to avoid wheel re-invention. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 17 (1): 87 – 105.

Lopez, V., and Esteves, J. 2013. Acquiring external knowledge to avoid wheel re-invention. *Journal of Knowledge Management* 17.1: 87 – 105.

Nwalo, H. 2012. *User Education in academic libraries: Students' use of academic library*. London: Library Association Publishing Limited.

Okonedo, S., and Popoola, S.O. 2012. Effect of self-concept, knowledge sharing and utilization on research productivity among librarians in public universities in South-west, Nigeria. *Library philosophy and practice*. 11.2:1-22.

Örtenblad, A. (2002). A typology of the idea of learning organisation. *Management Learning*, 33: 213-230.

Örtenblad, A. (2004). The learning organisation: towards an integrated model. *The Learning Organisation*, 11: 129-144.

Rehman, W.U., Ilyas, M., and Asghar, N. 2015. Knowledge sharing, knowledge management strategy and performance. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*.

Santos-Vijande, M., López-Sánchez, J., and Trespalacios, J. 2011. How organisational learning affects a firm's flexibility, competitive strategy and performance. *Journal of Business Research*. 65: 1079-1089.

Sarrafzadeh, M., A. Hazeri, and S. Alavi. 2011. The Status of Web 2.0 in Iran's LIS Education. *Education for Information*, 28 (2): 233–245.

Sivadas, K. K. 2012. *Library management*. New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.

Skinnarland, K. I. T., and Sharp, P. 2011. Knowledge Sharing (KS), Organisational Learning and Competitive Advantage in a Scandinavian Hotel Company. Organisation Learning, Knowledge and Capabilities Conference, 1–26.

Tan, B. W. C., Lam, C., Ooi, K., and Ng, F. 2010. Assessing the link between service quality dimensions and knowledge sharing: Student perspective. *African Journal of Business Management*. 4:6.

Tsang, E. W. K. (1997). Organisational learning and the learning organisation: A dichotomy between descriptive and prescriptive research. *Human Relations*, 50: 73-89.