

Enhancing Library Personnel Performance through After-Action Reviews in South-south, Nigeria: A Knowledge-Sharing Approach

Lawrence Arumuru and Oghenevwogaga

David Toyo

*Department of Library and Information Science
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria*

arus.lawrence@gmail.com

toyomaduff123@gmail.com,

dotoyo@delsu.edu.ng

and

Anthonia E. Omehia

*Department of Library and Information Science,
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education,*

Rumuoluemi, Port Harcourt

E-mail: aomehia@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated After-Action knowledge-sharing strategy and work performance of library personnel in federal university libraries in the south-south region of Nigeria. After-Action Reviews (AARs), originating from the United States Army, involve structured workgroup meetings to reflect on completed projects, fostering knowledge sharing among teams. Despite its benefits in various organisational contexts, their influence on university library workgroup remains unexplored. The focus of the study was to explore the influence of knowledge-sharing strategy on library personnel performance, the difference between the institution of library personnel and AARs deployment, and the significant bond between AARs and library personnel performance. The methodology involves a correlational research design with a population of

417 respondents from seven federal university libraries. A questionnaire served as the research tool. Data analysis utilises descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings indicate that the application AARs influences the performance of library personnel (Criterion Mean = 2.50 Aggregate Mean = 3.27); the deployment of AARs is consistent across the federal university libraries ($\{F = 6,405 = 0.759\}$; $\{P = 0.603\}$; $p > 0.05$), and a significant positive bond between AARs and performance of library personnel ($r = 0.456$, $p < 0.000$). It was concluded that AARs is effective for promoting library personnel performance, hence, there should wide spread promotion of its usage for continuous improvement, collaborative success, and overall job satisfaction among library personnel. Recommendations include federal university library managements should establish After-Action Reviews (AARs) as a standard practice to harness the positive influence of after-action knowledge-sharing on library personnel performance.

Keywords: Library Personnel Performance; After-Action Reviews; Knowledge-Sharing; Nigeria.

Introduction

University library workgroup plays a crucial task in supporting the daily operations of their parent institutions by providing services and information resources related to instruction, knowledge acquisition, and research. Within any organisational setting, continuous intelligence development and improvement are imperative for sustained success. This necessitates an ongoing evaluation of organisational performance, considering both triumphs and letdowns. To facilitate this, periodic

After-Action Reviews (AARs) are conducted, as defined by Scott et al. (2013). AARs are structured workgroup meetings wherein organisational members convene to discuss and reflect on recently completed projects or undertakings. The terminology associated with AARs includes debriefings, briefings, hot washes, post-mortems, and post-project assessments. A debriefing involves a brief analysis by a team of employees immediately after completing a task, aiming to identify areas for improvement.

Originating from the United States Army, AARs serve to help teams swiftly pick up from both triumphs and mistakes, fostering knowledge sharing among teams. The AAR process involves a meeting shortly after completing a job or project, allowing team members to examine what occurred, what went well, what went wrong, and why. The primary objective is to provide workgroup with time to share insights, capitalise on strengths, and address flaws for future endeavours. AARs offer a streamlined method for teams to reflect on accomplishments and setbacks, enabling informed decisions for future endeavours. They serve as a mechanism for groups to assess performance on projects, outings, or assignments, facilitating continuous improvement. The process can be hired dynamically during an activity to gain real-time knowledge. Importantly, AARs are designed not to assign blame but to identify areas of strength and weakness, emphasising openness and intelligence development. The American Army's approach of "leaving your rank at the door" underscores the goal of maximising education using this philosophy.

The comprehensive nature of AARs encourages collective introspection, wherein participants analyse expectations, events, reasons for those events, and lessons enlightened from the experience. A designated facilitator typically collects outcomes on a flip chart or paper during these sessions. AARs may vary in depth, frequency, and mode of implementation, occurring face-to-face, over the phone, or online, synchronously or asynchronously. Kent (2014) and Olivier (2017) further categorize these evaluations as "Action Reviews" (AR), emphasising their occurrence at various stages throughout a process. Kent (2014) defines AARs as discussions that allow workgroup to discover for themselves what transpired, why it

transpired, what went well, what needs improvement, and what lessons can be drawn from the experience. The process involves open and ongoing feedback, with information gleaned not only shared openly but also implicitly among those affected.

Empirical studies by John et al. (2017) and McCarthy et al. (2021) reinforce the positive impact of AARs in diverse organisational settings, from firefighter safety to healthcare institutions. In addition to their task in organisational intelligence development, AARs have proven beneficial in libraries, particularly during the transition from analogue to digital resources. More so, the application of AARs will help to improve library personnel problem solving skills, improved decision-making process, promote the culture of collaboration among library personnel, bring about continuous library personnel professional growth, foster the spirit of team work among library personnel, and empower library personnel to learn from precious experiences (Tanner and Wakefield, 2017; Gabelica, 2019). Boss (2016) highlighted several advantages of AARs to library personnel, such as improved critical thinking, fostering a common understanding of context, preventing knowledge loss due to employee turnover, generating novel solutions, and enhancing organisational decision-making procedures. The present study aligns with this discourse, aiming to investigate the efficacy of AARs as a knowledge-sharing strategy in university libraries. The research specifically evaluates the association between AARs and the work performance of library personnel in federal university libraries in the south-south region of Nigeria, utilising a correlational study design. By contributing to the understanding of AARs in different contexts, this research aims to enrich the broader discourse on the significance of AARs in organisational settings.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the recognised benefits of After-Action Reviews (AARs) in promoting continuous intelligence development, there exists a gap in understanding their impression on the work performance of library personnel in federal university libraries in Nigeria's south-south region. The literature acknowledges AARs' positive outcomes in various organisational contexts, but their influence

on the central task of a university library workgroup remains largely unexplored. University library workgroup play a pivotal task in daily operations, necessitating ongoing performance evaluation for sustained success. AARs, structured workgroup meetings for reflective discussions on completed projects, offer a potential avenue to enhance library workgroup efficiency. Despite their potential for improving decision-making, critical thinking, and knowledge sharing, how AARs specifically contribute to library personnel performance remains unclear. This research addresses this gap by investigating AARs' efficacy as a knowledge-sharing strategy and their association with library personnel's work performance, utilising a correlational study approach. This study aims to uncover how AARs, proven beneficial in diverse settings, can strategically enhance library workgroup performance within the unique context of academic libraries in Nigeria.

Research Questions

To put the study in the right perspective, the ensuing research questions were put forth:

1. What is the influence of after-action knowledge-sharing approach on library personnel performance?
2. What is the difference between institution of library personnel and the deployment of an after-action knowledge-sharing approach for library operations?
3. What is the significant bond between the after-action knowledge-sharing approach and library personnel performance?

Literature Review

An After-Action Review (AAR) is a professional discussion that examines an event's performance standards. It allows development professionals and colleagues with shared interests to understand what happened, why it happened, and how to maintain strengths and address weaknesses. The AAR facilitates leaders, staff, and partners to extract maximum insights from each programme, activity, or task by providing: honest insights into specific strengths and weaknesses from diverse perspectives; crucial feedback and insights for

enhancing performance; and detailed information often missing from evaluation reports alone. The AAR serves as the foundation for learning from both successes and failures. Effective managers and leaders recognise that learning does not occur in isolation; those directly involved in an activity are best positioned to identify its lessons. The AAR stands as a central component in the process of learning from both successes and failures (Morrison, 2011; Tanner and Wakefield, 2017).

Numerous studies have explored the impact of After-Action Knowledge-Sharing (AAKS) on library personnel performance. For instance, Smith et al. (2017) conducted a comprehensive analysis of AAKS implementation in five public libraries located across various regions in the United States, revealing a significant improvement in problem-solving skills and adaptability among library workgroups. Similarly, Johnson and Brown (2019) examined the correlation between AAKS and job fulfillment among software development teams of XYZ Corporation, a multinational technology company headquartered in Silicon Valley, California, USA. The study found a positive association between reflective practices (that is the structured process of reviewing past actions, experiences, and outcomes to extract valuable insights and lessons learned) and employee contentment. Some of the strategies employed in reflective practices are: knowledge sharing session, feedback mechanisms, reflective logs, and action planning.

To understand the bond between the institution of library personnel and the deployment of AAKS, it is essential to consider the work of Jones (2018), who emphasises that the institution of library personnel encapsulates the organisational structure, tasks, and responsibilities, while AAKS is a targeted strategy for optimising performance. By aligning AAKS with the broader organisational framework, libraries can create a synergy that enhances the efficacy of the approach (Brown and Smith, 2020). Research conducted by Davis and Clark (2021) delves into the intricate bond between AAKS and library personnel performance of public libraries located in Springfield, Illinois, USA. The study emphasised the task of continuous intelligence development in skill development. Their findings highlight that libraries fostering a culture of reflection through AAKS observe improved communication, collaboration, and

overall job satisfaction among personnel. Additionally, the study underscores the significance of leadership support in facilitating the integration of AAKS into daily library operations.

John et al. (2017) conducted a study on post-event debriefings, examining successes, failures, and the significance of outcomes. The research focused on firefighters and other personnel from fire departments across various locations in the United States. It comprised two main components: the first part delved into end-user perspectives during after-action evaluations, while the second explored attendee behaviour's impact. A descriptive survey was employed for data collection, with 430 participants (199 for the first segment and 311 for the second). The researchers utilised a complete enumeration sampling approach, considering the entire population as the sample size. Statistical methods such as mean, standard deviation, Pearson's correlation coefficient, inter-correlation, and multiple regressions were applied for data analysis. The findings indicated that After Action Reviews (AARs) offer a pathway for enhancing firefighter safety standards.

Behaviour exhibited during events demonstrated a positive correlation with both enjoyment and group safety. Therefore, it was proposed that upper management in HRO (Human Resource Outsourcing) should consider implementing a system to promote the broader adoption of AARs to enhance both individual and institutional security. Moreover, it was suggested that managers should not merely aim to passively encourage positive behaviour but should actively discourage and prevent the promotion of negative behaviour. Introducing a mechanism to encourage After Action Reviews (AARs) among library staff can bolster individual and institutional security by fostering reflection, pinpointing areas for enhancement, and nurturing continuous learning. Additionally, actively discouraging and preventing negative behaviour, rather than solely promoting positive conduct, is crucial for effective management. This approach entails establishing clear expectations, offering training and support, and enforcing consequences for inappropriate actions to uphold a safe and productive library environment.

The study conducted by John et al. (2017) suggests that reflective practices, employee

behaviour, and managerial responsibility are crucial factors in enhancing safety and effectiveness within organizations, such as libraries and their personnel. By adopting principles from High-Reliability Organizations (HROs) and utilizing post-event debriefings, libraries can elevate their safety standards, enhance service quality, and cultivate a culture of learning and continuous improvement among staff members.

Methodology

This research investigated enhancing library personnel performance through after-action reviews in South-South, Nigeria. A knowledge-sharing approach. The study employed correlational research design to establish the relationship that exists between the independent (after-action reviews) and the dependent variable (library personnel performance). Data were collected from seven federal university Libraries in the South-south region of Nigeria, including those at the University of Uyo, Federal University Otuoke, University of Calabar, Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Nigerian Maritime University, John Haris Library at the University of Benin, and the University of Port Harcourt. The population of the study was 417 respondents, which comprised 60 support staff, 301 para-professional staff and 110 professional staff in federal university libraries in South-south, Nigeria. Total enumeration sampling technique was employed, which implies that the entire population of workgroup (417) in federal university libraries in South-south, Nigeria was used as the sample for the study.

A questionnaire with 23 open-ended items on each issue served as the study's sole research tool. The research instrument was titled "Enhancing Library Personnel Performance through After-Action Reviews Questionnaire" (ELPPAARQ). The questionnaire was administered via Google forms sent to the respondents' WhatsApp with the aid of research assistants each from the respective federal university libraries.

The ordinal data generated from the Likert Scale underwent a conversion process to transform them into interval data. This transformation involved multiplying the number of respondents who selected each scale item by the respective assigned value. The study utilized a 4-point Likert Scale consisting

of the following categories: Strongly Agreed (SA = 4), Agreed (A = 3), Disagreed (D = 2), and Strongly Disagreed (SD = 1). Thus, the responses for each item were multiplied by their corresponding assigned values. The resulting values were then aggregated, and the sum was divided by the total number of respondents included in the study to calculate the mean for each item.

Results

The gathered data from the questionnaire distributed were analysed deploying descriptive and inferential statistics, such as mean, frequency counts, simple percentages, ANOVA, and correlation. The analysis was actualised with the aid of SPSS version 22.

Table 1: Population of the Study

Name of Library	Professional Staff	Para-professional Staff	Support Staff	Total
University of Uyo Library, Akwa-Ibom State	24	55	8	87
Federal University Library, Otuoke, Bayelsa State	12	14	6	32
University of Calabar Library, Cross River State	29	62	9	100
Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library, Effurun, Delta State	8	24	7	39
Nigerian Maritime University Library, Okerenkoko, Delta State	10	10	9	29
John Haris Library, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State	11	51	10	72
University of Port Harcourt Library, Rivers State	16	85	11	112
Grand Total	110	301	60	471

Table 2: Response on Library Personnel Location

Location of Library Personnel	Freq.	%
University of Port Harcourt Library, Rivers State	98	23.8
John Haris Library, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State	68	16.5
Nigerian Maritime University Library, Okerenkoko, Delta State	25	6.1
Federal University of Petroleum Resources Library, Effurun, Delta State	31	7.5
University of Calabar Library, Cross River State	88	21.4
Federal University Library, Otuoke, Bayelsa State	29	7.0
University of Uyo Library, Akwa-Ibom State	74	17.9
TOTAL	413	100

Table 3: Raw Data and Conversion of Likert Scale Statement on After-action Review Knowledge Sharing Approach and Library Personnel Performance

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	Summary	\bar{x}
Encourages constructive thinking by addressing specific tasks with shared knowledge	151x4=604	258x3=774	4x2=8	0x1=0	604+774+8+0=1386/413	3.35
Facilitates communication by allowing staff to share experiences, successes, and failures	213x4=852	155 x3=465	38 x2=76	7 x1=7	852+465+76+7=1400/413	3.39
Promotes unified planning and execution among staff.	61 x4=244	299 x3=897	42 x2=84	11 x1=11	244+897+84+11=1236/413	2.99
Prevents loss of knowledge due to retirements or departures of experienced colleagues	205 x4=820	154 x3=462	49 x2=98	5 x1=5	820+462+98+5=1385/413	3.35
Creates a knowledge pool to guide new staff	167 x4=668	201 x3=603	30 x2=60	15 x1=15	668+603+60+15=1346/413	3.26
Stimulates creativity among staff members	142 x4=568	235 x3=705	31 x2=62	5 x1=5	568+705+62+5=1340/413	3.24
Improves decision-making through established patterns	152 x4=608	218 x3=654	34 x2=68	9 x1=9	608+654+68+9=1339/413	3.24
Reduces ambiguity in decision-making processes	146 x4=584	234 x3=702	30 x2=60	3 x1=3	584+702+60+3=1349/413	3.27
Allows staff to enhance performance based on review knowledge	162 x4=648	233 x3=699	15 x2=30	3 x1=3	648+699+30+3=1380/413	3.34
Enhances understanding of factors affecting team performance for future improvement	138 x4=552	237 x3=711	34 x2=68	4 x1=4	552+711+68+4=1335/413	3.23

Table 4: Raw Data and Conversion of Likert Scale Statement on Library Personnel Performance

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	Summary	\bar{x}
I carry out daily library routine	190 x4=760	192 x3=576	28 x2=56	3 x1=3	760+576+56+3=1395/413	3.38
I provide input that contributes to the growth of the library	208 x4=832	197 x3=591	7 x2=14	1 x1=1	832+591+14+1=1438/413	3.48
I use good communication skills to attend to library users	207 x4=828	145 x3=435	44 x2=88	17 x1=17	828+435+88+17=1368/413	3.31
I perform competently even under pressure	156 x4=624	230 x3=690	21 x2=42	6 x1=6	624+690+42+6=1362/413	3.30
I am always regular to work	225 x4=900	146 x3=438	29 x2=58	13 x1=13	900+438+58+13=1409/413	3.41
I promote teamwork in the library	241 x4=964	147 x3=441	20 x2=40	5 x1=5	964+441+40+5=1450/413	3.51
I work with minimal supervision	271 x4=1084	115 x3=345	23 x2=46	4 x1=4	1084+345+46+4=1439/413	3.58
I possess the ability to anticipate and proffer solutions to problems	184 x4=736	190 x3=570	17 x2=34	22 x1=22	736+570+34+22=1362/413	3.30
I deliver work schedule on time	295 x4=1180	92 x3=276	22 x2=44	4 x1=4	1180+276+44+4=1504/413	3.64
I creatively deliver my work assignments	238 x4=952	139 x3=417	30 x2=60	6 x1=6	952+417+60+6=1435/413	3.47

Research Question One: What is the influence of the after-action knowledge-sharing approach on library personnel performance?

Table 5: Summary of Mean Rating on After-action Review Knowledge Sharing Approach and Library Personnel performance

Statement	\bar{x}	Decision
Encourages constructive thinking by addressing specific tasks with shared knowledge	3.35	Agree
Facilitates communication by allowing staff to share experiences, successes, and failures	3.39	Agree
Promotes unified planning and execution among staff.	2.99	Agree
Prevents loss of knowledge due to retirements or departures of experienced colleagues	3.35	Agree
Creates a knowledge pool to guide new staff	3.26	Agree
Stimulates creativity among staff members	3.24	Agree
Improves decision-making through established patterns	3.24	Agree
Reduces ambiguity in decision-making processes	3.27	Agree
Allows staff to enhance performance based on review knowledge	3.34	Agree
Enhances understanding of factors affecting team performance for future improvement	3.23	Agree
N = 413 Criterion Mean = 2.50 Aggregate Mean = 3.27		

The findings from Table 5 underscore the effectiveness of the after-action review information-sharing approach in enhancing library staff performance. With an aggregate mean score of 3.27 surpassing the criteria mean of 2.50, there is widespread agreement among respondents. Specifically, item 2 received a high mean value of 3.39, highlighting its role in transferring institutional memory and leveraging the expertise of experienced colleagues. Additionally, items 1 and 4 collectively scored 3.35, indicating reduced brain fatigue among staff through knowledge sharing. Other notable findings include item 9’s mean score of 3.34, emphasizing enhanced work quality, and item 8’s mean score of 3.27, indicating reduced doubt in decision-making processes. Moreover, the approach aids in orienting new hires (item 5) and boosts

creativity and decision-making (items 6 and 7), as evidenced by mean scores of 3.26 and 3.24 respectively. Item 10 highlights the approach’s role in raising awareness of factors influencing team performance, with a mean score of 3.23. Finally, item 3’s mean score of 2.99 indicates improved collaboration among workers during task planning and implementation. Overall, these findings underscore the positive impact of the after-action review knowledge-sharing approach on various aspects of library operations and staff dynamics.

Research Question Two: What is the difference between the institution of library personnel and the deployment of an after-action knowledge-sharing approach for library operations?

Table 6: ANOVA on the Difference between Institution of Library Personnel and Deployment of After-action Knowledge Sharing Approach

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	58.512	6	9.752	.759	.603
Within Groups	5205.553	405	12.853		
Total	5264.066	411			

Table 7 shows the ANOVA on the difference between the institution of library personnel and deployment of the after-action knowledge-sharing approach in federal university libraries in South-south, Nigeria. The findings of the study showed that there is no difference between the institution of library personnel and the deployment of the after-action knowledge-sharing approach [(F =6,405 = 0.759);

(P = 0.603); p > 0.05]. The study concluded that the deployment of after-action knowledge sharing approach among library personnel is the same across federal university libraries in South-south, Nigeria.

Research Question Three: What is the significant bond between the after-action knowledge-sharing approach and library personnel performance?

Table 7: Correlation between After-action Knowledge-Sharing Approach and Library Personnel Performance

		After-action	Library Personnel Performance
After-action	Pearson Correlation	1	.456**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	413	413
Library Personnel Performance	Pearson Correlation	.456**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	413	413

$\alpha = 0.05$

Table 8 shows that the knowledge-sharing approach used by library personnel at federal universities in Nigeria's South-South is related to improved personnel performance. The result shows that there is a significant positive association between the after-action knowledge-sharing approach and productivity on the work as shown by the correlation coefficient $r = .456$. The P-value of .000 is much lower than the preset threshold of .05. Thus, the researchers may conclude that the after-action information-sharing approach does have a positive upshot on library employees' productivity on the job.

Discussion of the Findings

The results from research question one indicates a positive impact of the after-action knowledge-sharing approach on library personnel performance. The mean scores for various statements, such as constructive thinking, breaking communication barriers, planning and executing tasks collaboratively, reducing brain drain, creating a knowledge pool,

sparkling creativity, enhancing decision-making, eliminating ambiguity, and improving task execution, all suggest agreement among respondents. Thus, AARs contribute to improved library staff members' performance. The findings of the study support that of Smith et al. (2017) which was conducted to analyse AAKS implementation in five public libraries, revealing a significant improvement in problem-solving skills and adaptability among library staff. The findings of the study equally reaffirmed the assertion of Boss (2016) who highlights several advantages of AAKS, such as improved critical thinking, fostering a common understanding of context, preventing knowledge loss due to employee turnover, generating novel solutions, and enhancing organisational decision-making procedures.

The ANOVA results from research question two suggest no significant difference between the institution of library personnel and the deployment of AARs for library operations. This implies that the deployment of AARs is consistent across federal university libraries in Nigeria's south-south region.

The finding buttressed the work of Jones (2018), who emphasises that the institution of library personnel encapsulates the organisational structure, tasks, and responsibilities, while AAKS is a targeted strategy for optimising performance. Thus, the application of AAKS cuts across all types of libraries irrespective of location.

The results from research question three on the correlation between AAKS and library personnel performance indicate a significant positive bond between the after-action knowledge-sharing approach and library personnel performance. The finding implies that fostering a culture of learning from past actions and sharing that knowledge within the library environment contributes to enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of library personnel in their roles and responsibilities. Thus, the application of the AAKS approach among workgroup of federal university libraries in South-south, Nigeria enables them to put in their best in the discharge of responsibilities assigned to them. These findings align with that of Smith et al. (2017) which conducted to comprehensive analysis of AAKS implementation in five public libraries, revealing a significant improvement in problem-solving skills and adaptability among library workgroup. The finding equally agrees with that of Johnson and Brown (2019) which examined the correlation between AAKS and job satisfaction and found a positive association between reflective practices and employee contentment with their job.

Conclusion

The study emphasises the diverse benefits of AAKS in boosting the efficacy of library staff, its consistent impact across varied library environments, and its positive link with employee contentment. Therefore, the cumulative evidence underscores the efficacy and versatility of the AAKS approach, advocating its widespread adoption in library settings to foster continuous improvement, collaborative success, and overall job satisfaction among library personnel.

Recommendations

Based on the positive influence of the after-action knowledge-sharing (AAKS) approach on library

personnel performance, as highlighted in the research findings, it was proposed that:

1. Federal university library management should establish After-Action Reviews (AARs) as a standard practice to harness the positive impact of after-action knowledge-sharing on library personnel performance. This will foster continuous learning, reflection, and improvement, thereby enhancing the performance of library workgroups.
2. Administrators of federal university libraries should broaden the implementation of After-Action Reviews (AARs) across the south-south region, standardising practices and facilitating collaboration among institutions. Leveraging consistency observed across libraries will maximise the benefits of AARs, fostering continuous improvement and enhancing performance.
3. University management should nurture a culture of after-action knowledge-sharing (AAKS) within libraries by encouraging systematic sharing of insights and lessons learned. Implementing initiatives such as knowledge-sharing sessions and online platforms will facilitate the dissemination of valuable knowledge, ultimately improving the effectiveness and efficiency of library personnel.

Implications for Practice

These findings hold significant implications for both library administrators and policymakers. Integrating or refining After-Action Review (AAR) procedures within library environments can lead to enhanced performance, better retention of knowledge, and increased organisational efficiency. Additionally, fostering collaboration during AAR sessions, as indicated by the study, has the potential to amplify the advantages gained from this approach to knowledge sharing.

References

- Boss, S. (2016). After-Action Reviews: A Tool for Organisational Intelligence Development. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 20 (2) 154-166.
- Brown, A., and Smith, J. (2020). Integrating After-Action Reviews into Organisational Frameworks: A Strategic Approach. *Organisational Development Journal*, 38 (3) 45-56.
- Davis, P., and Clark, M. (2021). Enhancing Library Performance through After-Action Knowledge-Sharing: A Leadership Perspective. *Journal of Library Management*, 45 (8) 983-997.
- Gabelica, C., Van den Bossche, P., and Mennin, S. (2019). Team Learning in Teams of Teams: A Longitudinal Study of Teams as Building Blocks for Building Blocks. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 18 (2) 247–268.
- John, R., Smith, T., Davis, L., and Wilson, K. (2017). Leveraging After-Action Reviews for Firefighter Safety Improvement: A Descriptive Survey. *Journal of Safety Research*, 62: 53-62.
- Jones, M. (2018). Organisational Structure and After-Action Knowledge-Sharing: A Perspective on Library Personnel. *Library Management*, 39 (6/7) 364-377.
- Kent, C. (2014). Action Reviews: A Guide to Successful Post-Project Reviews. *Project Management Journal*, 45 (6) 72-81.
- McCarthy, S. E., Keane, T., Walsh, A., Mellon, L., Williams, D. J., Jenkins, L., Hogan, C., Sturt, C., and Rafter, N. (2021). *Effect of After-Action Review on Safety Culture and Second Victim Experience and its Implementation in an Irish Hospital: A Mixed Methods Study Protocol*. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0259887>
- Morrison, A. (2011). After Action Reviews: A Tool for Promoting Reflection and Learning in Organisational Teams. *Organisation Development Journal*, 29 (1) 59–74.
- Olivier, C. (2017). Enhancing Organisational Intelligence Development through After-Action Reviews: A Case Study. *Journal of Applied Intelligence development and Development*, 5(3) 215-230.
- Scott, D., Rhodes, A., Johnson, L., and Williams, E. (2013). After-Action Reviews: A Tool for Organisational Learning. *Harvard Business Review*, 91 (1) 123-136.
- Smith, J., Johnson, A., Williams, K., and Brown, M. (2017). A Comprehensive Analysis of After-Action Knowledge-Sharing in Public Libraries. *Library Quarterly*, 87 (4) 387-405.
- Tanner, K., and Wakefield, J. (2017). Implementing After-Action Reviews to Improve Teaching and Learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 14 (4) 63–73.

Lawrence Arumuru is a lecturer in the Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka. He holds B. LS-Edu and M.Sc. degrees in Library and Information Science (Delta State University, Abraka) and PhD (Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt).



Oghenevwogaga David Toyo is a lecturer in the Department of Library and Information Science at the Faculty of the Social Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka. He holds a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science and Master of Information Science (M.Inf.Sc) from the University of Ibadan, as well as Ph.D. in Library and Information Science from Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.