

SELF-EFFICACY AND RESILIENCE AS DETERMINANTS OF INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS OF LIBRARY PERSONNEL IN STATE UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH-WEST, NIGERIA

By

WILLIAM P. TABUKE

Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan,
Nigeria

tabukewilliampeter@gmail.com; +2348074656573

OLUWAYINKA E. SOLANKE (CLN)

Library Unit, University of Medical Sciences, Ondo State, Nigeria

solankevmka@gmail.com; +2347066359459

MAGNUS O. IGBINOVIA¹ (CLN)

Department of Library, Archival and Information Studies, University of Ibadan,
Nigeria

Infor.migbinovia@gmail.com; Tel.: +2347061643107

Abstract

The study was conducted to examine self efficacy and resilience as determinants of information literacy skills among library personnel in South-west region of Nigeria. Descriptive survey research design was used for the study with a population of 140 library personnel across the 8 state university libraries in the region. Due to the manageable population size, total enumeration was adopted as the sampling technique. Questionnaire was used to elicit data from the 140 personnel out of which 119 responses were found suitable for the analysis, using descriptive statistics, correlation and multiple regression. The findings reveal a high level of information literacy skills, self efficacy and resilience. Both self efficacy and resilience had a significant positive relationship to information literacy skills. Also there is a significant positive relationship between self efficacy and resilience, and the linear combination of both had joint significant positive relationship to information literacy skills. The research concludes that there is a need for high information literacy skills among library personnel which is determined by self efficacy and resilience.

Keywords: Library personnel, Information literacy skills, Resilience, Self efficacy

Background of the Study

In a highly dynamic and complex society, the library as an intellectual hub is experiencing a new dimension of quest for information. Library users are becoming independent information seekers who resort to a librarian only when they encounter difficulties for which they expect the librarian to proffer solutions. Thus the librarian offers information services that bring succor to library users, invariably creating satisfaction and subsequent sense of loyalty from the users towards the library. Users' satisfaction of library services like other services results in high turn-over intention which is necessary in boosting the image of the library in the face of diverse competition (alternate sources of information). It is thus highly imperative for librarians to be information literate, and empowered to meet the myriad needs of library users.

Information literacy stands today as a major focus and purpose of librarianship (Marcum, 2002) even as the librarian is concerned with the general management of information to meet the information need of their clientele in a fast changing dispensation (Igbinovia, 2016). Information literacy is an essential element of the academic library's mission (Maughan, 2001) and as such should be developed by every personnel in the library. Information literacy according to Bawden (2001) is the competencies an individual summons to locate, retrieve, evaluate, select, and use information sources.

The importance of becoming an information literate librarian is emphasized in ensuring effectiveness and efficiency in handling information and information resources. Curzon (2004) opines that information literacy supports critical thinking since it emphasizes assessing search results for quality and relevance, and evaluating information choices for reliability, validity, authority and timeliness before making judgments based upon them. By implication, information literate librarian thinks critically around information management. Rockman (2004) asserts that regardless of an individual's great technical skills, attractive attitude and deep commitment to excellence, there will be no successful outcome without a high level of information literacy. According to the author, what is needed in the knowledge age particularly in the 21st century, are people with ability to absorb, analyse, integrate, effectively convey and use information to bring real value to everything they undertake.

Librarians seek to develop their information literacy, which is however determined by personal psychological factors, including self-efficacy and resilience. By implication, the self-efficacy and resilience of library personnel will predict their level of information literacy which is crucial to effective and efficient delivery of library services. Self-efficacy and resilience are two

measurable constructs under psychological capital (PsyCap) worthy of scholarly attention. The term psychological capital originates from the emerging positive organisational behaviour (POB) literature. Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio (2007) define PsyCap as "an individual's positive psychological state of development that is characterized by (i) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (ii) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (iii) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (iv) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success.

Objectives and Hypotheses

The main objective of the study is to investigate how self-efficacy and resilience as constructs in PsyCap helps library personnel in state university libraries in South-west, Nigeria develop their information skills. The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. Determine the level of efficacy of library personnel in selected academic libraries in the state universities libraries under study;
2. Determine the level of resilience of library personnel in selected state university libraries;
3. Examine the level of information literacy of library personnel in selected academic libraries.

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study at .05 level of significance:

- Ho1: There is no significant positive relationship between efficacy and information literacy of library personnel;
- Ho2; There is no significant positive relationship between resilience and information literacy of library personnel;
- Ho3: There is no significant positive relationship between efficacy and resilience of library personnel;
- Ho4: The linear combination of efficacy and resilience do not have joint significant positive relationship on information literacy of library personnel.

Literature Review

Librarians are saddled with the social responsibility of meeting the diverse information needs of their clientele using various information resources. As a result, there is the need for them to become information literate librarians. Igbinovia (2016) asserts that information is a necessary resource for the development of an academic librarian, and that reliable information is the chief

corner stone for building the expertise and practice of librarian's performance. While using information to render service, the librarian could encounter an overabundance of information where his capacity to evaluate it is exceeded and here lies the need for information literacy proposed by Kirinic (2012) to mean the learned techniques and skills for utilizing the wide range of information tools as well as primary sources in molding information solutions to their problems.

Information literacy according to CILIP (2004) is "knowing when and why you need information, where to find it, and how to evaluate, use and communicate it in an ethical manner", which is the chief corner stone of lifelong learning (Byerly and Brodie, 1999). It can be implied from Byerly and Brodie (1999) that to become an information literate librarian, librarians must learn how to learn with a great amount of independence, both as a skill and as a habit; and information literacy stands today as a major focus and purpose of librarianship, (Igbinovia, 2016). This has become very necessary given the observed paradigm shift of library users from being passive information consumers to active one (Spiranec & Zorica, 2010). Therefore an information literate librarian is a lifelong learner and lifelong learning according to Lau (2006) is critical to the success of any individual in the global information society. Lau (2006) asserts that the information literacy standards for becoming information literates or effective learners include three basic components of access, evaluation and use of information.

Information literacy connotes an understanding of the set of abilities that enable individuals recognize when information is needed and have the capacity to effectively locate, evaluate and use the needed information (American Library Association, 1989). . Information literacy is about people interacting, engaging, working with information in many contexts, either individually or in community, (Bruce & Hughes, 2010). According to Johnston and Webber (2003), information literacy is the adoption of appropriate information behaviour to obtain, through whatever channel or medium, information well fitted to information needs, together with critical awareness of the importance of wise and ethical use of information in society.

Information literacy has five specific competency standards known as the information literacy competence (ILC) which is given by ALA in Igbinovia (2016) as: identify when information is needed; access the needed information; evaluate the information found; apply the information to accomplish a specific purpose and understand the economic, legal and social issues in using information in any context. Thus an information literate person has a deep awareness, connection and fluency with the information

environment. Information literate people are engaged, enabled, enriched, and embodied by social, procedural and physical information that constitutes an information universe, (Lloyd, 2004V Moreover, beyond the acquisition of skills, information literacy "is an all encompassing process by which one interacts with information in diverse formats and is complemented by the transformative effect of this experience, (Andretta, 2007).

It can therefore be reasoned that librarians as information professional in an information age require high level information literacy skills for effective service delivery. However, from preliminary observation, information literacy skills of librarians are affected by several psychological factors including the self efficacy and resilience of the individual. It is pertinent to state that self efficacy and resilience are both constructs of psychological capital which characterise an individual's positive psychological state of development, with others such as optimism and hope (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

The concept of self-efficacy was given face lift in literature from the Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1977), which posits that an individual's sense of self-efficacy with regards to a particular task has four sources: a history of successful performance of the task; vicarious learning through observation of others performing the task; persuasion by others and affective arousal. The author defines self-efficacy as a belief in one's own capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to attain a goal, which according to Zimmerman (1996) is measured by degree of certainty that one can perform given tasks. In essence, self-efficacy refers the belief in one's ability to accomplish a task and involves development of an "orchestration capacity" for successful accomplishment (Gist and Mitchell 1992).

Self efficacy is an important factor that could affect commitment to goals (Igbokwe, 2011) which leads to success at both the individual or organizational levels. High self-efficacy also allows people to select challenging settings, explore their environment or create new ones (Schwarzer and Schmitz, 2005). This implies that people with high self efficacy do not dodge seemingly difficult or strange tasks. Rather, individuals with high self efficacy choose challenging tasks, develop complicated ways to overcome the obstacles, (Keles, 2011), and become persistent and success-oriented in terms of difficulties (Shahnawaz and Jafri, 2009).

Self efficacy is a factor which influences human functioning (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 2002) including information literacy skills. Kurbanoglu (2009) asserts that while information literacy skill ensures lifelong learning, it does not solely guarantee success and as such the individual should develop self confidence

(self efficacy) in the skills, showing a positive correlation between information literacy skill and self efficacy. This correlates the findings of Bandura (1986) that efficacy perceptions develop from a gradual attainment of skills and experience over time. Nahl and Meer (1997) found a positive relationship between students' self-efficacy and their search performance, which is a part of information literacy skills. Therefore the authors conclude that an individual with high self efficacy is able to develop his information literacy skills effectively and a highly information literate person easily builds confidence on his skills. However, another psychological capital that could possibly influence the information literacy skills of an individual is resilience.

The concept of resilience was earlier conceptualized by (Luthans et al 2007) as an ability to sustain an effort when beset by problems and adversity in a bid to attain success. Lesley (2007) notes that emotional resilience and getting along, were significantly correlated with a measure of information literacy competency, Kurbanoglu, Akkoyunlu, and Umay (2006) note that self-efficacy beliefs determine how long individuals will persevere and how resilient they will be in the face of difficulties and how much effort they will expend on an activity. The higher the sense of efficacy, the greater the effort, persistence, and resilience (Pajares, 2002) which are two factors crucial for information problem solving, self-regulated learning and lifelong learning

Research Methods and Procedure

The descriptive survey research design was used for the study comprising of 140 library personnel (professional librarians and library officers) from eight (8) state university libraries in South-west region of Nigeria namely: Adekunle Ajasin University, Ondo State; Ekiti State University, Ekiti State; Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Oyo State; Lagos State University, Lagos State; Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State; Ondo State University of Science and Technology, Ondo State; Osun State University, Osun State and Tai-Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State. This population of 140 library personnel was used as the sampling size; hence the sampling technique used for the study is the total enumeration which permits a high level of generalization of the research findings to the population under study.

A structured questionnaire titled Self efficacy, resilience and information literacy skills questionnaire (SERILSQ), was used to elicit data from the respondents. The questionnaire consists of four sections (A-D). Section A elicits data on the demographics of the respondents. Section B and C contain self efficacy and resilience scales respectively with six (6) items each, an

adaptation from the psychological capital scale developed by Luthans, et al (2007). The items were measured with a four likert (4-1) scale of strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) and strongly disagree (SD) respectively.

Section D contains information literacy skills scale with twenty (20) items, an adaptation from the information literacy questionnaire developed by Kurbanoglu, Akkoyunlu and Umay (2004) with an original 40 items scale. The items were measured with a four likert (4-1) scale of strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) and strongly disagree (SD) respectively.

In a bid to ascertain the reliability of the scales, a pilot study was conducted, Data from this study were analysed which yielded a cronbach alpha of 0.87 for self efficacy, 0.72 for resilience and 0.91 for information literacy skills. Given the above results, the scales for each variable of self efficacy, resilience and information skills are considered fit for the study.

The statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) was used for the analysis. Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentages were used to analyse research questions while inferential statistics such as correlation and multiple regressions were used for the five hypotheses which were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Presentation of Results

A total of 140 copies of the research instrument were distributed, out of which 119 (0.85%) were retrieved and used for analysis. The response rate of 85% is considered adequate for analysis since the standard acceptable for most research work is 60% (Dude, Minish-Majanja, & Cloete, 2010). The retrieved data for analysis is thus consider adequate for the study and generalization of findings.

Research Objectives Three research objectives were raised for this study to find out the level of self efficacy, resilience and information literacy of library personnel as well as how self efficacy and resilience contributes to library personnel becoming information literate. The results are presented below in line with the objectives raised for the study:

1. Determine the level of self-efficacy of library personnel in selected academic libraries

Table 1: Self-efficacy of Academic Library Personnel

S/N	Self-efficacy (Confidence)	SA(%)	A(%)	D(%)	SD(%)	Mean
1	I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues	46(38.7)	70(58.8)	2(1.7)	1(0.8)	3.35
3	I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution	47(39.5)	67(56.3)	5(4.2)	-	3.35
4	I feel confident contributing for discussions about the library's strategy	43(36.1)	70(58.8)	3(2.5)	3(2.5)	3.29
5	I feel confident contacting library users to discuss problems	44(37.0)	67(56.3)	6(5.0)	1(0.8)	3.28
5	I feel confident discussing my work area with the management	39(32.8)	74(62.5)	4(3.4)	2(1.7)	3.2
6	I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area	36(30.3)	78(65.5)	4(3.4)	1(0.8)	3.25
	N = 119; Grand Mean=19.78					

Table 1 reveals that a higher percentage, with the mean of 3.35, of the respondents felt confident presenting information to a group of colleagues and also confident of analyzing a long-term problem to find solution. This is closely followed by respondent who felt confident contributing for discussions about the library's strategy; with the mean of 3.29. However, a lower percentage of the respondents felt confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area and discussing their work area with the management; with the mean of 3.25 and 3.26 respectively.

In order to ascertain the level of self-efficacy of the respondents, a test of norm was conducted and the scale between 1 -8 shows a low level, 9-16 shows a moderate level while, 17 - 24 shows a high level of self-efficacy. The overall mean score for the self-efficacy is "19.78" which fall between the scale "17 - 24". This shows that the level of self-efficacy of the library personnel was high.

2. Determine the level of resilience of library personnel in selected academic libraries

Table 2: Resilience of Academic Library Personnel

S / N	Resilience Items	SA(%)	A(%)	D(%)	SD(%)	Mean
1	I can get through difficult times at work because I've experienced difficulty before	35(29.4)	72(60.5)	8(6.7)	4(3.4)	3.16
2	I won't hesitate to take my own decision at work if necessary	26(21.8)	80(67.2)	13(10.9)	-	3.11
3	I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work	25(21.0)	84(70.6)	8(6.7)	2(1.7)	3.11
4	I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job	38(31.9)	56(47.9)	21(17.6)	4(3.4)	3.08
5	I usually take stressful things at work in stride	24(20.1)	76(63.9)	16(13.4)	3(2.5)	3.0
6	When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it and moving on	19(15.9)	26(21.8)	54(45.4)	20(16.8)	2.3
	N = 119; Grand Mean = 17.85					

Table 2 reveals that a higher percentage of the respondents, with the mean of 3.16 can get through difficult times at work because they had experienced difficulty before. This is closely followed by respondents who affirmed that they would not hesitate to take their own decision at work if necessary as revealed by mean 3.11. This is closely followed by mean 3.08 of respondents who feel they can handle many things at a time at their job. Only a few, as revealed by mean 2.37, indicated that when they have a setback at work, they have trouble recovering from it and moving on. This means that it was not difficult for the respondents to recover from any setback they are likely to experience at work.

In order to ascertain the level of resilience of the respondents, a test of norm was conducted and the scale between 1-8 shows a low level, 9-16 shows a moderate level while, 17 - 24 shows a high level of resilience. The overall mean score for the resilience is "17.85" which fall between the scale "17 - 24". This shows that the level of resilience of the library personnel was high.

3. Examine the level of information literacy skill of library personnel in selected academic libraries

Table 3: Information Literacy Skills of Academic Library Personnel

S/N	Resilience Items	SA(%)	A(%)	D(%)	SD(%)	Mean
1	Determine the authoritativeness, correctness and reliability of the information sources	44(37.0)	65(54.6)	9(7.6)	1(0.8)	3.28
2	Evaluate information critically	39(32.8)	74(62.2)	5(4.2)	1(0.8)	3.27
3	Select information most appropriate to the information need	40(33.6)	67(56.3)	6(5.0)	6(5.0)	3.19
4	Identify points of agreement and disagreement among sources	34(28.6)	73(61.3)	10(8.4)	2(1.7)	3.17
5	Evaluate www sources	29(24.4)	74(62.2)	15(12.6)	1(0.8)	3.10
	Interpreting, synthesizing, and using information					
6	Interpret the visual information graphs, tables, diagrams)	32(26.9)	79(66.4)	8(6.7)	-	3.20
7	Synthesise newly gathered information with previous information	32(26.9)	76(63.9)	11(9.2)	-	3.18
8	Synthesize and summarize information gathered from different sources	27(22.7)	82(68.9)	7(5.9)	3(2.5)	3.12
9	Paraphrase the information	30(25.2)	72(60.5)	13(10.9)	4(3.4)	3.08
	Communicating Information					
10	Choose a format (i.e. written, oral, visual) appropriate to communicate with the audience	44(37.0)	69(58.0)	6(5.0)	-	3.32
11	Determine the content and form the parts (introduction, conclusion) of a presentation (written, oral) Prepare a bibliography	39(32.8)	75(63.0)	5(4.2)	-	3.29
12	Prepare bibliography		61(51.3)	11(9.2)	1(0.8)	3.28
13	Determine the level appropriate to communicate with the audience	35(29.4)	78(65.5)	4(3.4)	2(1.7)	3.23
14	Make citations and use quotations within the text					
15	Create bibliographic records for different kinds of materials (i.e. books, articles, web pages)	42(35.3)	62(52.1)	14(11.8)	1(0.8)	3.22
16	Make an oral presentation	36(30.2)	74(62.2)	6(5.0)	3(2.5)	3.20
17	Write a research paper	34(28.6)	75(63.0)	9(7.6)	1(0.8)	3.19
18	Create bibliographic records and organize the bibliography	38(31.9)	67(56.3)	12(10.1)	2(1.7)	3.19
	Evaluating the product and process					
19	Learn from my information problem solving experience and improve my information literacy skill	34(28.6)	79(66.4)	4(3.4)	2(1.7)	3.22
20	Criticize the quality of my information seeking process and its products	24(20.2)	76(63.9)	15(12.6)	4(3.4)	3.01
	N = 119; Grand Mean = 63.97					

Table 3 reveals the response rate on the level of information literacy skill of library personnel in selected academic libraries. The table reveals a mean of

3.28 respondents who indicated that they could determine the authoritativeness, correctness and reliability of the information sources. Similarly on interpreting, synthesizing, and using information, the mean of 3.20, indicated respondents could interpret visual information (i.e. graphs, tables, diagrams).

In addition, a mean of 3.32 revealed respondents that affirmed they can choose a format (i.e. written, oral, visual) appropriate to communicate with the audience. In evaluating the product and process, a mean of 3.22 revealed respondents that can learn from their information problem solving experience and improve their information literacy skill.

In order to determine the level of information literacy skill of the library personnel, a test of norm was conducted and the scale between 1-27 shows a low level, 28 - 54 shows a moderate level while, 55 - 80 shows a high level of information literacy skill. The overall mean score for the information literacy skill is "63.97" which fall between the scale "55 - 80". This shows that the level of information literacy skill of the library personnel was high.

Hypotheses

In order to test the relationship between variables used in the study as guided by literature, four null hypotheses were generated and tested at 0.05 level of significance and the results of the analysis of data in view of these hypotheses are respectively stated below;

Ho1: There is no significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and information literacy of library personnel.

Table 4: Relationship between self-efficacy and information literacy of library personnel

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	r	Sig. (P)	Remark
Self-efficacy Information literacy	19.78 63.97	1.782 7.867	119	.442**	.000	Sig.

Table 4 presents information on relationship between self-efficacy and information literacy of library personnel. Findings show that self-efficacy has significant positive relationship with information literacy of the library personnel ($r = .442^{**}$, $N = 119$ and $P < 0.05$). This means that for every level of increase in self-efficacy, there is improvement on the level of information literacy skills of the library personnel. Therefore, Ho1 is rejected.

Ho2: There is no significant positive relationship between resilience and information literacy of library personnel.

Table 5: Relationship between resilience and information literacy of library personnel

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	Sig. (P)	Remark
Resilience Information literacy	17.85 63.97	1.821 7.867	119	.036**	.002	Sig.

** Significant $P < .05$

Information on the relationship between resilience and information literacy skills of the library personnel is presented in Table 5. Findings show that resilience has significant positive relationship with information literacy skills of the library personnel ($r = .036^{**}$, $N = 119$ and $P < 0.05$). This means that as resilience increase, information literacy skills of the library personnel also improve. Therefore, Ho2 is rejected.

Ho3: There is no significant positive relationship between efficacy and resilience of library personnel.

Table 6: Relationship between self-efficacy and resilience of library personnel

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	r	Sig. (P)	Remark
Self-efficacy Resilience	19.78 17.85	1.782 1.821	119	.238*	.032	Sig.

** Significant $p < .05$

Table 6 presents information on relationship between self-efficacy and resilience of library personnel. Findings show that self-efficacy has significant positive relationship with resilience of the library personnel ($r = .238^{**}$, $N = 119$ and $P < 0.05$). This means that for every level of increase in self-efficacy, there is increase in the level of resilience of the library personnel. Therefore, Ho3 is rejected.

Ho4: The linear combination of self-efficacy and resilience will not have joint significant positive relationship on information literacy of library personnel.

Table 7: Multiple Regression analysis showing the linear combination of self-efficacy and resilience on information literacy of library personnel

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Stand. Coefficient	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta Contribution		
(Constant)	9.257	1.811		7.194	.000
Self-efficacy	.235	.048	.143	2.538	.000
Resilience	.032	.045	.049	.560	.007

**Significant $P < .05$

Table 7 reveals the joint prediction of self-efficacy and resilience to the information literacy of the library personnel, expressed as beta weights, viz: self-efficacy ($\beta = .143$, $P < .05$) and resilience ($\beta = .049$, $P < .05$). Hence, self-efficacy and resilience jointly and significantly predict the information literacy skills of the library personnel. However, self-efficacy has the highest prediction ratio. Therefore, Ho4 is hereby rejected.

Discussion of Findings

The study showed that library personnel in the South-west region of Nigeria have a high level of self efficacy which was highly influenced by their high level of confidence in presenting information at a group of colleagues and in analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution among others. This finding corroborates that of Adio and Popoola (2010) who carried out a study on librarians in federal universities in Nigeria and found a high level of self efficacy. From the study of Bandura (1997), it can be implied that library personnel understudied to an extent have recorded mastery experience (past experiences of success or command), vicarious experience (observing the successes and failures of others), possess good verbal persuasion and psychological state or emotional activation. It can be implied that the library personnel are very likely to be committed to their carrier since Adio and Popoola (2010) found a positive relationship between self efficacy and carrier commitment. Also it can be implied that the library personnel understudied are very likely to perform highly in their job (Burgoon et al 2012).

Also the study revealed a high level of resilience among library personnel in the Southwest region of Nigeria induced mainly by their ability to their ability to get through difficult times at work because of their prior experience. This implies that the personnel in the understudied libraries are likely to experience certain outcomes associated with high resilience among which according to (Clements, 2011) include increase job motivation, satisfaction and productivity. In a bid to foster resilient behaviour among personnel, Denhardt & Denhardt (2010) note that the organizational culture must be such that encourages innovation, learning from failures, cooperation and collaboration, necessary to engender trust and a psychologically safe environment to take risk.

Moreover the study explored the level of information literacy skills of library personnel in South-west region of Nigeria and found a high level which was induced mainly by their ability to choose the right format to communicate with, determine the content and form he part of a presentation as well as determine appropriate information sources. This finding corroborates that of Igbinovia (2016) who in his study on academic library personnel in Edo State, Nigeria found a high level of information literacy competence, While Irawati (2007) found a good level of information literacy competence among library and information science students who will eventually become personnel of various libraries. These findings are expected given the high relevance of information literacy to librarianship in its focus and purpose (Marcum, 2002).

The study also revealed a positive correlation between the independent variables (self efficacy and resilience) and dependent variable (information literacy skills). Also both independent variables were positively correlated and they will jointly predict information literacy competence with self efficacy exerting a higher ratio of prediction. While previous study shows positive relationship between self efficacy and information literacy (Adetoro, Simisaye and Oyefuga, 2010) and between self efficacy and resilience (Kurbanogiu, 2009), The implication of this that for library personnel to continually mention a high level of information literacy skills, which is pertinent to effective librarianship, they must continually develop their psychological capital especially self efficacy and resilience.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study which was carried out to* examine self efficacy and resilience as determinants of information literacy skills of library personnel revealed that the understudied personnel had high level of information literacy skills accounted for by the high level of self efficacy and resilience. This is particularly of interest considering the need for library personnel to become information

literate in a highly competitive work environment. Given the dynamism of information and by extension the information profession, there is need for library personnel to constantly improve their information literacy skills with special focus on psychological determinants of self efficacy and resilience.

In light of the findings above, the following recommendations are made concerning library personnel in South-west region of Nigeria and beyond:

1. Library personnel should continually engage in self development in the areas of information literacy and psychological capital of self efficacy and resilience.
2. Library management should ensure an organizational climate that favors the development of personnel psychological capital of self efficacy and resilience which will invariably influence their information literacy skills.
3. An information literacy skill of today might become obsolete tomorrow. To this end library management should expose personnel to international best practice of information literacy and ensure continuous upgrade of such skills through workshops, conferences and seminars.
4. Library management should set up systems to reward any personnel who display a high level of information literacy skills towards meeting the library's objectives.
5. Library management should create a conducive work environment where personnel can learn and unlearn, communicate freely, try new things and be free to make mistakes that will form part of their mastery and vicarious experience.

References

- Adio, Gboyega and Popoola, S.O. (2010), "Demographic Variables and Self-efficacy as Factors Influencing Career Commitment of Librarians in Federal University Libraries in Nigeria". *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). Paper 329. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/329>
- American Library Association's Presidential Committee on Information Literacy (1989). Presidential Committee on Information Literacy: final report. Available at www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlpubs/whitepapers/presidential.htm and research, Riverina: Charles Sturt University, Centre for Information Studies. 177-192.

- Andretta, S. (Ed). (2007). Change and challenge: Information literacy for the 21st century.
- Adelaide: Auslib Press Andretta, S. (Ed). (2007). *Change and challenge: Information literacy for the 21st century*. Adelaide: Auslib Press
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy. Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84,191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Burgoon, J.M., Mecce, J.L. and Granger, N.A. (2012).Self-efficacy's influence on student academic achievement in the medical autonomy curriculum. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 5,(5), 249-25
- Byerly, G. and Brodie, C. S. (1999). Information literacy skills models: defining the choices. In *Learning and libraries in an information age: principles and practice*. Ed. Barbara K. Stripling, Englewood: Littleton: Libraries Unlimited, p. 54-82.
- CILJP (2004). Information Literacy: definition, [online]. Available at: http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/adult_literacy/iltiterate_adults_in_england [Accessed 3 September 2015]
- Clements, R. (2011). Improving Organisational Performance by Building Emotional Resilience. Closing the Loop Conference 2011, Centre for Corporate Health -Workplace Stress Experts
- Cuszon, S. (2004). Developing faculty-librarian partnerships in information literacy. In I. R. Associates (Ed.), *Integrating information literacy into the higher education curriculum: Practical models for San Francisco*: Jossey-Bass.
- Denhardt, J. And Denhardt, R. (2010). Building Organisational Resilience and Adaptive Management, Ch 16 in Handbook of Adult Resilience. J.W. Reich, AJ. Zautra, and J.S. Hall (eds.). The Guilford Press, New York.

- Gist, M., & Mitchell, T. (1992). Self-efficacy: a theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 183-211.
- Igbinovia, M. O. (2016). Emotional Self Awareness and Information Literacy Competence as Correlates of Task Performance of Academic Library Personnel. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Paper 1370.
- Igbckwe, P.C. (2011). Job satisfaction and performance of librarians in federal university libraries in south east Nigeria. A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka
- KELES, Hatice Necla (2011), "Pozitif Psikolojik Sermaye: Tanimi, Bitesenleri ve Orgut Yonetimine Etkileri", *Organizasyon ve Yonetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3 (2), 343-350
- Kirinic, V. (2012). Information literacy: definitions, standards and assessment, related concepts. ERASMUS mobility 20011-2012, Graz University.
- Kurbanoglu, S, (2009). Self-efficacy: an alternative approach to the evaluation of information literacy. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries International Conference, Chania Crete Greece.6*
- Kurbanoglu, S. S., Akkoyunlu, B and Umay, A. (2006). Developing the information literacy self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Documentation* 62(6), 730-743.
- Lau, J. (2006). Guidelines on information literacy for lifelong learning. Final draft, IFLA.
- Lesley S. J. F. (2007), "Developmental Social-Emotional Behavior and Information Literacy," in *Information and Emotion: The Emergent Affective Paradigm in Information Behavior Research and Theory*, eds. Diane Nahl and Dania Bilal (Medford, NJ: Information Today, 2007), 107.
- Lloyd, A., (2004). Working (in)formation: conceptualizing information literacy in the workplace. In: *Proceedings of 3rd International Lifelong Learning Conference. 13-16 June 2004*. Rockhampton, Queensland; Central Queensland University Press. 218-224.

- Luthans, F., **Youssef, C. M.**, and Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Marcum, J.W. (2002). Rethinking information literacy. *The library quarterly* 72(1),1-26
- Rockman, I. (2004). Introduction: The importance of information literacy. In I. R. Associates (Ed.), *Integrating information literacy into the higher education curriculum; Practical models for transformation* (pp. 1-28). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwarzer, R. & Schmitz, G.S. (2005). Perceived self-efficacy and teacher burnout: a longitudinal study in ten schools. Research paper. Freie Universitat Berlin, Germany.
- Shahnawaz, M. G., and Jafri, M. H. (2009). Psychological capital as predictor of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 35, 78-84.
- Spiranec, S., and Zorica, M. B. (2010). Information literacy 2.0: hype or discourse refinement? *Journal of Documentation* 66.1: 140-153.
- Zimmerman, B.J.(1996). Self-efficacy and educational development, in Bandura, A.(eds.) *self-efficacy in changing societies*, New York: Cambridge University Press.