# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background to the Study

Knowledge sharing is referred to as activities that involve transferring or disseminating knowledge from one person, group or organization to another. It is the fundamental means through which employees can contribute to knowledge application, innovation, and ultimately the competitive advantage of an organization (Jackson et al., 2016). The authors further reiterated that knowledge sharing between employees allows organizations to exploit and capitalize on knowledge-based resources. According to Teimouri et al. (2011) and Onifade (2015), knowledge sharing is the process by which knowledge held by an individual is converted into a form that can be understood, absorbed and used by other individuals. In addition, knowledge sharing is based on the experiences gained internally and externally in an organization and it is assumed that if knowledge is available to other members in an organization, it would reduce duplication of efforts, serve as a basis for solving problems and enhance decision making (Maponya, 2014; Onifade, 2015).

Arising from above, one can simply deduce that knowledge sharing, therefore, is about teamwork, that is, working together to achieve the greatest result especially in a library set up. In essence, knowledge and experience of librarians are assets of any library and should be valued and shared particularly in this age of knowledge economy (Lee, 2010). Besides, libraries may provide good and quality services for their clientele and communities, if librarians share knowledge with one another (Townley, 2010). Parirookh and Fattahi (2015) noted that sharing of knowledge among librarians could improve organizational learning in university libraries. However, it was observed that lots of knowledge sharing activities in university libraries was largely uncoordinated; hence, sharing knowledge among librarians have always been on an informal basis and usually based on verbal conversations (Maponya, 2014).

Active knowledge sharing therefore begins when other people voluntarily donate their knowledge and eagerly collect from others the knowledge needed, thus creating a knowledge sharing circle in the organization (Liao et al., 2016). Hines (2018) observed that those who use the libraries are changing and their expectations are changing. Thus, libraries have to provide high-level services to meet the needs of their users. More importantly, the changing roles of university libraries demand that librarians working in these libraries must acquire new competencies and skills. They must be proficient to be able to satisfy their users' needs. Since it is not possible for an individual to have an all-round knowledge in a profession, it is therefore, necessary that librarians have to collaborate and share (tacit and explicit) knowledge with one another.

More so, literature seems to suggest that libraries play a vital role in the context of how knowledge will be disseminated widely across different categories of knowledge users in the society. Libraries have been variously referred to as the purveyors of information, the custodians of knowledge, and the houses of learning; they play a vital role in the development of any society by catering for the information needs of millions of peoples within a particular community and the country as a whole. On the other hand, librarians have been referred to as the ultimate knowledge managers because they have been the custodians of documented knowledge for centuries (Koina, 2013; Onifade 2015). They are seen by many as effective, intelligent, problem solvers with a high level of research, technical and specialist skills in terms of knowledge management (Houghton et al., 2010; Mavodza, 2010).

Practices simply mean the actual application or use of an idea, belief, or method particularly in accomplishing job functions. KM practices include the understanding of knowledge management: knowledge generation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge organization, knowledge storage, knowledge transfer, knowledge sharing, and knowledge retention (Branin, 2013; Daud et al., 2018). According to Singh (2017), information professionals need to develop the capabilities to survive in a knowledge-based society, while organizations also need to improve investment and intensify efforts in ensuring that the information and knowledge available in databases, patents, trade secrets or in the minds of people, is fully utilized and translated into products and services that give value to the organization. Similarly, university libraries and their associated institutions can work together to collaborate, share and disseminate knowledge (Jain, 2017).

Therefore, it becomes imperative for an organization to have a clear understanding of what KM connotes to its operations. KM practices are required to enhance efficiency and lend value to organizational knowledge. These practices include knowledge generation, which encompasses activities that bring to light all knowledge that is new to a group or to an individual. That comprises the exploitation of existing knowledge to create new knowledge, or finding new knowledge through interacting and collaborating with other individuals or systems (Nonaka, 1991; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995; Nonaka and Teece, 2001). This process therefore involves the acquisition of knowledge for it to be successful. The acquired knowledge is of limited value if it is not organized and stored for easy retrieval. Once it is available for retrieval, there is need to have systems that enable its sharing and transfer. In other words, a process of knowledge retention results when an organization is able to facilitate the capture and transfer of both formal and informal knowledge through knowledge networking, thereby using the available intellectual capital to its advantage (Mavodza, 2010).

Besides, KM affects the organization's strategic planning, its ability to meet its goals and objectives, and its projection on how best to use the services and knowledge products for the future (Stankosky, 2015). Owing to the fact that KM practices involve people in the organizations, there can be some barriers to KM’s success. For instance, KM practices differ from the usual daily business and policy that could guide them. Other barriers include fear of adopting new or different ways of doing things that causes human resistance, lack of appropriate organizational infrastructure to handle some KM practices, and it may be deemed unsuitable for some settings. This view concurs with the suggestion made by Singh and Kant (2018) that KM barriers include lack of top management commitment, lack of technological infrastructure, lack of clearly defined methods or processes for KM practice, lack of organizational structure that supports a KM strategy, lack of organizational culture, lack of motivation and rewards, staff retirement, lack of ownership of problem, and staff turnover.

Knowledge sharing is the process of coordinating learning activities where individuals, mutually exchange their knowledge and jointly create new knowledge. (Den Hooff & De Ridder, 2014; Yang, 2014). Knowledge sharing practices among workers worldwide is perceived as one of the most convenient and effective ways to obtain knowledge. It enhances the ability to seek studies-related help from one another and facilitates achieving outcomes of collective learning. Knowledge sharing practices help workers solve problems, learn new things and increase understanding. Workers can learn from each other and benefit from new knowledge and development by one another. Workers that are able to share knowledge are more productive and more likely to survive on their jobs than workers that do not (Yang, 2004).

According to Peariasamy (2019), knowledge sharing practices improve librarians' skills and knowledge, which in turn increases their efficiency and productivity. Those with limited knowledge benefit from the advantage of knowledge sharing practices in their libraries. For any university library to perform its functions effectively, its work areas must include the following approaches: information and communication technologies, automation, networking, internet, administration, cataloguing, acquisition, abstracting, indexing, publishing, marketing of products and services, seminars, workshops, polices, interlibrary loan, staffing, knowledge management and database management among others (Fayose & Nwalo, 2010; Alegbeleye, 2010; Etim, 2010). Therefore, to ensure a good flow of information, librarians must share their knowledge. In the absence of this, there will be no free-flow of knowledge, and this will lead to information hoarding (Yang, 2014).

Therefore, a lot of emphasis on educating librarians who are well prepared to play an effective role in the knowledge society is required because librarians are the main driving force for educational development and the advancement of information (Yang, 2014). Effective sharing of this resource is consequently one of the most important challenges facing librarians in university libraries (Eze, 2010; Aranda & Fernandez, 2012). Knowledge sharing practices are premised on knowledge management contexts while knowledge management encompasses two types of knowledge, namely, tacit and explicit. The concepts tacit and explicit knowledge were first developed by Polanyi (1966) and detailed by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995). Tacit knowledge is knowledge that cannot be expressed in words, sentences, numbers or formulas. Tacit knowledge is said to be context-specific, technical skills, craft, expertise, cognitive skills, beliefs and images (Lin & Tseng, 2015; Srdoc et al., 2015).

On the other hand, Choi and Leed (2013) and Barth (2012) believed that tacit knowledge exists in people's mind and is quite difficult to transfer. Hawamdeh (2013) in Singh (2017) supported Choi and Leed (2013) and affirmed that tacit knowledge is undocumented. Explicit knowledge, unlike tacit knowledge, is objective and can be expressed in words, sentences, numbers or formulas (context-free). Examples are theoretical approach, problem solving, manuals and database. Nonaka (1994) and World Press (2011) both described explicit knowledge as that which is formal, systematic and can be codified into records such as databases and libraries, as expressed by Walczak (2015) who also described explicit knowledge as that which has been "encoded into some media external to a person". Explicit knowledge is relatively easy to articulate and to communicate and, thus, is transferable between individuals and organizations (Lee & Yang, 2010).

In a global context, individual countries are increasingly engaging in knowledge sharing activities, emphasizing knowledge as a new source of growth. For example, South Korea's knowledge sharing Programme (KSP) is based on an analysis of the country's economic development over the past 40 to 50 years. Malaysia, being a multi-racial society, faces the challenges of creating knowledge sharing capability in organizations, as individual employees often reflect cultural values in the workplace. Similarly, studies have shown that trust is a significant factor that negatively affects the rate at which people engage in knowledge sharing practices as people basically do not trust each other, and, the knowledge that they each possess. People also lack confidence to share and exchange expertise (OECD, 2015). According to Chowdhury (2006), fear of being penalized is another factor that hinders KS practices in Asia. This, perhaps, should be considered the most challenging barrier to wider implementation of KM in Asia.

Azudin et al. (2019) posited that Asians are generally less vocal and critical in the workplace compared to Westerners, as adduced by some psychologists. In another study carried out by Ardichvile et al. (2012) Illinois at Urbana, when employees view knowledge as a public good belonging to the whole organization, knowledge flows easily (Davenport, 1996). The study further showed that one of the major purposes of KM is to capture the expertise of experienced workers before they leave an organization and that trust among community members and in the organizations is a vital tool for effective knowledge sharing activities. In the African context, the issue of knowledge-sharing practices has become more topical in global development cooperation discourse than ever before and is linked to the growing recognition of the positive growth and development effects of accentuating knowledge as a development resource (Akude and Keijzer, 2014).

In Africa, states have had to make severe cuts in their budgets for the science and education sectors in order to qualify for concessional loans from international financial institutions (Akude and Keijzer, 2014). Simultaneously, a few states and young entrepreneurs have been designing innovative solutions and using new technologies to facilitate knowledge-sharing and its application. Still, Africa's challenges in exploiting the opportunities offered by knowledge sharing to improve its economies persist, despite promises of assistance from Africa's global development partners (Akude and Keijzer, 2014). Furthermore, the drive to manage knowledge sharing practices in the African culture is characterized by an old African proverb that states "when an old man dies, the entire library is burnt" (Zachary and Masheka, 2010). In this, there is need for Africa to capture indigenous knowledge, share and transfer it by networking between electronic networks that have been created in order to foster connections across varying boundaries to create knowledge banks that link expertise with demand.

Similarly, Dube and Ngulube (2012), in their article, analyzed knowledge sharing in a typical South Africa organization mainly characterized by the prevalence of the radical culture, nationality, ethnicity and other differences. They highlighted that in South Africa, knowledge sharing practices evolved along different paths. The results of their findings reveal that knowledge sharing in most university libraries is limited due to a number of systemic reasons, such as the absence of a knowledge sharing policy, the unsatisfactory reward system used by the universities, the spirit of the labour laws, lack of trust and the under-utilization of information and communication technologies. Knowledge sharing practices (such as the use of office memo, web-forums, bulletin boards, personal contact, discussion groups, meeting, social networks etc) in African university libraries' context, currently use of technology to network their operations such as administration, cataloguing, interlibrary loan and international bibliographic project (Fayose and Nwalo, 2010).

If this technological development is properly utilized, it helps the growth and development of libraries in different directions. It allows easy integration of various activities, facilitates cooperation, helps to avoid duplication of efforts within the library and among libraries in a network, eliminates some uninteresting and repetitive work and provides marketing opportunity for its services (Fayose and Nwalo, 2010). Some African universities have seen the need to make use of information technology in order to promote research and enhance excellence as Etim (2010) reported findings on some of the African universities in terms of knowledge sharing practices. For instance, Cameroon interuniversity network is an example of the determination of the Cameroonian authorities of higher education to provide universities with modern infrastructure. In Kenya, the Kenya education network (KENET) is an initiative to establish a high speed, reliable and sustainable IP network for interconnectivities among educational institutions.

Despite the enormous benefits derivable in sharing knowledge, some organizations and group of individuals still failed to facilitate this process (Babcock, 2014). The failure of knowledge management system might be due to many reasons some of which include; lack of consideration on how the organizational situation influences individual characteristics on knowledge sharing (Carter & Scarborough, 2011; Voelpel et al., 2015). One major factor that inhibits knowledge sharing is that knowledge can be considered a source of power and superiority (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2010). According to Husted and Michailova (2012), employees' unique knowledge often results in positive evaluations from human resource systems (e.g. performance appraisal, staffing etc.) and personal gains such as cash bonuses, promotions, stretch job assignments, and protection from layoffs. This scenario creates a disincentive for knowledge sharing because by sharing knowledge, it becomes a common good and individuals lose their distinctiveness compared to others.

The university librarian shall be duly responsible to the Vice Chancellor for the overall administration of the university library; its branches and extension and for providing library service for the entire university community. University libraries include college and university libraries. Commonly referred to as research libraries, they are often used by students as a quiet place for study and a place for research by the staff and researchers at large. Librarians here are therefore expected to be up and doing in carrying out their various assignments to serve the users. According to the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) (2010), University libraries have long enjoyed their status as the “heart of the university”. However, in recent decades, higher education environments have changed. Government officials see higher education as a national resource. Employers view higher education institutions as producers of a commodity student learning.

In addition to knowledge sharing activity itself, documenting the results of knowledge sharing is one important step to support the knowledge creation process. The results of knowledge sharing should be organized into organizational knowledge that can be accessed by all library employees in the future. According to Nove et al. (2012), most libraries did not process or organize the knowledge sharing result seriously; they only put emphasis on the knowledge sharing for knowledge exchange. The absence of documentation and organization of knowledge that makes the open access is almost impossible. Libraries hold not many knowledge resources because of lack knowledge sharing activities. We can say that open access initiatives is still a long way to go as long as those libraries are not aware and put more attention about documentation system seriously.

## 1.2 Statement of the problem

University libraries in the developed world are striving to develop KM tools to promote knowledge sharing among staff (White, 2014; Jantz, 2011 and Stover, 2014), in order to improve service delivery, enhance skills deployment and facilitate skills transfer through mentoring, education and training. However, knowledge sharing among professional librarians in university libraries in Africa, generally, Nigeria and Kwara State, in particular is limited. Literature (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2010 Husted and Michailova, 2012 and Bordia, et al. 2016) show that one major factor that inhibits knowledge sharing among librarians is that knowledge can be considered a source of power and superiority of which employees' unique knowledge often results in positive evaluations from human resource systems (e.g. performance appraisal, staffing etc.) and personal gains such as cash bonuses, promotions, stretch job assignments, and protection from layoffs.

This scenario creates a disincentive for knowledge sharing because by sharing knowledge, it becomes a common good and individuals lose their distinctiveness compared to others. University libraries in Nigeria are at a crossroads. This is because they are operating in an era of dwindling finances where resources (financial and materials) are not forthcoming whereas Nigerian Federal University libraries derive the greater part of their funds from Federal government (Okiy, 2015). In addition, series of attempts were made to adopt the ICT technologies for improved services but very little success has been recorded. A lot still needs to be done (Ani et al, 2015; Fatoki, 2015; Etim, 2016; Womboh & Abba, 2018). Librarians are the custodians of the documented knowledge because they are seen by many as effective, intelligent, problem solvers with a high level of research, technical and specialist skills in terms of knowledge management (Houghton et al.,2010).

Yet, it was amazing that the rate at which knowledge is shared among librarians in universities was very low (Onifade, 2015). Likewise, there are natural tendencies for people in almost every organization to hoard knowledge; this attitude of knowledge hoarding however, can affect librarians' output and other knowledge users in terms of knowledge dissemination and research productivity in general (Okonedo and Popoola, 2012). Similarly, most university libraries in Nigeria are severely constrained by a number of factors that includes erratic internet services, lack of hardware and software and in most instances the non-availability of the said ICTs in most university libraries. Also, many of the librarians do not understand clearly how to effectively share knowledge, some lack social networking skills and many are not able to use technology adequately to effectively share their experiences while some libraries still do not appreciate the importance of knowledge sharing as they complain of lack of time to engage in knowledge sharing (Awodoyin, et al. 2015).

Moreover, there is difficulty in the availability of contemporary books and journals from overseas due to the high rise in foreign exchange. This has deterred many university libraries from acquiring current and relevant titles that will support the academic programmes of their parent institutions. Thus, the efforts of most university libraries in providing modern information services are thwarted by the existence of the aforementioned problems whose genesis is that of inadequate funding. In addition, IT literacy among academic librarians in most libraries is still at the peripheral level. It was also observed that many staff of university libraries are not computer literate as such they find it difficult to cope with the requirements of the electronic age (Nok, 2016; Awodoyin et al., 2015). Owing to myriads of challenges confronting the processes of knowledge sharing which has hitherto been an impediment to knowledge sharing practices among the librarians.

Hence, the researcher explored the knowledge sharing practices and the factors that influence information exchange within and amongst professional librarians of university libraries in Kwara State. The outcomes of the study are expected to help inform managers and practitioners on the implementation of knowledge sharing policies, ICT infrastructure development, education and training; and staff retention universities libraries and impact on the rest of the Nigerian university libraries.

## 1.3 Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to explores the knowledge sharing practices amongst librarians of university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to:

i. Investigate the perception of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria;
ii. Establish the extent of sharing knowledge amongst librarians in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria; and
iii. Highlight the perceived benefits of knowledge sharing practices amongst librarians in in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria.

## 1.4 Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

i. What is the perception of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?
ii. What is the extent of sharing knowledge amongst librarians in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria? and
iii. What are the perceived benefits of knowledge sharing amongst librarians in in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?

## 1.5 Scope of the Study

Knowledge management is a multidisciplinary area of study which encompasses knowledge creation, capturing, representation and finally sharing for an organizational success. However, to make study manageable based on the availability of the resource and time, the study has to be delineated in scope as well as in depth. Hence, this study was delineated to explore only the existing knowledge sharing practices and the rate at which such practices is being carried on in the university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria.

## 1.6 Significance of the study

The motivation of this study is based on the fact that the knowledge and experience of librarians are assets of any library and should be valued and shared (Lee, 2010). Knowledge sharing is the fundamental means through which employees can contribute to knowledge application, innovation, and ultimately the competitive advantage of an organization. Besides, knowledge sharing between employees allows organizations to exploit and capitalize on knowledge-based resources (Jackson et al., 2016). In view of the above, the importance of undertaking this study cannot be overemphasized.

This study is therefore significant in view of its perceived contribution to the developmental plan for university practitioners who might use the outcome of this research work in developing a platform for librarians to share knowledge and promote knowledge sharing concept and practices among librarians. In addition, it will improve the existing knowledge base, literatures on the subject matter and the developmental plan of Nigeria towards ensuring that knowledge sharing practices and the rate at which such knowledge is exchanged within and outside the university libraries in Nigeria are significantly improved.

## 1.7 Operational Definition of Terms

**University Libraries:** Are the libraries found in universities whose sole responsibility is to support the teaching, learning and research and acquire information materials for the curriculum of the universities and the immediate community at large.

**Knowledge:** Is the fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained through experience or association. Knowledge is like a garden, which if not cultivated, cannot be harvested. Knowledge is a dynamic human process of justifying personal belief towards the truth.

**Knowledge Sharing:** It refers to the process of exchanging information, expertise, skills, and insights between individuals, teams, or organizations. It's about transferring knowledge from one person or group to another, whether explicitly through documents or implicitly through experience and learning.

**Knowledge Sharing Practices:** It refers to the processes and methods by which individuals or groups of people exchange their knowledge, skills, and experiences. It involves the mutual transfer of learning, ideas, and expertise to foster collective understanding and innovation.

**Knowledge Management:** Is an effort to increase useful knowledge within the organization. KM is the collection of processes that govern the creation, dissemination, and utilization of knowledge.

**Professional Librarians:** Are knowledgeable subject specialists who is trained in library and information science and is responsible for managing information resources and providing access to them.

# CHAPTER TWO

# REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

## 2.1 Introduction

This chapter focused on extensive review of related and relevant literature on integration and use of cloud computing technology in university libraries. Review of related literature gives an evaluation of previous literature to the researcher's area of study. The review of this study is guided by the following research outlines/subheadings:

2.2 Knowledge Management Practices;

2.3 Knowledge Sharing Practices in Global Perspectives;

2.4 Knowledge Sharing Practices in African Perspectives;

2.5 Knowledge Sharing Practices in Nigeria;

2.6 Factors Influencing Knowledge Sharing Practices;

2.7 Perception on Knowledge Sharing Practices;

2.8 Benefits of Knowledge Sharing Practices; and

2.9 Summary and Gaps in Literature.

## 2.2 Knowledge Management Practices

Application of KM principles in a library is very essential to enhance knowledge sharing practices (Jantz, 2011). Knowledge management was developed with the purpose of "information capture, auditing of information, maintaining and updating the technology platform, marketing, education and training" (Jantz, 2011). Besides, the capture and sharing of knowledge entails understanding the KM process and cultural issues in an organization as essential for the organization to benefit from KM. Hayes (2017) suggests the creation of a strategic plan that focuses on KM principles. Knowledge management is as old as humankind is. Its eminent debut, though, can be traced back to the late forties, during the Second World War, when it was noted that upon successive building of fighter planes, fewer defects were reported and this was associated with knowledge sharing. The early industrial age saw the ancient man make improvements on the survival tools, which improved in quality as he made one tool after the other, each time realizing fewer defects because of perfection derived from experience.

Upon such understanding, man decided to start saving the experience gained in forms that can be retrieved if need arises. This brought about the concept of learning that encouraged producers of goods to engage in quality mass production that came to warrant exchange of products in form of barter trade (Cortada & Cortada, 2011). Similarly, White (2014), from a study on KM practices in an academic library at the Oxford University Library Service (OULS), supports the idea that KM practices can enhance the quality of library service. The study was intended to show the need to include KM in library strategy to retain expertise for the benefit of staff and users, to "provide an additional tool in assessing staff's perception of change, knowledge creation and sharing practices.

In addition to the concept of librarians operating as team members, Robertson and Sullivan (2010) suggest digital libraries as vehicles of systemic educational change. This is because technology in digital libraries is an enabler in the modern information supply chain (Abell, 2010; Jain, 2017; Singh, 2017), and librarians must thus be skilled at the technical aspects of the job. Studies carried out at the Eskind Biomedical Library in Nashville, Tennessee (Williams et al., 2014), as well as at the Perseus Digital Library at Tufts University (Rydberg-Cox et al., 2010), show examples of instances where KM practice is addressed in digital library set-ups because library practice is having a tendency towards an increased transformation into digital libraries. Libraries play a vital role in the context of how knowledge will be disseminated widely across different categories of knowledge users in the society. Evidence from literature indicated that librarians are the custodians of the documented knowledge because they are seen by many as effective, intelligent, problem solvers with a high level of research, technical and specialist skills in terms of knowledge sharing practices (Houghton, Poston-Anderson and Todd, 2010).

Supporting this view, Ferguson, Hider and Lloyd (2018) posited that tools of knowledge management consist of 70% services and 30% technology. Librarians provide these services and are thus playing the role of knowledge manager. Their functions are but not limited to:

- *Providing services to the user community;*
- *Sharing of information and understanding of user needs;*
- *Analyzing documents, classifying and sorting them for easy retrieval; and*
- *Building the indexes.*

Furthermore, knowledge management and librarianship are sister disciplines since knowledge management has roots in the Libraries and Information Studies (LIS) discipline as well as the management and information technology fields. Because of this strong connection between the skills and competencies required for a knowledge manager and a librarian, moving from a librarian role to a knowledge management role may be a natural transition (Arnott, 2014). Martin et al. (2016) pointed out that LIS professionals are also experts in content management. They postulated that Libraries and Information centers would continue to perform access and intermediary roles, which embrace not just information but also knowledge management. The difference today is that these traditional roles could be expanded if not transformed through activities aimed at helping to capture tacit knowledge and by turning personal knowledge into corporate knowledge that can be widely shared through the library and applied appropriately (Henczel, 2014).

The SECI model (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995) is about how to create organizational knowledge, how to share it, how to convert knowledge from one type to another and how to manage organizational knowledge. The SECI's observation constitutes the engine of the whole knowledge-creation and transfer process. This engagement results in a knowledge dynamic of sharing and creation of knowledge that may be captured and retained in the organization. Through social interaction between individuals and organizations, knowledge is created and expanded, and this interaction is referred to as knowledge conversion. Conversion of knowledge from one form to another results in retention of knowledge in the organizational system. Senior workers and experts share their knowledge with juniors and new entrants. The sharing of knowledge and experiences means that when retirees leave their jobs, there will be no vacuum created as their knowledge has been retained by new and young employees who remain behind (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995).

Nove and Dyah (2013) observed that among many libraries that are still oriented to traditional concepts, there are some libraries that already have more advanced visions by applying knowledge sharing to various contexts, especially enhancing knowledge creation among staff in order to be able to produce both products and services innovation in the libraries. Knowledge sharing has not been formally adopted by many libraries, and only a few libraries have implemented it. Nevertheless, in the process of implementation of knowledge sharing, libraries are still not maximized; it is visible from the strategy that only focuses on the implementation of knowledge sharing, (face to face meeting) or just to share the results of the seminar/training without considering knowledge sharing as a complex process for knowledge creation. Only some libraries are equipped with very basic information technology and discussion rooms during knowledge sharing practice. This is because libraries try to develop a knowledge sharing culture among library employees.

Social networks thus become common technological apparatus that support collaboration, knowledge sharing, interaction and communication among users in different places who come together with a common interest or goal (Balubaid, 2013). Studies have shown that, currently, social networks are at the forefront among several approaches of KS practices in several organizations, mostly university libraries. ICTs like Web 2.0 are playing an important role in dissemination of knowledge and in communication. The term Web 2.0 refers to a new generation of web applications that provide for online participation, collaboration and interaction. It involves the use of social media software services such as blogs, wikis, multimedia and social networks (Howe & Kekwaletswe, 2010). Examples of social networks that can enhance or support knowledge sharing in university libraries are: videoconferencing/telephone, groupware such as lotus notes, intranets/internet, portals, expertise location, electronic bulletin boards, knowledge directories, databases, electronic mails, intelligent search engines and weblogs, Facebook and Twitter (Shanhong, 2010).

Other approaches to KS practices include: the use of office memo, web-forums, bulletin boards, personal contact, discussion groups among others (Mushi, 2019). Parirokh and Fattahi (2015) describe knowledge sharing practices (the use of office memo, web-forums, bulletin boards, personal contact, discussion groups, meeting, social networks etc) among librarians as that tool that can improve organizational learning in university libraries. According to Porumbeanu (2010), most librarians, in their survey, were aware of the idea of knowledge sharing practice, and many of them characterized the managerial style in their organizations as being one that creates an encouraging climate. White (2014) was also of the view that university libraries can benefit from KM in integrating librarians' knowledge into the whole process of library services while librarians will consider their organization as a learning organization (Bekele, 2014).

In a related study, Ravi (2018) postulated about the library-changing environment, where in the library world, rapid technological changes have had the impact of changing the way library services are provided. The way towards achieving the teaching and educational goals of colleges is inadvertently impacted upon. In that case, the skills of the Metropolitan College of New York (MCNY) librarians have to be as relevant to the electronic milieu created by the technological changes as to that of print (Ravi, 2018). Additionally, Ravi (2018) maintained that the concept of ownership of items has become more fluid because of the prevalence of new communication technologies that include social software like blogs and wikis, MySpace, flikr, and collaboration platforms such as Wikipedia.

The collection development function of the librarians now consists of deciding which items to provide straightforward access to, besides the traditional services of issuing print publications, to users. One may say that libraries are now expected to build and maintain "knowledge gateways" and in the process, pull together a range of information resources and sources that address the research needs of their communities. Collaborating with the above, Onifade (2015) opined that federal university libraries still have to provide quality service that will meet the needs of their users, which are constantly changing due to technological advancement in learning.

## 2.3 Knowledge Sharing Practices in Global Perspectives

Individual countries are increasingly engaging in knowledge sharing practices, emphasizing knowledge as a new source of growth. For example, South Korea's universities knowledge sharing programme (KSP) is based on analysis of the country's economic development over the past 40 to 50 years. The KSP built 108 knowledge sharing partnerships and e-learning platforms for best practices during the period 2004-2013 with a budget that increased from USD 949 000 in 2004 to USD 16.6 million in 2013 (KEI, 2012). In Germany, Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), working on behalf of the German Government, chiefly with the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development sees knowledge sharing practices as a mechanism that allows actors to work together to produce knowledge and innovations that provide specific answers to common questions, and as a co-creative participatory method for achieving a sustainable future (GIZ, 2013). Other bi- and multilateral organizations have developed knowledge sharing efforts. Examples are the joint initiative of the World Bank with emerging and developing countries in support of South-South cooperation, and "knowledge hubs" as presented during the High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation in Mexico in April 2014 (OECD, 2014).

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) also established knowledge sharing projects with partners in the region (OECD and Post-2015 Reflections). Malaysia, being a multi-racial society, faces the challenges of creating knowledge sharing capability in organizations as cultural values are often reflected in the workplace by individual employees. For organizations, it is not clear whether this diversity has resulted in any form of competitive advantage. Studies have shown that various communities in Malaysia do not bring their respective cultures to work, and as such, the company values prevail. In Asia, people do not trust each other with the knowledge that they each possess. People also lack confidence to share and exchange expertise (OECD, 2014). Another factor is the fear of being penalized. This, perhaps, should be considered the most challenging barrier to wider implementation of KM in Asia. However, Chowdhury (2016) states that most KM models are formed in the context of a Western framework in which freedom of expression and individualism are both accepted social norms. This though is not necessarily the case in many organizations in Malaysia. Psychologists accept that Asians are generally less vocal and critical in the workplace compared to Westerners (Azudin et al., 2019).

In another study carried out by Ardichvile et al. (2012) on motivation and barriers to participation in virtual knowledge sharing communities of practice at Caterpillar Inc., a Fortune 100, Multinational Corporation based in Illinois at Urbana, their study indicated that, when employees view knowledge as a public good belonging to the whole organization, knowledge flows easily. They posited this, based on the reports from the field of KM that virtual communities of practice are becoming a KM tool of choice for an increasing number of multinational corporations, including such well-known industry leaders (Davenport, 2010). The British Petroleum study was based on an in-depth qualitative investigation of virtual knowledge-sharing communities of practice in a large, multinational corporation supported by National Centre for Supercomputing

Applications and the Centre of International Business Education and Research (CIBER) at the University of Illinois at Urbana (Cohen & Prusak 2010; Ellis 2011; Haimila 2011). Their further study showed that one of the major purposes of KM is to capture the expertise of experienced workers before they leave an organization and that trust among community members and in the organizations is a vital tool for effective knowledge sharing activities. They postulated that an organization striving to create a network of vibrant virtual communities of knowledge sharing practices would need to create a supportive environment, which consists of the following elements:

- *A set of institutional norms promoting institution-based trust, including those clearly communicating that knowledge sharing is a norm of this organization that the organization trusts its employees, and that sharing is a moral obligation of all employees;*
- *Multiple face-to-face communities of practice (study and discussion groups, informal task forces), which provide a foundation for knowledge-based trust. Some of these communities could later evolve into virtual communities; others will never be replaced by the virtual forms, but may use, as needed, some of the tools of the virtual communities to enhance their face-to-face interactions and learning; and*
- *A set of clearly communicated norms and standards for sharing knowledge, which would reduce the anxiety associated with the uncertainty about what constitutes acceptable postings, what violates corporate security rules, etc*

## 2.4 Knowledge Sharing Practices in African Perspectives

The issue of knowledge-sharing practice has become more topical in global development cooperation discourse than ever before and is linked to the growing recognition of the positive growth and development effects of accentuating knowledge as a development resource (Akude and Keijzer, 2014). This recognition, however, follows decades of under-investment in knowledge infrastructure as well as the prevalent policy of neglecting investments in higher education and innovation while focusing on primary education. Particularly in Africa, states have had to make severe cuts in their budgets for the science and education sectors in order to qualify for concessional loans from international financial institutions (Akude & Keijzer, 2014). Simultaneously, a few states and young entrepreneurs have been designing innovative solutions and using new technologies to facilitate knowledge-sharing activity and its application. Africa's challenges in exploiting the opportunities offered by knowledge sharing practice to improve its economies persist, despite promises of assistance from Africa's global development partners (Akude & Keijzer, 2014).

Furthermore, the drive to manage knowledge in African culture is characterized by an old African proverb that states in Africa, "when an old man dies, the entire library is burnt" (Zachary & Masheka, 2010). In this, there is need for Africa to capture indigenous knowledge, share and transfer it by networking between electronic networks that have been created to foster connections across varying boundaries to create knowledge bank that links expertise with demand. Among the knowledge bank is Knowledge Management Africa (KMA), which has become knowledge engine that drives appropriate development solutions for Africa (Banhenyi, 2017). The mission of KMA is to promote the use of Africa's collective knowledge as a key development resource and establish KM platforms that will create access to existing networks and facilitate the sharing and utilization of knowledge across all sectors. KMA organizes biennial conferences in different countries to boost the implementation of KM in Africa.

In a study carried out by Ireri and Wairagu (2017) in Zachary and Masheka (2010), the African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF) which was considered as an advanced big step to the second generation of Knowledge management whereby knowledge must not only be captured and shared but also be produced. AMREF's approach is to facilitate the development of innovative models for community participation in the improvement of health. It recognizes knowledge as a valuable resource that deserves to be consciously captured and managed to facilitate sharing of experiences and lessons learnt from different programmes, both internally and externally (Ireri & Wairagu, 2017). Similarly, Dube and Ngulube (2012), in their article, analyzed knowledge sharing practice in a typical South Africa organization mainly characterized by the prevalence of the radical culture, nationality, ethnicity and other differences. The authors highlighted further that in South Africa, knowledge management sharing evolved along different paths.

On the one hand, there are those who seek to preserve apartheid and on the other, there are those who seek to overcome it and replace with democratic alternative. According to Kamal, Manjit and Gurvinder (2017) in Dube and Ngulube (2012), these paths not only permeate the political and social landscape but also lead to the evolution of diverse and heterogeneity within organizations, which may create a lack of trust and skepticisms and subsequently politicking and hostility towards knowledge sharing practices. The results of their findings reveal that knowledge sharing practices in the Department are limited due to a number of systemic reasons such as the absence of a knowledge sharing policy, the unsatisfactory reward system used by the Department, the spirit of the labour laws, a lack of trust and the under-utilization of information and communication technologies.

## 2.5 Knowledge Sharing Practices in Nigeria

Most KM models are formed in the context of a western framework in which freedom of expression and individualism are both accepted social norms (Chowdhury, 2016). This is generally not the case in many of the libraries in Nigeria. According to Sodiya et al. (2016), the issue of brain drains, which started far back in the 1980s, where many professionals left the country due to the devaluation of the Naira and inflation has led to exit of tacit knowledge from many organizations including libraries. Sun and Scott (2015) posited that KM initiatives involve taking account of the socio-cultural factors which inhibit people's willingness to share knowledge, such as conflict, trust, time or concerns about loss of power/status cited in (Omotayo, 2015). Even though there are many efforts to encourage the sharing of knowledge, many employees may not welcome knowledge sharing because they may want to hoard knowledge in order to protect career opportunities, save time and may not have the resources needed to share knowledge and may want to avoid negative exposure especially when knowledge in question is tacit in nature (John & Joseph, 2014).

Corroborating this view is the work of Okonedo and Popoola (2012) which stated that there is natural tendency of employees in almost every organization to hoard knowledge. Using the library sector as a case study, this attitude of knowledge hoarding among librarians can affect research and productivity in general. Onifade (2015) posited that librarians in the federal university libraries in Nigeria have positive attitudes towards knowledge sharing practices but averagely share and that the level at which they share knowledge was low. The author carried out her research on 18 federal university libraries in Nigeria using 412 librarians as the sample size. The results showed that librarians in federal university libraries in Nigeria slightly share knowledge with one another, despite the fact that they understand the importance of knowledge sharing practices. Aswath and Gupta's (2019) and Kumaresan's (2010) studies revealed that a large portion of staff knowledge is tacit and rooted in individual experience, judgment and intuition; it is like a trade secret that any employee would like to hold back.

However, Onifade (2015) was of the view that if incentives are given to librarians, this can motivate them to improve on knowledge sharing practices among themselves; to add, mentoring and regular training should be encouraged among librarians in sharing knowledge. A knowledge sharing policy should be developed to knowledge sharing compulsory among librarians. Librarians should be encouraged to join platforms such as librarians' forum and other networking sites to exchange knowledge and interact with colleagues internally and externally. Similarly, Lawal et al. (2014) carried out a study on knowledge sharing practices among academic staff of federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta in Nigerian; in line with the librarians' complaints, knowledge sharing practice was known to be an influencing factor that enhances research, scholarly publishing, sharing of vital research data and information, and collaborative research among the academic staff in different parts of the world.

The author also reported that knowledge sharing practices could assist the academic staff to keep abreast of the up-to-date information particularly in their chosen professions; it was discovered that internet service was the major medium that they use to share their knowledge with the outside world. The study was able to identify some barriers to the inability of the academic staffs to share knowledge which were, inadequate awareness about the importance of knowledge sharing in academic community and poor attitude of academic staff to the principle of sharing knowledge with one another. The study further recommended the following: creation of awareness programme on knowledge sharing activities and adequate provision of internet facilities to enhance knowledge sharing practices among the academic staffs as well as the outside world.

## 2.6 Factors Influencing Knowledge Sharing Practices

Organizational factors that influence knowledge sharing practices have been discussed by various authors and they have reported that the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) is successful in explaining factors related to the knowledge-sharing behavior among individuals. These factors include personal cognition, interpersonal interaction, and organizational contexts (Cabrera et al., 2015). Similarly, Kankanhalli et al. (2015) believed that an individual's perceived benefit is one of the major factors that encourage employees to contribute knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories. Factors that influence KS were identified as communication technologies (ICTs), mutual trust, reward system/incentives, job design/office layout, management/leadership support, staffing and budgets (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Riege, 2015; & Mutula, 2014). Incentives/Rewards Many university libraries have introduced reward systems for motivating the employees to share knowledge. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has been used in previous KM studies as drivers or determinants of knowledge sharing behavior (Wang & Hou, 2015).

Among these, individual drivers that affect knowledge sharing intentions are enjoying helping others, e.g. (Hung et al., 2011; Chennamaneni et al., 2012; Ma & Chan, 2014), knowledge self-efficacy (Van Acker et al., 2014), and expect organizational rewards and reciprocal benefits (Jeon et al., 2011; Chennamaneni et al., 2012). Based on the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), organizational rewards such as promotion, bonus, and higher salary have been shown to be positively related to the frequency of knowledge contribution made to KMSs especially when employees identify with the organization (Kankanhalli et al., 2015). However, the findings of Bock and Kim (2011) were in contrast with the Social Exchange Theory by Blau (1964) who posits that individuals' engagement in social interactions are based on the expectation that it will, in some, way led to social rewards such as approval, status, and respect. Likewise, Osherloh and Frey (2010) supported the view of Blau (1964) that intrinsic rewards are the most effective in facilitating the sharing of tacit knowledge (the most difficult knowledge that university librarians shared among themselves). Thus, the expectation of personal benefits can motivate university librarians to share their knowledge (tacit and explicit) with their colleagues (Constant et al., 2010).

Trust refers to a set of specific beliefs primarily pertaining to the integrity, benevolence, and ability of another party (Chiu et al., 2016). People are more likely to exchange and are more willing to share their resources if trust is developed; the higher the degree of trust, the more individuals are inclined to share their knowledge with others. Delahaye (2010) refers to trust as a critical influencing factor to knowledge sharing, for without trust, knowledge sharing is of no meaning. Davenport and Prusak (2010) also consider trust as a crucial promoter to the efficiency of knowledge sharing, thus expediting the transmission of knowledge. Al-Alawi et al. (2017), Lin (2017), and Lee et al. (2010) all introduce trust as an important affecter to knowledge sharing. This assertion is in agreement with the social exchange theory propounded by Blau (1964) which states that trust is essential for the social exchange process. Trust creates and maintains exchange relationships, which in turn may lead to the sharing of good quality knowledge. When trust exists between two parties, they are more willing to engage in cooperative interaction (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 2010).

Interpersonal trust is important in teams and organizations for creating an atmosphere for knowledge sharing (Nonaka, 1994). In addition, a study by Xiaoping and Lin (2017) on the knowledge innovation culture (KIC) of libraries revealed that when trust and collaboration are built among librarians, it improves human resource development and cultivates knowledge innovation among talented individuals. Trust creates and maintains relationships, which, in turn, may lead to knowledge sharing. Moreover, attitudes and perceptions of individuals in informal settings are difficult to evaluate. Trust is particularly important in such behaviors like knowledge sharing in virtual communities (VC) (Chiu, Hsu and Wang 2016). Consistent with a study by Chang et al. (2012) on social capital and knowledge sharing on patient safety in Taiwan, the results revealed that trust among professional, registered nurses (NRs) in relation to KS was significant and positive. Through trust and collaboration, individuals contributed their own knowledge, skills and expertise. Consequently, based on trust and collaboration, librarians can realize knowledge creation so much the better through discussion of problems by either acquiring new knowledge or sharing tacit knowledge (Xiaoping and Lin, 2017).

Trust can influence the social exchange behaviors between people. Wu and Tsang (2018) proved through empirical research using a virtual community as a template that trust is closely related to the members' viscidity to the cyberspace and their willingness to knowledge sharing practices. Trust has great impact on university librarians who participate in knowledge sharing practices. This study suggests that the knowledge sharing practices established on trust can improve university librarians' willingness to provide private resources in the form of tacit and explicit knowledge for others and to form exchange behaviors. Knowledge sharing may also be embedded in broader organizational networks such as communities of practice. Ties among individuals within social networks can facilitate knowledge transfer and enhance the quality of information received (Cross & Cummings, 2014). In virtual communities, both the number of direct ties and personal relationships an individual has with other members have been shown to be positively related to the quantity and the perceived helpfulness of knowledge shared (Chiu et al., 2016; Wasko & Faraj, 2015).

Individuals' expectation of maintaining and strengthening their social ties by frequently participating in a web-based professional community has been found to positively affect their intention to continue participating in the community (Chen, 2017). The concept of tie strength suggests that strong ties involve higher emotional closeness whereas weak ties are more likely to be non-redundant connections and thus be associated with nonredundant information (Perry-Smith, 2016). Reagans & McEvily (2013) found tie strength and social cohesion to be positively related to the ease of knowledge transfer as perceived by the knowledge source, suggesting that the connections with knowledge recipients may motivate providers to share knowledge. According to Levin and Cross (2014), controlling for trustworthiness, knowledge recipients with weak ties reported more benefits compared to those with strong ties. These studies have focused more on relationships rather than individuals. The findings suggest that the existence of network connections, and the associated social capital can facilitate knowledge sharing practices within an organization (Kankanhalli et al., 2015).

Research on hidden profiles focuses on how information sampling affects team decision making (Stasser & Titus, 2013). The issue of social costs associated with unique information may help us understand why certain information/knowledge is less likely to be shared. It is also possible that a university librarian might be less likely to share knowledge in a team or an online community of practice that might reveal mistakes or errors made by his/her boss or an influential peer. Bandura (2010) defines self-efficacy as the individual's judgment on their capability to implement a particular task, which does not mean the assessment of actual skills people hold, but the self-appraisal of what people believe they can accomplish. Wasko and Faraj (2015) identified self-efficacy as a strong affecter for the librarians to share the knowledge with their colleagues.

Therefore, self-efficacy has been considered as an antecedent of attitude to share the knowledge by some researchers such as Bandura (1986), Igbaria and Iivari (1995), Li et al. (2018).

According to the empirical investigation result, Cho et al. (2017) found that self-efficacy has remarkable impact on the employees' intention to share knowledge. Perceived self-efficacy plays an important role in influencing individual behavior. People who have high self-efficacy are more likely to perform related behavior than those with low self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is supposed to facilitate forming of behavioral intentions, the development of action plans and the initiation of action. To take knowledge sharing into practice, the desire to share knowledge is not enough as perceived capabilities to complete are also needed. Several researchers have confirmed the effect of self-efficacy on knowledge sharing intention (Cho et al., 2017). Some authors examine the impact of self-efficacy of university librarians on intention to share knowledge, while others examine its effect on attitude. Wen-Jung Chen, HanYin Cheng (2012) take self-efficacy as a moderating role between attitude and intention as important factors that affect how university librarians share knowledge among themselves.

Intention is dependent on attitude, so the attitude to sharing can be a predictor of intention to knowledge sharing (Mohammed et al., 2011). Employees' attitude affects the intentions, which resultantly develop the behaviors. If an individual expresses a positive attitude, he/she will have a positive intention towards knowledge sharing practices (Mohammed et al., 2011). It is widely accepted that the intention to engage in behavior is determined by the attitude towards that behavior. Thus, individuals may show more inclination on knowledge if their attitudes towards the knowledge sharing are positive. Attitude is viewed as a strong predictor of behavioral intention in a wide range of studies and so, it is justified to believe that the more positive an attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the more intention to being involved in knowledge sharing practices (Mohammed et al., 2011).

Organization support is very powerful and influences daily work practices in university libraries (Lauring, 2019). Michailova and Minbaeva (2012) investigated how core organizational values, which are an important part of the organizational support, impact knowledge sharing practices of librarians. This assertion agrees with the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) which assumes that the relationship between employees and their employer is built on the trade of effort and loyalty for benefits such as pay, support, and recognition (van Knippenberg, 2016). Therefore, organizational support, direct or indirect, is an essential factor in the theory. Reciprocity refers to what both parties within the relationship expect to gain in return in terms of benefits through exchanges. People can obtain knowledge and information but they have never been sure that their knowledge will be shared without expectation of a return (Chang & Chuang, 2011). When people perceive that their social relationship is on an equal footing, they can feel the equality of their interaction.

The reason why the knowledge owner is willing to take time and energy to share knowledge of the knowledge demander is that he hopes the knowledge demander can convey information to him when the knowledge demander becomes the knowledge owner in the future. In this way, knowledge sharing is achieved (Chang & Chuang, 2011). Reciprocity is the future earnings expectations following people's contribution of knowledge. Personal cognition of exchange relationships can be decided upon by the comparison of the input/outcome rate. Chang and Chuang (2011) claimed that when people think they are not properly treated, he will reduce input. This claim thus conforms favourably with SET (Blau, 1964) because reciprocity is the core principle of social exchange theory. Social exchange theory suggests that people engaged in social activities and relations tend to give rise to social contribution. Generalized social exchange of knowledge may also occur among employees within an organization such that employees that receive knowledge from another team may reciprocate the favour by sharing knowledge with yet another team. In both the team scenario and an online community context, it would be interesting to examine how a "social sanctions" system develops and works to reduce free riding in a generalized social exchange (Das & Teng, 2012).

Management/leadership support, as an attribute of the knowledge sharing process, is considered one of the related organizational factors which influence organizational success. Li Chang, Mirmirani and Ilacqua (2019), in their study of distributed leadership and knowledge sharing in multinational organizations in the U.S.A., found that distributed leadership as a management style worked for such firms with different cultures. The study confirmed that such leadership promoted achievement of goals through different styles of management practices. Moreover, top management support is positively associated with employee knowledge sharing capabilities in university libraries. The findings from an empirical study by Lin (2017) on knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability at one of the national universities in Taiwan found that top management support was effective for employee willingness to share knowledge with colleagues. The study revealed that managers enhanced the positive mood of employees regarding social exchange through providing monetary incentives and useful feedback to improve knowledge sharing.

The findings agree with Haque and Anwar (2012), who confirmed that support from senior management plays a vital role in the effectiveness of knowledge-based decisions through providing timely funding for knowledge application. Therefore, management support enhances trust among librarians in creating, sharing and using knowledge in university libraries. Top management are bound to influence knowledge sharing among staff in university libraries through inspiring, mentoring, setting examples, creating mutual trust and respect, listening, learning and teaching (Holsapple, 2013). Li Chang, Mirmirani and Ilacqua (2019) note that one of the leadership concerns in a knowledge-based economy is knowledge management, since knowledge sharing involves the protection of patents, copyrights, and other intellectual properties.

Information and communication technology (ICT) is an extended term for information technology (IT) which stresses the role of unified communications and the integration of telecommunications (telephone lines and wireless signals), computers as well as necessary enterprise software, middleware, storage, and audio-visuals. Information and communication technologies are effectively used among university librarians to facilitate knowledge sharing practices through the codification, integration and dissemination of organizational knowledge. It allows university libraries to expand available social networks to overcome boundaries in geographical locations in order to achieve effective collaborative activities (Lin, 2017). As stated by Dewah (2011), ICT tools provide an enabling platform for knowledge capturing, sharing and retention. Gold and Arvind-Malhotra (2011) concur with this assertion that IT facilitates knowledge flow and eliminates barriers to communication and knowledge sharing within university libraries.

Likewise, knowledge management and the information profession are intimately associated with information and communication technologies, particularly computer-based information systems and communication networks. For example, if information is the raw material for knowledge management and the information profession, then technology promotes them by facilitating the creation, storage and distribution of information. Knowledge management through use of ICTs can bring positive change in the library organizations. (Alegbeleye, 2010). However, Adaptive Structuration Theory (AST), Giddens (1984) criticizes the technocentric view of technology use and emphasizes the social aspects. Groups and organizations using information technology for their work dynamically create perceptions about the role and utility of the technology, and how it can be applied to their activities. These perceptions can vary widely across groups and influence the way technology is used.

This theory looks at the behavior of humans as they use technology (such as computers) in a social structure. It also refers to the nature of group-computer interaction since organizations such as libraries in the university settings rely heavily on the use of advanced information technology for the purposes of satisfying the users' queries. Since it focuses on communication using information technology, the theory highlights the concepts of appropriation and structuration (Sedera & Zakaria, 2018). It draws some links between individuals and organizational learning due to the key concepts that address aspects of group interaction with technology. While it criticizes the technocentric view of technology use, it places more emphasis on social aspects. The AST (Giddens, 1984) therefore agrees with the view that technologies such as computers enable the transfer, sharing and most importantly, the retention of knowledge for preservation and reuse.

Staffing and budgets are some of the organizational factors that affect knowledge sharing in university libraries since knowledge sharing requires trust, openness, knowing who knows what and time to nurture and acquire (Keong & Al-Hawamdeh, 2012). With high staff turnover and restructuring experienced by university libraries, sometimes it is difficult to create the atmosphere needed to share knowledge among staff. Knowledge sharing practices can be seen as a tactic to scale down staff to cut budgets. Downsizing/retrenchment is defined as an "organization's strategy designed to reduce the number of staff to make significant changes in the structure of the organization in an attempt to improve its efficiency and effectiveness" (Carbery & Garavan 2015). It involves cutting down the number of staff due to budget deficits and may also involve hiring, freezing posts and forcing employees to retire early to cut budgets (Carbery & Garavan, 2015).

Cabrera (2015) and Cabrera, Collins and Salgado (2016) pointed out that extensive training can increase knowledge sharing and cooperation. The training itself is actually the process of knowledge delivery and transfer, which, in essence, is a way to implement knowledge sharing. Training is a primary vehicle to transfer knowledge from experienced employees to others in the organization. It involves many knowledge senders and receivers, which can improve the interaction between different people, during the interaction, the role of sender and receiver may exchange, the original knowledge sender may become a knowledge receiver from a knowledge sender who originally be a knowledge receiver, and the same situation may occur between any two receivers. Therefore, training can help to improve knowledge sharing implementation.

## 2.7 Perception on Knowledge Sharing Practices

According to Daniel (2015), knowledge sharing practice among workers worldwide is perceived as one of the most convenient and effective ways to obtain knowledge, and knowledge sharing among workers enhances the ability to seek studies-related help from one another. Knowledge sharing practice among workers essentially facilitates achieving outcomes of collective learning. The author opined that learning and knowledge sharing are intimately connected and that the knowing process is a component of sharing, thinking and learning. In addition, Oye et al. (2011) were of the view that the creation and dissemination of knowledge, especially in large organizations, requires both a cultural-social and a technological dimension. Corroborating this view, Matheson and Tarjan (2010) observed that firms must provide workers with Information Technology (IT) infrastructures and ensure that these infrastructures are used to create, store, and distribute their knowledge. The knowledge tools should be perceived as easy to use and as adding value to the workers' performance, or else the workers may be deterred from putting their knowledge into the systems.

They reiterated that even if the knowledge systems are highly usable, usage alone is unproductive if the workers are not willing to share truly valuable knowledge with their colleagues and firms. Oye et al. (2011) concluded that besides setting up effective IT infrastructures, firms/organizations must also create appropriate reward systems that will motivate workers to truly share knowledge and do it using the IT systems provided; if this is put in place, it will remove the inferiority complex among librarians in libraries. Patrick and Dotsika (2017) viewed knowledge sharing as the social interaction that involves the sharing of both the goal and the favourable outcome centred on problem solving. Lee (2011) opined that levels of knowledge sharing are not discrete, but display the flows of interaction among members, subsets, and sets. This opinion of Lee (2011) conforms with SET's (Blau, 1995) that interpersonal interaction and knowledge-sharing behavior which states that social interaction provides the opportunity to combine and exchange knowledge among members within an organization.

Guzman (2017) perceived knowledge-sharing practices as collaborative activities and relates it with communication. The professional concept of knowledge sharing is a collaborative communication for professional gains different from information distribution and selective dissemination of information (SDI) which are information services. It is mainly for professional gains geared towards enhanced knowledge, skill and competencies, professional self-improvement and may result in enhanced services (Boer, 2015, Anasi et al., 2014). The four modes of Nonaka and Takeuchi's SECI model talks about how knowledge within an organization is transferred from experienced employees to the new staff, thereby facilitating knowledge retention. That is, the SECI model shows that knowledge can be transferred from one employee to another, from the heads of employees to documents/databases through knowledge conversion, thus retaining knowledge in the organization system. Therefore, if university librarians collaborate among themselves to share knowledge, this would facilitate transfer of knowledge and its retention.

Furthermore, it is also clear that knowledge sharing has been perceived to be an essential part of knowledge management. Patrick and Dotsika (2017) view knowledge sharing practices as the social interaction that involves the sharing of both the goal and the favourable outcome centred on problem solving. Lee (2011) opined that levels of knowledge sharing are not discrete, but display the flows of interaction among members, subsets, and sets. Considering this view with respect to SET (Blau, 1964), Hall (2013) stated that social interaction may lead to a series of exchanges between parties. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (2010) argued, "network ties (social interaction) influence both access to parties for combining and exchanging knowledge and anticipation of value through such exchange." Knowledge sharing is, thus, also viewed as activities of transferring or disseminating knowledge (embracing implicit and tacit knowledge) from one person, group or organization to another.

In Nigeria, Onifade (2015) reported that the librarians were asked to state their perception and what they understand by the concept of knowledge sharing practices. The result shows that they understood the concept of knowledge sharing as they agreed that it is the process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual is shared with another individual. The result also shows that respondents are aware of the importance of sharing knowledge with one another and that knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity to library services. The overall mean score of the scale is 3.13, rated as weighted average of 61.3%, thereby indicating that librarians in federal university libraries in Nigeria have a positive perception on knowledge sharing.

## 2.8 Benefits of Knowledge Sharing Practices

Authors such as Bouthillier and Shearer (2012), Cabrera and Cabrera (2012), Gafoor and Cloete (2010) and Griffiths (2010) cited in Dube and Ngulube (2012) were of the view that without knowledge sharing, people in organizations tend to remain fixed in silos, poorly knitted together, prone to duplication of work and repetition of mistakes, wastage of resources, forgetful of good ideas, and without the harnessing of strengths which are time-consuming, costly and may lead to ineffectiveness and inefficiencies in the job performance. Research has also shown that knowledge sharing is capable of reducing the production costs, and leads to faster completion of new product development projects, team performance, firm innovation capabilities, and firm performance, including sales growth and revenue from new products and services (Arthur & Huntley, 2015).

The authors further reiterated that because of the potential benefits that can be realized from knowledge sharing, many organizations have invested considerable time and money into knowledge management initiatives, including the development of knowledge management systems that use state-of-the-art technology to facilitate the collection, storage, and distribution of knowledge. Dewah (2012) posited that organizations are now addressing the issue of knowledge sharing due to their growing awareness of the importance of knowledge to organizational success. Through sharing, knowledge is retained within the organizations while effective knowledge sharing practices have the potential to give an organization a sustainable competitive advantage that is difficult to imitate for their competitors (King et al., 2012; Chen, 2014; Ford, 2014; Shin, 2014; Chong et al., 2014). The ultimate goal of sharing employees' knowledge is its transfer to organizational assets and resources (Dawson, 2011). As Inkpen (2010) puts it, "unless individual knowledge is shared throughout an organization, the knowledge will have a limited impact on organizational effect".

Knowledge sharing practices among university librarians is perceived as one of the most convenient and effective ways to obtain knowledge. It enhances their ability to seek studies related help from one another and facilitates achieving outcomes of collective learning. Learning and knowledge sharing practices are closely related. The knowing process is a component of sharing, thinking and learning (Alegbeleye, 2010; Etim, 2010). For instance, if any university library is to perform its functions effectively, its work areas must include the following: information and communication technologies, automation, networking, internet, administration, cataloguing, acquisition, abstracting, indexing, publishing, marketing of products and services, seminars, workshops, polices, interlibrary loan, staffing, knowledge management and database management among others (Alegbeleye, 2010; Etim, 2010).

Eden and Ani (2010) stated that knowledge management is an activity that aids at spreading information. It is an activity that aims at spreading and/or circulating the knowledge of a phenomenon, an individual, a community, a society and an institution in order to bring about direct positive change in the state of- the-art of a system, institution or an organization, especially as it relates to productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. Mohammed (2013) also posited that knowledge management aids the transformation of relationship between experts and amateurs, poor and rich, educated and uneducated, literate and illiterate, enlightened and ignorant, government and citizenry, etc towards advancement and progress of the nation, society and individuals. Knowledge Management in libraries refers to effectively identifying, acquiring, developing, resolving, using, storing and sharing knowledge to create an approach to transforming and sharing of tacit and explicit knowledge, and to raise emergency and innovative capabilities by utilizing the wisdom of the team.

University libraries are quite interested in using technology to network operations such as administration, cataloguing, interlibrary loan and international bibliographic projects. If properly utilized, it helps the growth and development of libraries in different directions. It allows easy integration of various activities, facilitates cooperation, helps to avoid duplication of efforts within the library and among libraries in a network, eliminates some uninteresting and repetitive work and provides marketing opportunity for its services (Fayose & Nwalo, 2010). The option available for now is to include networks, electronic mail and the internet to satisfy the information needs of the users in the twenty-first century.

Organizations can adopt a variety of mechanisms like Knowledge Management and preserve the knowledge which can be later used by other employees even when one moves out; this practice would develop a legacy for the company. Davenport (2010) and Alexopoulos and Monks (2014) considered knowledge sharing as a crucial KM outcome within organizations; it facilitates the integration and regeneration of fragmented, specialized and/or asymmetrically distributed knowledge, thus making feasible the creation of new knowledge, and the production of complex and innovative products and services (Pastor et al., 2010). Ditrichova (2015) opined that knowledge sharing increases efficiency, creativity and innovation; it also leads to better decision making while it preserves the existing knowledge.

Finally, knowledge sharing empowers employees by increasing their commitment and giving them a voice. These authors (Powell, Piccoli, & Ives, 2004, and Staples and Webster, 2008) opine that both physical and virtual teams bring together individuals from different backgrounds, with different expertise and different perspectives; they rely on one another's knowledge for solving problems and benefit from diversity if they engage in knowledge sharing, as cited in Tuan (2013).

It is also the view of Specialist Library (2005) that effective sharing of best practices can help organizations to:

- *Identify and replace poor practices – in this case, it helps to remove the old methods of cataloguing and classifying in the libraries;*
- *Raise the performers closer to that of the best - where librarians work together as a family and attend to users' queries;*
- *Avoid reinventing the wheel - once a better method of doing things had been identified, it is no more proper to go back to it as it will affect the productivity of workers;*
- *Minimize re-work caused by use of poor methods - avoiding at most, old ways of shelving in the libraries;*
- *Save cost through better productivity and efficiency - through better ways of doing one's job, there is more productivity and efficiency on the job, thereby minimizing costs; and*
- *Improve services to customers - more users will come to the libraries once there are improved services rendered to them by the librarians.*

## 2.9 Summary and Gaps in Literature

The chapter reviewed literature from different previous studies related to the subject under study. The literature reviewed was structured in conformity with the study objectives as well as the research questions. The following issues were discussed: knowledge sharing practices and concepts, benefits and meaning of knowledge sharing, the constraints to knowledge sharing, knowledge sharing in global, African and Nigeria perspectives as well as factors affecting knowledge sharing. Empirical studies under each theme were highlighted and discussed, where possible. From the literature reviewed, it was observed that there is a dearth of research findings on knowledge sharing practices with respect to Nigeria universities' context, particularly the Southwestern federal universities. Literature also revealed that there is lack of a systematic approach to library knowledge support structure, which creates a wide knowledge gap among librarians.

This scenario creates a vacuum as soon as any librarian leaves the job; he or she goes away with his or her wealth of knowledge. Whereas if such knowledge were shared, it would ensure that important knowledge would still be available even when such staff has left. Therefore, this lack of organized knowledge support structure renders knowledge retention ability ineffective among the librarians. Literature review indicated that lots of knowledge sharing activities in university libraries were largely uncoordinated, hence sharing knowledge among librarians has always been on an informal basis and usually based on verbal conversations. Many factors, as revealed by literature review, militate against knowledge sharing practices in Nigeria.

# CHAPTER THREE

# RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology that was adopted to carry out this research which includes: the design of the study, population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instrument, validity of the instrument, procedure for data collection, method of data analysis and ethical consideration.

## 3.2 Research Design

The study adopted the descriptive survey design, it involves a systematic and comprehensive collection of information about the opinions, attitude, feelings, and beliefs and behavior of people through observation, interviewing, and administering of questionnaires to a relatively large and representative sample of the population of interest (Cresswell, 2015). The survey design is appropriate for this study because it enabled the researcher to provide a rich detailed on the exploration of knowledge sharing practices amongst professional librarians of university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria.

## 3.3 Population of the Study

The population for this study consisted of all the One-hundred and fifty-eight (158) librarians in university libraries in Kwara State. It covered all the librarians in all the universities in Kwara State, Nigeria. The population of the librarians is presented in Table 3.1:

*Table 3.1: Population of Librarians and Library Officers in University Libraries in Kwara State*

| University | Librarian | Library Officer | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| University of Ilorin, Ilorin | 38 | 28 | 66 |
| Kwara State University, Malete | 18 | 7 | 25 |
| Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| Landmark University, Omu-Aran | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Summit University, Offa | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Ojaja University, Eiyenkorin | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Thomas Adewunmi University, Oko | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Ahman Pategi, University, Pategi | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Muhammed Kamaldeen University, Ilorin | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Kwara State University of Education, Ilorin | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| **Total** | **98** | **60** | **158** |

## 3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The study adopted total enumeration sampling technique. If a study population is small and less in number; it may be preferable to do a study of everyone in the population, rather than a sample (Kumar, 2018). The researcher involved all the librarians in all the university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria. The sample size obtained for this study was amount to One-hundred and fifty-eight (158).

## 3.5 Research Instrument(s)

The instrument for data collection for this was is questionnaire. The questionnaire titled: "exploration of knowledge sharing practices amongst professional librarians of university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria" was designed in a way that it elicits the needed information from the librarians used for the study. The survey questionnaire comprises a closed-ended questionnaire, and the questionnaire is mainly for library staff in all the university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria.

### 3.6 Validity and Reliability of the Instrument(s)

The instrument for this study was validated to know and be sure of the extent to which it will collect the correct data for which it was designed (Winter, 2015). The research instrument had gone through several stages of face validation. The researcher and the supervisor designed the instrument based on the research questions. The questions were vetted and corrections was made to ensure that the research questions are met.

A test-re-test method of two weeks intervals was also adopted: test-re-test reliability measures the consistency of results when the researcher repeats the same test on the same sample at a different point in time. The responses obtained was subjected to Cronbach's Alpha and the correlation coefficient, all returned and all the items used in this research have a scale ranging from 0.6 to 0.8 which will accept alpha level to confirm the reliability of the instrument of the study.

### 3.7 Method of Data Collection

The questionnaire for the study was administered to respondents in all the university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria by the researcher and two (2) research assistants during the library opening hours of working days. This is to avail the researcher to have physical contact with the respondents and be able to explain to them the areas where they might find it difficult to understand the questions asked. A letter of introduction was obtained from the researcher's supervisor to facilitate access to librarians in partaking university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria. A total of One-hundred and fifty-eight (158) copies of the questionnaire were administered to the librarians in all the university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria.

### 3.8 Method of Data Analysis

The data collected was collated and subjected to comprehensive data analysis using the IBM Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) software version 26.0. The descriptive statistics includes frequency counts, percentages, mean and standard deviation. Tables were used for results presentation.

### 3.9 Ethical Considerations

The study made use of anonymity ethical consideration and follow all the ethics guiding scholarly writing by ensuring the work is original. Anonymity refers to keeping secret by not identifying the ethnic or cultural background of respondents, refrain from referring to them by their names or divulging any other sensitive information about a participant (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). This enhances honesty towards the research subject by protecting them from physical and psychological harm thereby ensuring that the researcher does not ask embarrassing questions which can disguise or even shock the respondent.

# CHAPTER FOUR

# DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

## 4.1 Introduction

This chapter is focused on the analysis of the data, presentation of results and discussion of findings. Data collected through questionnaires are presented in tables and analyzed using frequency counts and percentages. Also in this chapter, the major findings of the study are further discussed.

## 4.2 Response Rate

*Table 4.1: Response Rate*

| Distributed Questionnaire | Retrieved Questionnaire | Valid | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 158 | 151 | 147 | 93.0 |

The total of 158 copies of questionnaires was administered to the librarians and library officers in the ten universities in Kwara State. 151 copies were retrieved and 147 copies were filled and valid which resulting as response rate of 93.0%. As shown in table 4.1.

## 4.3 Demographic Data of the Respondents

*Table 4.2: Demographic Information of the Respondents*

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 85 | 57.8 |
| Female | 62 | 42.2 |
| **Total** | **147** | **100.0** |
| **Age Bracket** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Less than 25 years | 2 | 1.4 |
| 25 – 34 years | 21 | 14.3 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 35 – 44 years | 27 | 18.4 |
| 45 – 54 years | 84 | 57.1 |
| 55 – 64 years | 13 | 8.8 |
| **Total** | **147** | **100.0** |

| **Marital Status** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|---|---|---|
| Single | 18 | 12.2 |
| Divorced | 1 | 0.7 |
| Widowed | 2 | 1.4 |
| **Total** | **147** | **100.0** |

| **Educational Attainment** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
|---|---|---|
| Diploma | 1 | 0.7 |
| OND | 6 | 4.1 |
| BSc/HND | 13 | 8.8 |
| Masters | 102 | 69.4 |
| PhD | 21 | 14.3 |
| Others… | 4 | 2.7 |
| **Total** | **147** | **100.0** |

| **Years of Experience** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
|---|---|---|
| 1 – 5 years | 25 | 17.0 |
| 6 – 10 years | 37 | 25.2 |
| 11 – 15 years | 26 | 17.7 |
| 16 – 20 years | 26 | 17.7 |
| 20 years and above | 33 | 22.4 |
| **Total** | **147** | **100.0** |

Table 4.2 shows that across all the institutions, there were more responses from males than the females. Responses from males were 85 (57.8%) while female has 62 (42.2%). This indicates that there were more male librarians than females in the study site. In terms of age, the librarians' age distribution shows that 57.1% of the respondents were between 45 - 54 years, followed by 18.4% that corresponds to 35 - 44 years. Those librarians whose ages were less than 25years were 2 (1.4%) and those within 25-34 years were 21 (14.3%) while respondents within age brackets of 55-64 were 13 (8.8%). In other words, 13(8.8%) were close to the retirement age of 65; this reflects that the majority (75%) of the respondents still have at least between 20 and 30 years to work in

their respective libraries. The results in the Table 5.4 showed that only 18 (12.2%) of the librarians across the institutions were single in terms of their marital status while a large number of them 126 (85.7%) were married. Others are: divorced 1 (0.7%) and widowed 2 (1.4%). Since there is a high number of married respondents, these librarians are not only educated, they are mature people.

With respect to educational qualifications of librarians in this study, their qualifications range from Diploma to Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). Only 1 (0.7%) of the respondents has a Diploma as the highest educational qualification; 6 (4.1%) were National Diploma (OND) holders; 13 (8.8%) were Bachelor Degree/Higher National Diploma (HND) holders; 102 (69.4%) were Masters Holders; 21 (14.3%) were PhD holders while those in the "others" category were 4 (2.7%). The Senior School Certificate Examination (S.S.C.E) covers 0.6%, Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) covers 1.4%, while the remaining 0.7% mentioned Nigeria Certificate in Education (N.C.E) as the highest qualification obtained. Year of experience of the respondents varied from 1 to 21 years and above. Those with years of service within 1-5 years were 25 (17.0%); those within 6-10 years were 37 (25.2%); 11-15 years and 16-20 years were each 26 (17.7%) respectively; while those that are 21 years and above were 33 (22.4%).

## 4.4 Analyses of Variables

**Research Question One: What is the perception of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?**

*Table 4.3: The perception of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries.*

| Options | SA | A | D | SD | M | St. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I think knowledge sharing is a process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual should be shared with another individual. | 27(13.55) | 63(31.5%) | 98(49% | 12(6%) | 2.525 | 0.80162 |
| I think knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity to library services. | 39(19.5%) | 142(71%) | 16(8%) | 3(1.5%) | 3.085 | 0.5739 |
| I am aware of the importance of sharing my knowledge with my colleagues. | 44(22%) | 72(36%) | 69(34.5%) | 6(3%) | 2.8063 | 0.82664 |
| By sharing knowledge, I can use the experience of others in finding solutions to problems I encounter on the job. | 46(23%) | 109(54.5%) | 42(21%) | 3(1.5%) | 2.99 | 0.70881 |
| I feel knowledge sharing will enhance my skills in this library. | 49(24.5%) | 80(40%) | 56(28%) | 3(1.5%) | 2.9634 | 0.82316 |

**Weighted Average = 2.87(57.48%)**

***Keys: SA****=Strongly Agreed;* ***A****=Agreed;* ***D****=Disagreed;* ***SD****=Strongly Disagreed;* ***M****=Mean;* ***St. D****=Standard Deviation*

The first research question sought to identify the perception of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries in Kwara State. The means score of those that emphasize that knowledge sharing is a process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual should be shared with other individuals is 2.53 on 5-point scale, while the standard deviation is 0.802. This means that on average, respondents agree with the fact that knowledge possessed by an individual should be shared with another individual. Secondly, the mean score of those librarians that are of the opinion that knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity to library services is 3.085. This information implies that on average, librarians supported the fact that knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity to library services. Besides, the highest number librarians think knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity to library services since it has the highest mean value of 3.085 with a standard deviation of 0.5739.

**Research Question Two: What are the methods of sharing knowledge amongst librarians in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?**

*Table 4.4: The extent of sharing knowledge amongst librarians in university libraries.*

| Options | SA | A | N | D | SD | M | St. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Face-to-face | 12(6%) | 29(14.5%) | 118(59%) | 32(16%) | 6(3%) | 2.9543 | 0.82248 |
| Seminars | 12(6%) | 24(12%) | 46(23%) | 101(50.5%) | 17(8.5%) | 3.435 | 1.01039 |
| Meetings | 6(3%) | 37(18.5%) | 85(42.5%) | 46(23%) | 23(11.5%) | 3.2183 | 0.9836 |
| Personal Telephone Calls | 9(4.5%) | 21(10.5%) | 70(35%) | 81(40.5%) | 16(8%) | 3.3756 | 0.9428 |
| E-mails | 14(7%) | 29(14.5%) | 94(47%) | 41(20.5%) | 22(11%) | 3.14 | 1.02746 |
| Video Conference | 10(5%) | 21(10.5%) | 74(37%) | 70(35%) | 25(12.5%) | 3.395 | 1.002 |
| Workshops | 3(1.5%) | 20(10%) | 85(42.5%) | 68(34%) | 24(12%) | 3.45 | 0.88397 |
| Library Forum | 3(1.5%) | 9(4.5%) | 72(36%) | 87(43.5%) | 29(14.5%) | 3.65 | 0.83726 |
| **Weighted Average = 3.33 (41.59%)** | | | | | | | |

***Keys:*** ***SA****=Strongly Agreed;* ***A****=Agreed;* ***N****=Neutral;* ***D****=Disagreed;* ***SD****=Strongly Disagreed;* ***M****=Mean;* ***St. D****=Standard Deviation*

Table 4.4 shows the methods adopted by the librarians in university libraries in Kwara State to share knowledge amongst themselves. This section thus presents answers to the research question as the data collected for the study reveals that the librarians in university libraries in Kwara State share knowledge via Face-to-face (59%), meetings (42.5%), e-mails (47%), video conference (37%) and workshops (42.5%), while more than average share knowledge via other methods such as seminars (50.5%), personal telephone calls (40.5%), and library forum (43.5%). Overall, the total mean of their responses is 3.33 rated as weighted average of 41.6%. Although, according to these results, the degree to which the methods knowledge is being shared seems not that encouraging, it shows that librarians in university libraries in Kwara State slightly use those methods to share knowledge amongst themselves.

**Research Question Three: What are the perceived benefits of knowledge sharing amongst librarians in in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?**

*Table 4.5: The perceived benefits of knowledge sharing amongst librarians in university libraries.*

| Options | SA | A | N | D | SD | M |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledge sharing helps to improve productivity and performance in the library. | 83(56.5%) | 59(40.1%) | 3(2.0%) | 1(0.7%) | 1(0.7%) | 4.48 |
| Knowledge sharing speeds up processing of users' queries. | 72(49.3%) | 70(47.9%) | 2(1.4%) | 0(0.0%) | 2(1.4%) | 4.42 |
| Knowledge sharing provides updates with current and valuable information in librarianship. | 78(53.1%) | 64(43.5%) | 0(0.0%) | 1(0.7%) | 4(2.7%) | 4.47 |
| Knowledge sharing brings together diverse knowledge and expertise. | 107(72.8%) | 36(24.5%) | 2(1.4%) | 1(0.7%) | 1(0.7%) | 4.67 |
| It is a together repository that we use to share knowledge. | 90(61.2%) | 40(27.2%) | 6(4.1%) | 6(4.1%) | 5(3.4%) | 4.38 |
| It motivates me to be vast in my area of expertise and knowledge. | 95(64.6%) | 48(32.7%) | 1(0.7%) | 0(0.0%) | 3(2.0%) | 4.59 |
| **Weighted Average = 3.56 (60.2%)** | | | | | | |

***Keys: SA****=Strongly Agreed;* ***A****=Agreed;* ***N****=Neutral;* ***D****=Disagreed;* ***SD****=Strongly Disagreed;* ***M****=Mean*

From Table 4.5, 142(96.6%) of the respondents with a mean value of 4.48 indicated that knowledge sharing helps to improve productivity and performance; 142(97.2%) of them with a 4.42 mean value stated that knowledge sharing speeds up processing of users' queries; 142(96.6%) with a 4.47 mean value also believed that knowledge sharing provides updates with current and valuable information; 143(97.3%) of them with a 4.67 mean value also believe that knowledge sharing brings together diverse knowledge and expertise; 130(88.4%) with a 4.38 mean value stated that knowledge sharing is a together repository while (143)97.3% with a 4.59 mean value indicated that knowledge sharing motivates them to be vast in their area of expertise and knowledge. In all the questions raised, the mean value is higher and very close to the "strongly agreed" response. This data therefore indicates that the majority of librarians in the study site do share knowledge mostly because of the reciprocal benefits from their colleagues or as the case may be.

## 4.5 Discussion of Findings

The study revealed there were more responses from males than females. The percentage difference in response between the two genders is 15.6% because there were 85(57.8%) responses from males and 62(42.2%) from females. Records in each federal university show that there are more male (librarians) than female staff. This finding in the gender category is at variance with the findings of Onifade (2015) who revealed that there were more female librarians in federal universities in Nigeria than their male counterparts where, out of the total respondents, 187(51.7%) were female while 159(43.9%) were male. Some possible reasons that can be advanced to justify why male librarians were more than their female counterparts may be due to the peculiarity of the selected libraries in this study as well as the industrial actions that affected administrative positions in some of the visited university libraries during the course of the survey.

The respondents' age bracket in all the selected institutions varies from less than 25 – 64 years. From all the respondents, the majority are between the ages of 45-54 years, followed by those between ages 35-44 years; this information indicates that the respondents are mature enough to know the implication of their actions. This age bracket 45-54 is 57.14% of the total age bracket

(Figure 5.2). Therefore, the decisions of this age bracket go a long way in determining the outcome of this study. This result is in agreement with the findings of Onifade (2015). Similarly, the survey findings suggest that age is a determinant factor that affects knowledge sharing amongst librarians, as explained by Muchaonyerwa (2015).

Many librarians (respondents) had suitable qualifications that fitted best practice. The majority (69.4%) were Master's degree holders followed by PhD holders (14.3%), as shown in Table 5.2. This result indicates that most librarians under this study have higher qualifications. Moreover, only 17% of the respondents had less than 5 years-experience in service probably because all the university libraries under this study, except FUOYE, are first generation universities with the most qualified personnel. This result concurs with the findings of Onifade (2015) who suggested that the respondents had adequate and diverse qualifications which, if well harnessed, will improve their knowledge creation and networking.

In addition, in terms of years of experience, 83% of the total respondents have 6-21 years of experience and above. This is plausible since these higher qualifications would place the librarians at an advantage to understand the importance of sharing knowledge. This result is in consonant with the assertion of Mavodza (2010) who argued that librarians who worked for more than 15 years in the library were assumed to have thorough information of how knowledge is shared in Metropolitan College library in New York. Additionally, Peng, et al. (2010) observed that if experienced professional share their thinking of work and how it should be performed, this may help new workers to succeed in their jobs and benefit the organisation.

The first research question sought to identify the perception of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries in Kwara State. The main goal of this objective was to know whether the librarians in the in Kwara State actually understand the concepts of KS practices as well as the need to share knowledge among themselves and even beyond their organizations. Results of the descriptive statistics on the perception of some librarians, as indicated in Table 4.3, showed that they understood the concept of knowledge sharing as they agreed that knowledge possessed by an individual should be shared with another individual, with 2.53 mean score on 5-point scale, while the standard deviation is 0.802.

This result is in agreement with the findings of Connelly et al. (2013) and Achmad et al. (2012) who argued that employees' perceptions about a positive social interaction culture are a significant determinant of a positive knowledge sharing. Similarly, Onifade (2015) revealed in his findings that librarians in the in Kwara State agreed that knowledge sharing is the process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual is shared with another individual. In contrast, the industrial technology students in a public higher educational institution in Philippines suggested that sharing knowledge among individuals depends on their socio-economic characteristics such as gender, academic year level and scholastic status (Christian Le Marjo, 2012).

The second research question shows the rate at which the respondents make use of their specified methods of sharing knowledge differs. Some librarians prefer to use one particular method or more while some hardly ever use any specific medium but prefer all available means to share knowledge. These statistics therefore suggests that the face-to-face method is the most frequently used method while personal telephone calls is the least method in sharing knowledge amongst librarians in the study site. So, this conclusion is in contrast with the perspective of the Adaptive Structuration Theory (Anthony Giddens, 1984), which posited that some organizations such as university library settings nowadays rely heavily on the use of advanced information technology in the form of group-computer interaction to satisfy their users' queries as they come into the libraries (Sedera & Zakaria, 2018).

The third research question revealed that the majority (60.2%) of librarians in the study site share knowledge mostly because of the reciprocal benefits from their colleagues. Similarly, in all questions raised under this category, the mean value is higher and very close to the "strongly agreed" response. This data indicates that the perceived reciprocal benefit is a significant factor in knowledge sharing practices. Corroborating this claim, Kiesler and Sproull (2010) noted that sharing depends on the form of information, that is, individuals can be more willing to share intangible information (e.g., expertise and advice) because one can derive personal benefit in sharing it. Reciprocity is the core principle of Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1986). The SET says that reciprocity is the future earnings expectations after people's contribution of knowledge and the theory therefore, claims that people engaged in social activities and relation tend to participate in social contribution.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the key findings in summary and discussions in line with the objectives of the study. Covered in this chapter are also conclusion and recommendations. Lastly, the chapter provides possible areas for further studies that were outside the scope of this study.

## 5.2 Summary

The major findings of the study indicated that the librarians engage in knowledge sharing practices among themselves in university libraries in Kwara State. The findings also identified the methods adopted by the librarians in university libraries in Kwara State to share knowledge amongst themselves. The perceived benefits of knowledge sharing amongst librarians in university libraries in Kwara State were also highlighted. The major findings of the study are summaries as follows:

i. Librarians in Kwara State have positive perceptions on knowledge sharing such as I think knowledge sharing is a process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual should be shared with another individual; I think knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity to library services among others.
ii. Librarians in Kwara State shows adopted various methods to share knowledge amongst themselves. Such methods are: Face-to-face, meetings, e-mails, video conference and workshops.

iii. Lastly, the study identified the perceived benefits of such as knowledge sharing helps to improve productivity and performance in the library and knowledge sharing speeds up processing of users' queries among others.

## 5.3 Conclusion

This study was carried out on knowledge sharing practices amongst librarians in university libraries in Kwara State. The following objectives served as a guide: the perceptions of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries in Kwara State; methods of knowledge sharing practices adopted by the librarians in university libraries in Kwara State; and the perceived benefits of knowledge sharing practices amongst the librarians in university libraries in Kwara State. The study concluded that librarians in university libraries in Kwara State have positive perceptions on knowledge sharing practices. In the same vein, knowledge sharing practices can bring innovation and creativity to library services, and there was an awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing practices amongst librarians in the study site.

Also, librarians used many methods in sharing knowledge, but the face-to-face method is the most frequently used one while personal telephone calls is the least method adopted in sharing knowledge. Similarly, librarians have full knowledge of the efficacy of those methods used in their respective libraries. In terms of infrastructures, the common infrastructure put in place by the management of the selected libraries is Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) even though not all university library sections were fully computerized. Even though in some places where the internet facilities were available, lack of adequate technical knowhow to explore the facilities became a bane. Finally, although knowledge sharing practices exist amongst librarians in the university libraries in Kwara State but the rate at which they share knowledge is not high.

## 5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings from this study, the following recommendations were given:

i. There should be adequate and regular on-job training for the librarians to improve their competence and capability in sharing knowledge. Therefore, there should be opportunity for the librarians to attend seminars, workshops, conferences and special trainings on librarianship and related courses.
ii. There should be a need for the librarians to be motivated and encouraged to engage in knowledge sharing practices. This motivation can be through intrinsic or extrinsic rewards while required resources to facilitate the process should be made available and accessible.
iii. The methods adopted for knowledge sharing should be encouraged as it shows presence of a good interpersonal relationship amongst librarians, which made the adoption of this method easier for librarians to share knowledge among themselves.

## 5.5 Areas for Further Study

Based on the study findings, this researcher has identified areas where further related studies could be undertaken; these are discussed below.

i. There is a need for a study to be carried out in other states in Nigeria in order to determine whether the outcome of the current study can be generalized across other geopolitical zones in Nigeria.
ii. The fact that knowledge sharing practices is beneficial does not mean that every knowledge shared recipient will utilize the knowledge as expected. Therefore, there is a need to carry out an assessment on the development nature of knowledge sharing beneficiaries.

## References


Adelabu, A. (2010). Personnel problems in Nigeria's university libraries: in search of a realistic solution. *International Library Review, 3*(4), pp.355-363.

Alavi, M. (2010). *Managing organizational knowledge.* In R.W. Zmud (Ed.), Framing the Domain of IT Management: Projecting the Future Through the Past (pp. 15-28). Cincinnati, Ohio: Pinnflex Educational Resources, Inc. Boland, R. J., Jr.

Alavi, M. and Leidner, D. E. (2011). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly,* 107-136.

Alegbeleye, B. (2010). Old wine in new bottle: A critical analysis of the relationship between knowledge and library and information science. Paper presented at the 48th National Conference of the Nigeria Library Association, Abuja, 2010.

Al-Hawamdeh, S. (2013). Knowledge management: cultivating knowledge professionals. Elsevier.

Amina, A. B. (2015). Library funding in Nigeria: past, present and future. *The Bottom Line, 18*(2), 63-70.

Ani, O. E., Esin, J. E. & Edem, N. (2015). Adoption of information and communication technology (ICT) in academic libraries: A strategy for library networking in Nigeria. *The Electronic Library, 23*(6), 701-708.

Anna, N. E., & Puspitasari, D. (2013). Knowledge sharing in libraries: A case study of knowledge sharing strategies in Indonesian university libraries. Proceedings of IFLA WLIC 2013 (1-11). Singapore: IFLA.

Ardichvili, A., Page, V. & Wentling, T. (2013). Motivation and barriers to participation in virtual knowledge-sharing communities of practice. *Journal of knowledge management, 7*(1), 64-77.

Arias Aranda, D. & Molina-Fernández, L.M. (2012). Determinants of innovation through a knowledge-based theory lens. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 102*(5), 289-296.

Arthur, J. B. & Huntley, C. L. (2015). Ramping up the organizational learning curve: Assessing the impact of deliberate learning on organizational performance under gainsharing. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(6), 1159-1170.

Asrar-ul-Haq, M. & Anwar, S. (2016). A systematic review of knowledge management and knowledge sharing: Trends, issues, and challenges. *Cogent Business & Management, 3*(1), 1127744.

Aswath, L. & Gupta, S. (2019). Knowledge management tools and academic library services. In International Conference on Academic Libraries–vision and roles of the future academic libraries (05-08).

Awodoyin, A., Osisanwo, T., Adetoro, N. & Adeyemo, I. (2016). Knowledge Sharing Behavior Pattern Analysis of Academic Librarians in Nigeria. *Journal of Balkan Libraries Union, 4*(1), 12-19.

Azudin, N., Ismail, M. N. & Taherali, Z. (2019). Knowledge sharing among workers: a study on their contribution through informal communication in Cyberjaya, Malaysia. Knowledge Management & E-Learning: *An International Journal, 1*(2), 139-162.

Babcock, P. (2014). Shedding light on knowledge management. *HR magazine, 49*(5), 46-51.

Barbie, E., (1989). *Survey Research Methods. (2nd ed).* California: Wadsworth Publishing Company,

Bartol, K. M. & Srivastava, A. (2012). Encouraging knowledge sharing: The role of organizational reward systems. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 64-76.

Becerra-Fernandez, I., Cousins, K. C. & Weber, R. O. (2017). Nomadic context-aware knowledge management systems: Applications, challenges and research problems. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation, 1*(2), 103-121.

Bouthillier, F. & Shearer, K. (2012). Understanding knowledge management and information management: the need for an empirical perspective. *Information research, 8*(1), 8-1.

Burgess, D. (2015). What motivates employees to transfer knowledge outside their work unit? The *Journal of Business Communication, 42*(4), 324-348.

Cabrera, A. & Cabrera, E. F. (2012). Knowledge-sharing dilemmas. *Organization studies, 23*(5), 687-710.

Cabrera, E. F. & Cabrera, A. (2015). Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(5), 720-735.

Carrillo, P. M., Anumba, C. J. & Kamara, J. M. (2010). Knowledge management strategy for construction: Key IT and contextual issues. *Proceedings of CIT, 2000*, 28-30.

Chang Li, H., Mirmirani, S. & Ilacqua, J. A. (2019). Confucius Institutes: Distributed leadership and knowledge sharing in a worldwide network. *The Learning Organization, 16*(6), 469-482.

Chaudhry, A. S. (2015). Knowledge sharing practices in Asian Institutions: a multi-cultural perspective from Singapore. Proceedings of the 7th IFLA General Conference and Council of the World Library and Information Congress, Oslo, Norway

Chiu, C. M., Hsu, M. H. & Wang, E. T. (2016). Understanding knowledge sharing in virtual communities: An integration of social capital and social cognitive theories. *Decision Support Systems, 42*(3), 1872-1888.

Chowdhury, N. (2017). Knowledge Management in Malaysia. In KM Asia 2007 Conference, Singapore.

Christian, L. M. (2013). Perception on Knowledge-sharing Activities among Industrial Technology Students in a Public Higher Education Institution. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology 6*(8), 1418-1423.

Chyi-Lee, C. & Yang, J. (2010). Knowledge value chain. *Journal of management development, 19*(9), 783-794.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach.* Los Angeles: Sage publications.

Daud, S., Rahim, R. E. A. & Alimun, R. (2018). Knowledge creation and innovation in classroom. *International Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(1), 75-79.

De Jong, T. & Ferguson-Hessler, M. G. (2010). Types and qualities of knowledge. *Educational psychologist, 31*(2), 105-113.

De Vries, R. E., Van den Hooff, B. & de Ridder, J. A. (2016). Explaining knowledge sharing: The role of team communication styles, job satisfaction, and performance beliefs. *Communication Research, 33*(2), 115-135.

Dewah, P. (2011). Knowledge retention strategies in selected southern African public broadcasting corporations. Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Fort Hare. Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/10353/438

Dewah, P. & Mutula, S. M. (2016). Knowledge retention strategies in public sector organizations: Current status in sub-Saharan Africa. *Information Development, 32*(3), 362-376.

Dewah, P. (2015). Organizational learning as a knowledge retention strategy in selected public broadcasting corporations in the Southern African Development Community. *Mousaion, 33*(1), 60-79.

Diso, L. I. (2015). Information production, transfer, and delivery: Mass information work and television Journalists' dilemma in Nigeria. *The International Information & Library Review, 37*(4), 285-294.

Drucker, P. F. (2011). *Knowledge work and knowledge society: The social transformations of this century.* British Library. USA Publisher: Oxford University Press

Dube, L. & Ngulube, P. (2012). Knowledge sharing in a multicultural environment: Challenges and opportunities. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science, 78*(1), 68-77.

Edem, N. & Ani, O. (2010). *Knowledge management in academic libraries in Nigeria.* In 48th National Conference and Annual General Meeting of the Nigerian Library Association (102-109).

Ernest, P. (1994). *An introduction to research methodology and paradigms.* London: Sage Publications

Ferguson, S., Hider, P. & Lloyd, A. (2018). Are librarians the ultimate knowledge managers? A study of knowledge, skills, practice and mindset. *The Australian Library Journal, 57*(1), 39-62.

Foss, N. J., Minbaeva, D. B., Pedersen, T. & Reinholt, M. (2019). Encouraging knowledge sharing among employees: How job design matters. *Human resource management, 48*(6), 871-893.

Gold, A. H. & Arvind Malhotra, A. H. S. (2011). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of management information systems, 18*(1), 185-214.

Gupta, A. K. & Govindarajan, V. (2010). Knowledge flows within multinational corporations. *Strategic Management Journal,* 473-496.

Gurteen, D. (2010). Creating a knowledge sharing culture. *Knowledge Management Magazine, 2*(5), 1-4.

Gururajan, V. & Fink, D. (2010). Attitudes towards knowledge transfer in an environment to perform. *Journal of knowledge Management, 14*(6), 828-840.

Haas, M. R. & Hansen, M. T. (2017). Different knowledge, different benefits: Toward a productivity perspective on knowledge sharing in organizations. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(11), 1133-1153.

Hall, H. (2011). Input-friendliness: Motivating knowledge sharing across intranets. *Journal of Information Science, 27*(3), 139-146.

Hall, P. M. (2012). Survivors' perspectives of organizational downsizing on knowledge sharing in a downsized environment. *Open Journal of Leadership, 1*(04), 17.

Hidayanto, A. N., Hapsari, I. C., Alfina, I. & Sucahyo, Y. G. (2013). Knowledge Sharing Perception: Multiple Case Studies in Indonesian IT Consulting Companies. *JCP, 8*(10), 2719-2723.

Holsapple, C. W. & Joshi, K. D. (2011). Organizational knowledge resources. Decision support systems, 31(1), 39-54.

Holsapple, C. W. & Singh, M. (2013). The knowledge chain model: Activities for competitiveness. In Handbook on knowledge management (215-251). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Holste, J. S. & Fields, D. (2010). Trust and tacit knowledge sharing and use. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 14*: 128-140.

Hsu, M. H., Ju, T. L., Yen, C. H. & Chang, C. M. (2017). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 65*(2), 53-169.

Husted, K. & Michailova, S. (2012). Diagnosing and fighting knowledge-sharing hostility. *Organizational Dynamics, 31*(1), 60-73.

Inkpen, A. C. (2010). Learning through joint ventures: a framework of knowledge acquisition. *Journal of Management Studies, 37*(7),1019-1044.

Iqbal, M. J., Rasli, A., Heng, L. H., Ali, M. B. B., Hassan, I. & Jolaee, A. (2011). Academic staff knowledge sharing intentions and university innovation capability. *African Journal of Business Management, 5*(27), 11051.

Ismail, A. A., Yousif A. N. & Fraidoon, M. Y. (2017). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: Critical success factors. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 11*(2), 22-42.

Jantz, R. (2011). Knowledge management in academic libraries: special tools and processes to support information professionals. *Reference Services Review, 29*(1), 33-39.

Jennex, M. E. (2018). Knowledge management success models. In Knowledge Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications (32-40). IGI Global.

Jones, R. (2019). Personal knowledge management through communicating. *Online Information Review, 33*(2), 225-236.

Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. & Wei, K. K. (20150. Contributing knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories: An empirical investigation. *MIS quarterly,* 113-143.

Kermally, S. (2012). *Effective knowledge management: a best practice blueprint.* Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kharabsheh, R. A. (2017). A model of antecedents of knowledge sharing. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management, 5*(4), 419-426.

Kidwell, J. J., Vander L. K. & Johnson, S. L. (2010). Applying corporate knowledge management practices in higher education. *Educause Quarterly, 23*(4), 28-33.

Koina, C. (2013). Librarians are the ultimate knowledge managers. *The Australian Library Journal, 52*(3), 269-272.

Kumaresan, S. C. (2010). Knowledge management and knowledge sharing for strategic library planning. Value of knowledge sharing for expatriate library professionals. *Perspectives in International Librarianship,* 4.

Kwok, S. H. & Gao, S. (2015). Attitude towards knowledge sharing behavior. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 46*(2), 45-51.

Lawal, W. O., Agboola, I. O., Aderibigbe, N. A., Owolabi, K. A. & Bakare, O. D. (2015). Knowledge sharing among academic staff in Nigerian University of Agriculture: A survey. *International Journal of Information Library and Society, 3*(1).

Lee, C. K. & Al-Hawamdeh, S. (2012). Factors impacting knowledge sharing. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management, 1*(01), 49-56.

Lee, J. N. (2011). The impact of knowledge sharing, organizational capability and partnership quality on IS outsourcing success. *Information & Management 38*(5), 323-335.

Leonard, D. & Sensiper, S. (2010). The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation. *California Management Review, 40*(3), 112-132.

Liao, S. H., Fei, W. C. & Chen, C. C. (2017). Knowledge sharing, absorptive capacity, and innovation capability: an empirical study of Taiwan's knowledge-intensive industries. *Journal of Information Science, 33*(3), 340-359.

Lilleoere, A. M. & Holme, H. E. (2011). Knowledge-sharing enablers and barriers in pharmaceutical research and development. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 15*(1), 53-70.

Lin, C. & Tseng, S. M. (2015). The implementation gaps for the knowledge management system. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 105*(2), 208-222.

Lin, H. F. (2017). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower. (28)*3/4: 315-332.

Lin, H. F. (2017). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of Information Science, 33*(2), 135-149.

Lin, H. F. (2017). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower, 28*(3/4), 315-332.

Martin, B., Hazeri, A. & Sarrafzadeh, M. (2016). Knowledge management and the LIS professions: Investigating the implications for practice and for educational provision. *The Australian Library Journal, 55*(1), pp.12-29.

Mavodza, J. (2010). Knowledge management practices and the role of an academic library in a changing information environment: The case of the Metropolitan College of the New York (Doctoral dissertation).

McDermott, R. & O'Dell, C. (2011). Overcoming cultural barriers to sharing knowledge. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 5*(1), 76-85.

McInerney, C. (2012). Knowledge management and the dynamic nature of knowledge. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology, 53*(12), 1009-1018.

Mosoti, Z. & Masheka, B. (2010). Knowledge management: The case for Kenya. *Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa, 2*(1), 107-133.

Newman, B. & Conrad, K. W. (2010). A framework for characterizing knowledge management methods. Practices, and Technologies, A series of papers on the theories, processes and practices behind Knowledge Management.

Noe, R. A., Colquitt. J. A., Simmering, M. J., & Alvarez, S. A. (2013). *Knowledge management: Developing intellectual and social capital. San Francisco,* CA: Jossey-Bass.

Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge creation company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. New York: Oxford University Press

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science, 5*(1), 14-37.

Nonaka, I. & Konno, N. (1998). The concept of Ba: Building a foundation for knowledge creation. *California Management Review, 40*:40-47.

Nonaka, I., Byosiere, P., Borucki, C. C. & Konno, N. (1994). Organizational knowledge creation theory: A first comprehensive test. *International Business Review, 3*(4), 337-351.

Nonaka, I., Toyama, R. & Konno, N. (2010). SECI, Ba and leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long Range Planning, 33*(1), 5-34.

Noor, N. M. & Salim, J. (2011). Factors influencing employee knowledge sharing capabilities in electronic government agencies in Malaysia. *IJCSI International Journal of Computer Science Issues, 8*(4/2).

Obembe, D. (2010). Understanding individual action: when employees contravene management directives to foster knowledge sharing. *Management Research Review, 33*(6), 656-666.

Okonedo, S. & 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.*

Omotayo, F. O. (2015). Knowledge Management as an important tool in organisational management: A review of literature. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 1*.

Onifade, F. N. (2015). Knowledge sharing among librarians in Federal university libraries in Nigeria. *Information and knowledge Management, 5*(3).

Oshri, I., Pan, S. L. & Newell, S. (2016). Managing trade-offs and tensions between knowledge management initiatives and expertise development practices. *Management Learning, 37*(1), 63-82.

Osterloh, M. & Frey, B. S. (2010). Motivation, knowledge transfer, and organizational forms. *Organization Science, 11*(5), 538-550.

Patrick, K. & Dotsika, F. (2017). Knowledge sharing: developing from within. *The Learning Organization, 14*(5), 395-406.

Porumbeanu, O. L. (2010). Implementing knowledge management in Romanian academic libraries: Identifying the elements that characterize their organizational culture. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36*(6), 549-552.

Prieto, I. M., Perez, S. M. P. & Martín S. C. (2010). Managing knowledge through human resource practices: empirical examination on the Spanish automotive industry. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(13), 2452-2467.

Pring, R. (2010). The ‘false dualism’ of educational research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 34*(2), 247-260.

Qureshi, A. M. A. & Evans, N. (2015). Deterrents to knowledge-sharing in the pharmaceutical industry: A case study. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 19*(2), 296-314.

Reagans, R. & McEvily, B. (2013). Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion and range. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(2), 240-267.

Riege, A. (2015). Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 9*(3), 18-35.

Rosen, B., Furst, S. & Blackburn, R. (2017). Overcoming barriers to knowledge sharing in virtual teams. *Organizational Dynamics, 36*(3), 259-273.

Rowley, J. (2013). Knowledge management–the new librarianship? From custodians of history to gatekeepers to the future. *Library Management, 24*(8/9), 433-440.

Rubenstein, A. H. & Geisler, E. (2013). *Installing and managing workable knowledge management systems.* Greenwood Publishing Group.

Sedera, D. & Zakaria, N. H. (2018). Adaptive structuration theory view of post implementation knowledge management for enterprise systems. PACIS 2018 Proceedings, 179.

Shanhong, T. (2010). The characteristics, content and correlative technology of knowledge management in new century. *New Technology of Library and Information Service, 5.*

Sheng, X. & Sun, L. (2017). Developing knowledge innovation culture of libraries. *Library Management, 28*(1/2), 36-52.

Shin, M. (2014). A framework for evaluating economics of knowledge management systems. *Information & management, 42*(1), 179-196.

Singh, M. D. & Kant, R. (2018). Knowledge management barriers: An interpretive structural modeling approach. *International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management, 3*(2), 141-150.

Sitlington, H. & Marshall, V. (2011). Do downsizing decisions affect organisational knowledge and performance? *Management Decision, 49*(1), 116-129.

Soliman, F. & Spooner, K. (2010). Strategies for implementing knowledge management: role of human resources management. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 4*(4), 337-345.

Teimouri, H., Emami, S. & Hamidipour, S. (2011). Studying the effective organisational factors on knowledge sharing between employees of governmental organizations in Isfahan province, Iran. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 3*(5).

Townley, C. T. (2011). Knowledge management and academic libraries. *College & research libraries, 62*(1), 44-55.

Tsui, L., Chapman, S. A. & Stewart, S. (2016). A Handbook on Knowledge Sharing: Strategies and Recommendations for Researchers, Policy Makers and Service Providers. Alberta: Community-University Partnership for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families.

Van Den Hooff, B. & De Ridder, J. A. (2014). Knowledge sharing in context: the influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and CMC use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 8*(6), 117-130.

Voelpel, S. C., Dous, M. & Davenport, T. H., (2015). Five steps to creating a global knowledge-sharing system: Siemens' ShareNet. *The Academy of Management Executive, 19*(2), 9-23.

Von Krogh, G., Ichijo, K. & Nonaka, I. (2010). Enabling knowledge creation: How to unlock the mystery of tacit knowledge and release the power of innovation. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Walczak, S. (2015). Organizational knowledge management structure. *The Learning Organization, 12*(4), 330-339.

Wang, S. & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(2), 115-131.

Watson, S. & Hewett, K. (2016). A multi-theoretical model of knowledge transfer in organizations: Determinants of knowledge contribution and knowledge reuse. *Journal of management studies, 43*(2), 141-173.

White, T. (2014). Knowledge management in an academic library. In 70th IFLA General Conference and Council, Buenos Aires, Argentina, August 22-27.

Williams, A., Giuse N., Koonce, T., Kou, Q. & Giuse, D. (2014). Using knowledge management practices to develop a state-of-the-art digital library. *MedInfo, 11*(1): 99-103.

Yang, J. T. (2017). Knowledge sharing: Investigating appropriate leadership roles and collaborative culture. *Tourism Management, 28*(2):530-543.

Yang, J. T. (2014). Job-related knowledge sharing: comparative case studies. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 8*(3), 118-126.

Yee-Loong C. A., Ooi, K. B., Bao, H. & Lin, B. (2014). Can e-business adoption be influenced by knowledge management? An empirical analysis of Malaysian SMEs. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 18*(1), 121-136.

## APPENDIX

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON:

## AN EXPLORATION OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING PRACTICES AMONGST PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

Dear respondent,

I am a student in the Department of Library and Information Science, Institute of Information and Communication Technology, Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin. I am currently undertaking research project titled: "*An exploration of knowledge sharing practices amongst professional librarians of university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria*". I therefore, request you to kindly provide your opinions to the questions as contained in the attached questionnaire. Information provided in this questionnaire will be held confidential and used for research purpose only.

Your quick response will be highly appreciated.

Thanks for your anticipated cooperation.

**ADETUNJI, Saidat Awele**

**Researcher**

**SECTION A: Demographic Data**

***Specify by ticking the right option***

***Please indicate your university library:***

| | |
|---|---|
| University of Ilorin Library | [ ] |
| Kwara State University Library | [ ] |
| Al-Hikmah University Library | [ ] |
| Summit University Library | [ ] |
| Landmark University Library | [ ] |
| Ojaja University Library | [ ] |
| Ahman Pategi University Library | [ ] |
| Thomas Adewunmi University Library | [ ] |
| Muhammed Kamaldeen University Library | [ ] |
| Kwara State University of Education, Ilorin | [ ] |

**Gender:** Male [ ]; Female [ ]

**Age Bracket:** Less than 25 years [ ]; 25 – 34 years [ ]; 35 – 44 years [ ]; 45 – 54 years [ ]; 55 – 64 years [ ]

**Marital Status:** Single [ ]; Divorced [ ]; Widowed [ ]

**Educational Attainment:** Diploma [ ]; OND [ ]; BSc/HND [ ]; Masters [ ]; PhD [ ]; Others………………………………….

**Years of Experience:** 1 – 5 years [ ]; 6 – 10 years [ ]; 11 – 15 years [ ]; 16 – 20 years [ ]; 20 years and above [ ]

**SECTION B: What is the perception of librarians on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?**

***Keys:*** *SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree*

| Options | SA | A | D | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I think knowledge sharing is a process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual should be shared with another individual. | | | | |
| I think knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity to library services. | | | | |
| I am aware of the importance of sharing my knowledge with my colleagues. | | | | |
| By sharing knowledge, I can use the experience of others in finding solutions to problems I encounter on the job. | | | | |
| I feel knowledge sharing will enhance my skills in this library. | | | | |

**SECTION C: What are the methods of sharing knowledge amongst librarians in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?**

***Keys:*** *SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree*

| Options | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Face-to-face | | | | | |
| Seminars | | | | | |
| Meetings | | | | | |
| Personal Telephone Calls | | | | | |
| E-mails | | | | | |
| Video Conference | | | | | |
| Workshops | | | | | |
| Library Forum | | | | | |

**SECTION D: What are the perceived benefits of knowledge sharing amongst librarians in in university libraries in Kwara State, Nigeria?**

***Keys:*** *SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree*

| Options | SA | A | N | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledge sharing helps to improve productivity and performance in the library. | | | | |
| Knowledge sharing speeds up processing of users' queries. | | | | |
| Knowledge sharing provides updates with current and valuable information in librarianship. | | | | |
| Knowledge sharing brings together diverse knowledge and expertise. | | | | |
| It is a together repository that we use to share knowledge. | | | | |
| It motivates me to be vast in my area of expertise and knowledge. | | | | |