

PERCEPTION OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN'S TOWARDS KNOWLEDGE SHARING FOR SERVICE DELIVERY IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN KADUNA STATE

Dr. Kabiru Dahiru Abbas

Bayero University, Kano.

Dalhatu Usman Mairiga

Abstract

The study investigated the perception of academic librarians towards knowledge sharing in the university libraries in Kaduna state; to identify the services delivered towards knowledge sharing in the university libraries in Kaduna state and to identify the inhibitors to knowledge sharing among academic librarians in the university libraries in Kaduna state. The study adopted the quantitative research approached from the positivists school of thought, using descriptive survey design. The total enumeration sampling scale was also adopted to administer questionnaires to 172 academic librarians. The data collected was analyzed using mean score value. The findings of the study revealed tha: majority of the respondents have positive perception towards knowledge sharing. The findings of the study also show tha: Current Awareness Services (CAS), reference services and circulation services are the major services delivered by the respondents. Also, findings of the study revealed that: insufficient funds, lack of seffective communication between staff and management and lack of motivation/support from management are the major inhibitors to knowledge sharing among academic librarians in the university libraries. However, the study recommended that the library management should be sending academic librarians to workshops, seminars, conferences and trainings on any topic related to knowledge sharing as this will positively reshape their mindsets, which will in turn, enhance their efficient and effective service delivery.

Keyw ords: Perception, Academic librarians, Knowledge sharing, University libraries, Kaduna states.

Introduction

Knowledge has become a competitive factor that provides an essential cause for both individual and organizational success. Knowledge sharing refers to the process of making knowledge available to others by exchanging it among organizational members in order for them to collaborate on organizational tasks, solve problems or implement ideas (Flinchbaugh and Chadwick, 2016). The aspect of the library services is that of collecting, synthesizing and disseminating up-to-date, accurate and unbiased relevant information and resources available in books, periodicals, bulletins, guides abstracts, indexes, bibliographies, and non-book formats which can be stored and retrieved whenever needed (Omoniwa, 2016). As such, it is of crucial importance for every academic library to instill positive perception about knowledge sharing on its employees (academic librarians) so as to deliver services of high quality.

Statement of the Problem

Knowledge sharing is taken by many organizations to be a panacea for boosting innovation and improving productivity. Hence, the inability of librarians to view knowledge sharing as the key factor for attaining success has been identified as one of the critical

contributing factor for sluggish service delivery within libraries. Preliminary investigations has however shown that academic librarians in university libraries in Kaduna state are not actively adopting knowledge sharing for effective library service delivery due to their perception thereby impeding knowledge innovation and technology diffusion. As such, there is the need to study the perception of academic librarians towards knowledge sharing in Kaduna state university libraries which would speed up maximum service delivery.

Research Objectives

the specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To investigate the perception of academic librarians towards knowledge sharing in the university libraries in Kaduna state.
2. To identify the services delivered towards knowledge sharing in the university libraries in Kaduna state.
3. To identify the inhibitors to knowledge sharing among academic librarians in the university libraries in Kaduna state.

Literature Review

Concept of Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing is very crucial for the realization of organizational success. Al-Hawamdeh (2015) sees knowledge sharing in a broader perspective as the communication of all types of knowledge including explicit knowledge (information, know-how and know-who) and tacit knowledge (skills and competency). A study conducted by Islam (2013) established that, the capability of sharing knowledge enhances research work significantly; individuals are stimulated to share knowledge to enhance learning and teaching activities. Simply, knowledge sharing denotes to the exchange of knowledge between at least two parties in a reciprocal process allowing reshaping and sense-making of the knowledge in a new context. That is to say, it is the willingness of individuals in an organization to share whatever they have or have created for improving workers' skills and knowledge which in turn increase workers efficiency and productivity.

Perception of Academic Librarians towards Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing need not to be forced but has to be positively perceived in as much as an organization aim at progressing effectively. Rowley and Delbrige (2013) explored Knowledge Sharing (KS) factors affecting academics in UK universities and found that academics had a positive attitude towards KS. This was attributed to the belief that KS would improve and extend their relationships with colleagues and bring other opportunities for internal promotion and external appointments. Also, Muchaonyerwa (2015) in a survey examines attitude and opinions of library employees regarding knowledge exchange in South Africa and uncovered that respondents had an affirmative outlook regarding knowledge sharing which was credited to the fact that sharing knowledge with co-workers was viewed as being good and wise. In a simple note, employees (academic librarians) must have a positive view and attitude towards knowledge sharing in as much as they want to maximize intellectual capital and achieve organizational goals and objectives,

Types of Services Delivered in Academic Libraries

Library services are crucial for all our activities. By definition, it is the process of collecting, synthesizing and disseminating up-to-date, accurate and unbiased relevant information and resources available in books, periodicals, bulletins, guides abstracts, indexes,

bibliographies, and non-book formats which can be stored and retrieved whenever needed Omoniwa (2016). Patel (2015) indicated that the services delivered by academic librarians are: web-OPAC service, current awareness service (CAS), circulation service, reference service, Inter Library Loan (ILL) service, reprographic services, and ICT base library services. Similarly, Umoh (2017) highlighted the generic services rendered by academic libraries as: circulation services, reference service, current awareness services, reprographic services, technical services, and inter-library co-operation. In a note shell, libraries are built and maintained to provide information and resources for a specific and defined community such as the schools, public, institutions, organizations e.t.c as such library services are the basic services provided in the library such as circulation services, reference services, technical services, reprographic services, ICT based library services e.t.c with the aim of satisfying the information needs of users (clienteles) which lies the root of librarianship

Inhibitors to Knowledge Sharing among Academic Librarians

Knowledge sharing may sometimes be difficult due to multiple challenging factors. Basically, inhibitors to knowledge sharing arise from a combination of individual factors such as: personal gains, awareness, lack of time, knowledge hoarding, poor communication skills, lack of trust and poor personal relationships, organizational factors such as: poor organizational culture, poor organizational structure, lack of support from management, and lack of effective communication between staff and management and technological factors such as: Lack of skilled staff to use ICT facilities for knowledge sharing and lack of technological infrastructure (Assefa, 2013). However, inhibitors to knowledge sharing are specifically any hindering factor or scenario that affect the smooth exchange or transfer of knowledge from one person to another or from one organization or organizational unit to another.

Methodology

This study adopted the quantitative research approach from the positivist school of thought using the descriptive survey design. The approach emphasizes on quantification in the collection and analysis of data in which such data can be expressed in numbers, percentages and tables (Babbie, 2010). The research setting for this study were Ahmadu Bello University library (ABU) Zaria, Nigerian Defense Academy library (NDA) Kaduna, The Air Force Institute of Technology library (AFIT) Kaduna also known as the Nigerian Air Force University, and Kaduna State University Library (KASU). The total enumeration sampling scale was adopted to administer questionnaires to 172 academic librarians and data collected was analyzed using mean score value. The decision rule is that where mean score is less than or equals to three ($x \leq 3$), it is disagree while mean score of greater than three ($x > 3$) is agree.

Table 1: The population of the study is presented in the table below

| Name of University | Expected Respondent (N=172) | Actual Respondents (N=144) | Percentages |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), Zaria | 115 | 98 | 85.2% |
| Nigerian Defense Academy (NDA), Kaduna | 8 | 5 | 62.5% |
| Airforce Institute Of Technology (AFIT), Kaduna | 34 | 26 | 76.4% |
| Kaduna State University (KASU), Kaduna | 15 | 15 | 100% |
| Total | 172 | 144 | 83.7% |

Result and Discussion

Table 2: Perceptions of Librarians towards Knowledge Sharing

| S/N | Perception of Academic Librarians towards Knowledge Sharing | SA | A | U- | D | SD | (X) | Remark |
|-----|--|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-----|--------|
| 1 | I perceive knowledge sharing as a process of capturing knowledge or moving knowledge from a source unit to a recipient unit | 83 (57.6 %) | 38 (26.4%) | 7 (4.9%) | 6 (4.2%) | 10 (6.9%) | 4.2 | Agree |
| 2 | I perceive knowledge sharing as a process whereby each worker can learn from the experiences and practices of the others | 84 (58.3%) | 39 (27.1%) | 7 (4.9%) | 5 (3.5%) | 9 (6.3%) | 4.2 | Agree |
| 3 | I perceive knowledge sharing as a process where individuals exchange knowledge and together create new knowledge. | 93 (65.0%) | 32 (22.4%) | 8 (5.6%) | 5 (3.5%) | 5 (3.5%) | 4.4 | Agree |
| 4 | I perceive knowledge sharing as a process of exchanging experience, events, thoughts or understanding of anything with an expectation to gain more understanding and insight about something for temporary curiosity | 78 (54.2%) | 29 (20.1%) | 19 (13.2%) | 7 (4.9%) | 11 (7.6%) | 4.0 | Agree |
| 5 | I perceive knowledge sharing as the communication of all types of knowledge both explicit and tacit knowledge. | 73 (50.7%) | 37 (25.7%) | 19 (13.2%) | 9 (6.3%) | 6 (4.2%) | 4.1 | Agree |
| 6 | I perceive knowledge sharing as what improves employees capacity | 89 (61.8%) | 42 (29.2%) | 5 (3.5%) | 4 (2.8%) | 4 (2.8%) | 4.4 | Agree |
| 7 | I perceive knowledge sharing as | 100 | 31 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 4.5 | Agree |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----|----------|
| | what stimulates organizational performance and effective service delivery, | (69.4%) | (21.5%) | (4.9%) | (2.1%) | (2.1%) | | |
| 8 | I perceive knowledge sharing as what leads to the leveraging and crystalizing knowledge across any organization | 71 (49.3%) | 34 (23.6%) | 24 (16.7%) | 5 (3.5%) | 10 (6.9%) | 4.0 | Agree |
| 9 | I perceive knowledge sharing as what enhances free flow of information in an organization | 77 (63.5%) | 52 (36.1%) | 4 (2.8%) | 5 (3.2%) | 6 (3.8%) | 4.3 | Agree |
| 10 | I perceive knowledge sharing as what brings chaos in organizations | 13 (9.1%) | 8 (5.6%) | 14 (9.8%) | 37 (25.9%) | 71 (49.7%) | 1.9 | Disagree |
| 11 | I perceive knowledge sharing as a threat to individual success in organizations | 12 (8.5%) | 3 (2.1%) | 8 (5.6%) | 44 (31.0%) | 75 (52.8%) | 1.8 | Disagree |
| 12 | I perceive knowledge sharing as a process of making same efforts again and again | 19 (13.7%) | 17 (11.8%) | 23 (16.0%) | 37 (25.7%) | 48 (33.3%) | 2.4 | Disagree |
| 13 | I perceive knowledge sharing as what apprehends fear that sharing may reduce or jeopardize people's job security | 15 (10.5%) | 9 (6.3%) | 20 (14.0%) | 30 (27.3%) | 60 (42.0%) | 2.1 | Disagree |
| 14 | I perceive knowledge sharing as what brings low awareness and realization of the value and benefit of possessed knowledge to others | 14 (9.7%) | 6 (4.2%) | 9 (6.3%) | 45 (31.3%) | 70 (48.6%) | 1.9 | Disagree |
| 15 | I perceive knowledge sharing as what makes decision making slower | 12 (8.2%) | 9 (6.3%) | 7 (4.9%) | 38 (26.4%) | 78 (54.2%) | 1.8 | |

Key: SA(Strongly Agree), A(Agree), U(Undecided), D(Disagree) SD(Strongly Disagree)

On table 2 the perception of the respondents about knowledge sharing based on the mean score of 4.2 depicts that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is a process of capturing knowledge or moving knowledge from a source unit to a recipient unit. Also, a mean score of 4.2 indicates that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is a process whereby each worker can learn from the experiences and practices of the others. Similarly, a mean score of 4.4 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is a process where individuals exchange knowledge and together create new knowledge. Likewise, a mean score of 4.0 indicates that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is a process of exchanging experience, events, thoughts or understanding of anything with an expectation to gain more understanding and insight about something for temporary curiosity and a mean score of 4.1 indicates that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is the communication of all types of knowledge both explicit and tacit knowledge. Also, a mean score of 4.4 presents that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing improves employees capacity. Furthermore, a mean score of 4.5 shows that

the respondents agree that knowledge sharing stimulates organizational performance and effective service delivery. Moreover, a mean score of 4.0 presents that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing leads to the leveraging and crystalizing knowledge across any organization. So also, a mean score of 4.3 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing enhances free flow of information in an organization while a mean score of 1.9 shows that the respondents disagree that knowledge sharing brings chaos in organizations. Similarly, a mean score of 1.8 shows that the respondents disagree that knowledge sharing is a threat to individual success in organizations. A mean score of 2.4 similarly shows that the respondents disagree that knowledge sharing is a process of making same efforts again and again and a mean score of 2.1 shows that the respondents disagree that knowledge sharing apprehends fear that sharing may reduce or jeopardize people's job security. Finally, a mean score of 1.9 reveals that the respondents disagree that knowledge sharing brings low awareness and realization of the value and benefit of possessed knowledge to others and a mean score of 1.8 shows that the respondents disagree that knowledge sharing makes decision making slower. This implies that respondents perceive KS as a process of capturing knowledge or moving knowledge from a source unit to a recipient unit, a process whereby each worker can learn from the experiences and practices of the others, a process where individuals exchange knowledge and together create new knowledge, a process of exchanging experience, events, thoughts or understanding of anything with an expectation to gain more understanding and insight about something for temporary curiosity, is the communication of all types of knowledge both explicit and tacit knowledge, improves employees capacity, stimulates organizational performance and effective service delivery, leads to the leveraging and crystalizing knowledge across any organization and enhances free flow of information in an organization

The findings of the study indicate that the perception of academic librarians towards knowledge sharing is positive and strong. Hence, the study finding is in agreement with the study of Rowley and Delbrige (2013) that explore knowledge sharing factors affecting academics in UK universities where it was found that academics have a positive attitude towards KS. Also, this study confirms the study of Muchaonyerwa (2015) who in a survey examined attitude and opinions of library employees regarding knowledge exchange in South Africa and uncovered that respondents had an affirmative outlook regarding knowledge sharing which was.

Table 3: Services Delivered by Librarians through Knowledge Sharing

| S/ N | Information Services Delivered by Academic Librarians | SA | A | U | D | SD | (X) | Remark |
|---------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-----|--------|
| 1 | Current Awareness Services (CAS) | 81 (56.6%) | 51 (35.7%) | 6 (4.2%) | 2 (1.4%) | 3 (2.1%) | 4.4 | Agree |
| 2 | Reference services | 89 (61.8%) | 47 (32.6%) | 3 (2.1%) | 2 (1.4%) | 3 (2.1%) | 4.5 | Agree |
| 3 | Technical Services | 79 (54.9%) | 43 (29.9%) | 8 (5.6%) | 9 (6.3%) | 5 (3.5%) | 4.2 | Agree |
| 4 | Circulation services | 81 (56.3%) | 52 (36.1%) | 6 (4.2%) | 4 (2.8%) | 1 (0.7%) | 4.4 | Agree |
| 5 | Reprography services | 62 (43.1%) | 46 (31.9%) | 19 (13.2%) | 11 (7.6%) | 6 (4.2%) | 4.0 | Agree |
| 6 | Bibliographic services | 72 (50.3%) | 48 (33.6%) | 11 (7.7%) | 7 (4.9%) | 5 (3.5%) | 4.2 | Agree |
| 7 | Extension/community services | 43 (29.9%) | 48 (33.3%) | 22 (15.3%) | 18 (12.5%) | 13 (9.0%) | 3.6 | Agree |
| 8 | Inter Library Loan (ILL) Services | 59 (41.3%) | 42 (29.4%) | 24 (16.8%) | 14 (9.8%) | 4 (2.8%) | 3.9 | Agree |
| 9 | Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) | 64 (44.4%) | 52 (36.1%) | 12 (8.3%) | 14 (9.7%) | 2 (1.4%) | 4.1 | Agree |
| 10 | Web OPAC services | 68 (47.6%) | 47 (32.9%) | 14 (9.8%) | 10 (7.0%) | 4 (2.8%) | 4.1 | Agree |
| 11 | Literature search services | 57 (39.6%) | 53 (36.8%) | 15 (10.4%) | 14 (9.7%) | 5 (3.5%) | 3.9 | Agree |
| 12 | Document Delivery Services (DDS) | 50 (34.7%) | 51 (35.4%) | 32 (15.3%) | 13 (9.0%) | 8 (5.6%) | 3.8 | Agree |
| 13 | Translation services | 39 (27.5%) | 40 (28.2%) | 36 (25.4%) | 18 (12.7%) | 9 (6.3%) | 3.5 | Agree |
| 14 | Article indexing services | 56 (38.9%) | 47 (32.6%) | 17 (11.8%) | 16 (11.1%) | 8 (5.6%) | 3.8 | Agree |
| 15 | ICT based library services | 67 (46.9%) | 55 (38.5%) | 13 (9.1%) | 6 (4.2%) | 2 (1.4%) | 4.2 | Agree |
| 16 | Union catalogue services | 47 (32.6%) | 42 (29.2%) | 30 (20.8%) | 21 (14.6%) | 4 (2.8%) | 3.7 | Agree |
| 17 | Outreach services | 36 (25.2%) | 49 (34.3%) | 28 (19.6%) | 21 (14.7%) | 9 (6.3%) | 3.5 | Agree |
| 18 | Lending services | 61 (42.4%) | 52 (36.1%) | 17 (11.8%) | 11 (7.6%) | 3 (2.1%) | 4.0 | Agree |
| 19 | Referral services | 66 (45.8%) | 51 (35.4%) | 14 (9.7%) | 8 (5.6%) | 5 (3.5%) | 4.1 | Agree |
| 20 | Browsing services | 74 (51.7%) | 50 (35.0%) | 7 (4.9%) | 4 (2.8%) | 8 (5.6%) | 4.2 | Agree |

On table 3 the services delivered by the respondents based of the mean score of 4.4 indicates that the respondents agree that they deliver Current Awareness Services (CAS), a mean

score of 4.5 shows that the respondents agree that they deliver reference services. Also, a mean score of 4.2 reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver technical services and a mean score of 4.4 also reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver circulation services. A mean score of 4.0 similarly reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver reprographic services and a mean score of 4.2 also reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver bibliographic services. Furthermore, a mean score of 3.6 similarly reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver extension/community services, while a mean score of 3.9 reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver Inter Library Loan (ILL) Services. A mean score of 4.1 reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) and a mean score of 4.1 similarly shows that the respondents agree that they deliver web OPAC services. Also, a mean score of 3.9 shows that the respondents agree that they deliver literature search services and mean score of 3.8 also shows that the respondents agree that they deliver Document Delivery Services (DDS). Furthermore, a mean score of 3.5 shows that the respondents agree that they deliver translation services and a mean score of 3.8 shows that the respondents agree that they deliver article indexing services. Similarly, a mean score of 4.2 shows that the respondents agree that they deliver ICT based library services while a mean score of 3.7 shows that the respondents agree that they deliver union catalogue services. Also, a mean score of 3.5 shows that the respondents agree that they deliver outreach services, likewise a mean score of 4.0 reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver lending services, a mean score of 4.1 reveals that the respondents agree that they deliver referral services and finally, a mean score of 4.2 reveals that the respondents agreed that they deliver browsing services. This implies that information services like Current Awareness Services (CAS), reference, technical, circulation, reprographic, bibliographic, extension/community, Inter Library Loan (ILL), Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI), web OPAC, literature search, Document Delivery Services (DDS), translation, indexing, ICT, union catalogue, outreach, lending, referral and browsing services are delivered by academic librarians.

Findings of the study on services delivered by academic librarians depict that Current Awareness Services (CAS), reference services and circulation services were the major services delivered by the respondents. Hence, The study findings confirm the study of Patel (2015) on library and Information services delivered by librarians in India who found that the services rendered by librarians are current awareness service (CAS), reference service, literature search service, document delivery service, (DDS), translation service, article indexing service, Inter Library Loan (ILL) service, reprographic services, and ICT base library services. Similarly, this study finding is also in agreement with the study of Bell (2019) in India who identified the major services rendered in the library as circulation services, reference services, technical services, automation services and reprographic services.

Table 4: Inhibitors of Knowledge Sharing Among Librarians

| S/ N | Inhibitors to Knowledge Sharing in University Libraries | SA | A | U | D | SD | (X) | Remark |
|---------|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----|--------|
| 1 | Insufficient funds | 68 (47.2%) | 42 (29.2%) | 9 (6.3%) | 19 (9.0%) | 12 (8.3%) | 3.9 | Agree |
| 2 | Personal gains | 40 (27.8%) | 41 (28.6%) | 24 (16.7%) | 29 (20.1%) | 10 (6.9%) | 3.5 | Agree |
| 3 | Lack of trust | 42 (29.62%) | 40 (27.8%) | 27 (18.8%) | 23 (16.0%) | 12 (8.3%) | 3.5 | Agree |
| 4 | Knowledge hoarding | 44 (30.6%) | 35 (24.3%) | 19 (13.2%) | 29 (20.1%) | 17 (11.8%) | 3.4 | Agree |
| 5 | Poor personal relationships | 46 (32.2%) | 49 (34.3%) | 13 (9.1%) | 21 (14.7%) | 14 (9.8%) | 3.6 | Agree |
| 6 | Lack of time | 28 (19.4%) | 44 (30.6%) | 15 (10.4%) | 34 (23.6%) | 23 (16.0%) | 3.1 | Agree |
| 7 | Poor communication skills | 38 (26.6%) | 42 (29.4%) | 12 (8.4%) | 32 (22.4%) | 19 (13.3%) | 3.3 | Agree |
| 8 | Lack of awareness to share knowledge | 35 (24.5%) | 41 (28.7%) | 13 (9.1%) | 29 (20.3%) | 25 (17.5%) | 3.2 | Agree |
| 9 | Lack of skilled staff to use ICT facilities for knowledge sharing | 48 (33.3%) | 36 (25.0%) | 13 (9.0%) | 24 (16.7%) | 23 (16.0%) | 3.4 | Agree |
| 10 | Lack of technological infrastructure | 42 (29.2%) | 45 (31.3%) | 14 (9.7%) | 22 (15.3%) | 21 (14.6%) | 3.4 | Agree |
| 11 | Lack of motivation/support from management | 57 (40.1%) | 43 (30.3%) | 12 (8.5%) | 14 (9.9%) | 16 (11.3%) | 3.7 | Agree |
| 12 | Poor organizational culture | 50 (34.7%) | 40 (27.8%) | 18 (12.5%) | 19 (13.2%) | 17 (11.8%) | 3.6 | Agree |
| 13 | Poor organization structure | 43 (29.9%) | 36 (25.0%) | 21 (14.6%) | 23 (16.0%) | 21 (14.6%) | 3.3 | Agree |
| 14 | Lack of effective communication between staff and management | 56 (38.9%) | 45 (31.3%) | 14 (9.7%) | 18 (12.5%) | 11 (7.6%) | 3.3 | Agree |

On table 4 the inhibitors to knowledge sharing based on the mean score of 3.9 depicts that respondents of the study agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by insufficient funds, likewise a mean score of 3.5 indicates that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by personal gains. Similarly, a mean score of 3.5 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by lack of trust. A mean score of 3.4 indicates that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by knowledge hoarding and a mean score of 3.6 indicates that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by poor personal relationships. Also, a mean score of 3.1 presents that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by lack of time, likewise a mean score of 3.3 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by poor communication skills. Furthermore, a mean score of 3.2 presents that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by lack of

awareness to share knowledge. So also, a mean score of 3.4 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by lack of skilled staff to use ICT facilities for knowledge sharing while a mean score of 3.4 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by lack of technological infrastructure. Also, a mean score of 3.7 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by lack of motivation/support from management. A mean score of 3.6 similarly shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by poor organizational culture. Finally, a mean score of 3.3 reveals that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by poor organization structure and a mean score of 1.8 shows that the respondents agree that knowledge sharing is inhibited by lack of effective communication between staff and management. This implies that, all the listed factors including insufficient funds, personal gains, lack of trust, knowledge hoarding, poor personal relationships, lack of time, poor communication skills, lack of awareness to share knowledge, lack of skilled staff to use ICT facilities for knowledge sharing, lack of technological infrastructure, lack of motivation/support from management, poor organizational culture, poor organization structure and lack of effective communication between staff and management are the inhibitors to KS.

Findings from the inhibitors to knowledge sharing among academic librarians show that insufficient funds, lack of effective communication between staff and management and lack of motivation/support from management are the major inhibitors to knowledge sharing. Hence, the findings of this study collaborates Mushi (2009) who investigated factors hindering knowledge sharing in public university libraries in Tanzania and found that the factors include poor organizational structures, lack of knowledge sharing culture and strategies and individual and technological factors. Similarly, this study also harmonize with the findings of Wamundila and Ngulube (2011) that knowledge loss arising from individual, organizational and technological factors such as retirements and resignations, lack of trust, poor organizational structure, lack of technological infrastructure and lack of effective communication between staff and management would possibly be a risk to university operations.

Summary of Findings

1. Findings from the perceptions of academic librarians towards knowledge sharing show that majority of the respondents have positive perception towards knowledge sharing.
2. Findings from the services delivered by the academic librarians show that Current Awareness Services (CAS) and circulation services are the major services delivered by the respondents.
3. Findings from the inhibitors to knowledge sharing among academic librarians show that insufficient funds and lack of effective communication between staff and management are the major inhibitors to knowledge sharing.

Conclusion

From the findings of the study, it is concluded that a greater percentage of the respondents have positive perception towards knowledge sharing. It was also found that all the library services highlighted by the researcher were delivered and finally, it was found that all the inhibitors to knowledge sharing highlighted by the researcher were agreed upon. However, despite the outcome of the study, there is the need to further enlighten and motivate librarians to share their tacit knowledge for information service delivery as this would help to enhance and ascertain high level of clients' satisfaction which is the primary objective of librarianship.

Recommendations

Based on the study findings and conclusions the following recommendations are made:-

1. The library management should create a more conducive atmosphere that would encourage smooth mutual relationship among academic librarians as this would enhance their perception towards knowledge sharing.
2. There should be well packaged incentives to academic librarians so as to motivate them on knowledge sharing and delivering services of high quality.
3. The library management should be sending academic librarians to workshops, seminars, conferences and trainings on any topic related to knowledge sharing as this would positively reshape their mindset which would in turn slice away so many inhibitors to knowledge sharing.

References

- Al-Hawamdeh, S. (2015). *Knowledge management: cultivating knowledge professionals*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Assefa, T. (2013). Barriers of knowledge sharing among employees: The case of commercial bank of Ethiopia. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management* 12(2):1-11.
- Flinchbaugh, C. & Chadwick, C. (2016). Team-level high involvement work practices: investigating the role of knowledge sharing and perspective taking. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 26(2):134–150.
- Islam, M. S (2013) Knowledge sharing practices among doctoral students in JAIST to enhance research skills, *Knowledge Management and E-learning*. 5(2), 170-185
- Michailova, S & Gupta, A (2005), Knowledge sharing in consulting companies: Opportunities and limitations of knowledge codification, *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, 4 (03), 201-212,
- Muchaonyerwa, N. (2015). Knowledge sharing strategies in University libraries in KwaZulu Natal Province of South Africa. *Unpublished PhD Thesis: Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu Natal*.
- Mushi, R. J. (2009). Intellectual capital and public university libraries in Tanzania: A knowledge sharing perspective. *Unpublished MIS dissertation: Oslo University College* [Online] Available at: https://oda.hio.no/jspui/bitstream/10642/878/2/Mushi_ReubenJacob.pdf
- Nonaka, I & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Omoniwa, M. A (2016). The role of library and information services in national development, *Nigerian Libraries*, 22 (182):13-14
- Patel, B. K. D. (2015), A study of library and information services for agriculture universities researcher of Gujarat state, *Unpublished MLS dissertation: Hemchandracharya North Gujarat University* [Online] Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/105400>
- Rowley, F. & Delbrige, R. (2013), Knowledge sharing amongst academics in UK universities, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 17 (1), 201-212,
- Umoh EB (2017). Information and Services Provision by academic Libraries in Nigeria. *International Journal Academic Library & Information Science*, 5(5): 153-159

Wamundila, S. & Ngulube, P. (2011). Enhancing knowledge retention in higher education: a case of the University of Zambia: original research. *South African Journal of Information Management*, 13(1):1-9.