

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

May 2019

KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIOUR AND LIBRARIANS JOB PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES

Abiodun O. Odunewu
Olabisi Onabanjo University, bodunewu@yahoo.com

yacob Haliso
Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, masfjeb@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Odunewu, Abiodun O. and Haliso, yacob, "KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIOUR AND LIBRARIANS JOB PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES" (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2396.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2396>

1. INTRODUCTION

Universities through their academic activities which include teaching, research and community service generate vast knowledge that deserves proper management to ensure the proper tracking, and acquisition of knowledge wherever they are available and preserve same for future and immediate consultations. The task of knowledge tracking, acquisition, preservation and circulation is the business of the university libraries that are established to support the mandate of their institutions which are teaching, research and community service activities of the universities. As such, they acquire information resources in various formats in which they are available across various academic disciplines. The acquired resources are processed and organised towards access provision and dissemination. Through these activities, the library fulfils its mandate of supporting the academic activities of their institutions. University libraries thus remain the main access points for educational and recreational information resources in the universities. A well-established and functional library is a necessity in any university as the ability to fulfil the purpose of supporting the curriculum and research in the university depends on the quality of the library and its personnel. To ensure the quality of a university library, four major things comes into consideration: 1) the quality, recency and relevance of the resources 2) the appropriateness of the format in which the information resource is available 3) funding, and 4) the quality of staff. The quality of staff predicts the success or otherwise of the libraries.

University libraries thus need highly skilled and knowledgeable personnel to ensure qualitative service delivery, particularly in the digital era where information explosion prevails. Beyond attracting qualified, highly skilled, and knowledgeable personnel, the performance of the individual librarians should be a source of concern to library managements. This is of utmost importance as many organisations are now conscious of the vital position employee performance occupies in their bid for competitive advantage in the dynamic business environment. It has therefore raised in team leaders the challenge of ensuring high-level employee job performance.

Job performance which is a popular concept in managerial psychology has thus become an important index in predicting probable success or otherwise of any organisation, university libraries inclusive. Job performance has been described as a set of workers behaviour that can be monitored, measured and assessed, and the behaviours should be in agreement with the organizational goals (Igbinovia & Popoola, 2016). This simply means that individual performance in the work place is targeted at the overall performance of the organisation and that individual job performance can be rated against particular expected standards. Successful job performance is a function of the combination of quality attributes by individuals; the attribute includes abilities, competencies, motivation, interpersonal relationship, and commitment. Others include personal discipline, communication skills and self development. Any success oriented library management should regularly probe into the job performance of its librarians and other category of staff. Librarians' job performance has attracted the interests of some researchers, and the decline in quality of their job performance has been established. Igbinovia and Popoola (2016) posit that academic libraries in Nigeria have experienced a declined level of use as a result of poor services rendered by library personnel which they ascribed to a direct outcome of poor job performance. Amusa, Iyoro and Ajani (2013) probed work environment and job performance of librarians in the public universities in the South West region of Nigeria, and their study established that job performance of librarians in the zone was just fair. Amusa, Abdusalam and Ajani (2014) also observed that the decline in librarians' job performance has manifested in

the form of decline productivity, absenteeism, emotional instability among others. These submissions points to the fact there are issues with library services delivery and that could be pointing to poor job performance by the librarians. A need to probe into the job performance of this category of library personnel is thus established, particularly in the knowledge era.

Like personnel, knowledge is an important resource for the growth and survival of any organisation. It can be described as the heartbeat of any organization. It has been identified as a core resource in the survival of any organization. According to Daland (2016), knowledge has been found to be the most important asset in the knowledge economy. There are two types of knowledge namely –tacit and explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge can be obtained and shared through discussions and observations. It can simply be described as knowledge that is tied to the senses, tactile experiences, movement skill, intuition, unarticulated mental models, or implicit rules of thumb. Whereas knowledge that is uttered, formulated in sentences, and captured in drawings and writing is explicit. Explicit knowledge refers to knowledge which is easily expressed by words or documents, easily codified and articulated in language, and can be repackaged, transferred and shared among individuals. Tacit knowledge is an informal personal knowledge that is embedded in the mental processes and uniquely rooted in individual experience, beliefs, values and often times not easily learn or fully expressed because it is obtained through experience and work practices (Awodoyin, Osisanwo, Adetoro & Adeyemo, 2016). Whatever the type of knowledge is, it can be shared between two individuals, groups, teams, and organisations. This development has led to the emergence of knowledge sharing as a field of study.

Knowledge sharing is an aspect of knowledge management discipline. In the growing global economy, effective knowledge management has become a source of competitive advantage and knowledge sharing remains an essential part of knowledge management. Wang and Noe (2010) posit that the success of knowledge management initiatives depends on knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing can be defined as the transference of knowledge among individuals, groups, teams, departments and organizations (Asr ar-ul-Haq, Anwar, and Nisar, 2016). It is a process in which knowledge (expertise, skills or information) is exchanged among individuals, workers, communities, families, or organizations. To encourage knowledge creation, transfer, and management within an organization, workers in such organization must engage in knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing is two faceted, that is receiving or collecting and donating. This simply means an end is receiving and the other end is donating. Knowledge sharing is essential in any organisation as it aids performance and productivity. One will not be able to perform tasks in the areas where one lacks adequate knowledge; such challenge is overcome where a colleague possesses such knowledge and he is willing to share it. This study thus assumed that knowledge sharing will be a job performance enhancer for librarians in the university.

Therefore, the focus of this is on investigating how the independent variable of knowledge sharing will affect librarians' ability to effectively perform their job tasks using librarians in universities in the south-west zone of Nigeria as case study. Towards this, the following research questions were raised:

1. What is the level of job performance of librarians in universities in the south-west zone of Nigeria?
2. What is the status of knowledge sharing among librarians in universities in the south-west zone of Nigeria?

3. What kind of professional knowledge do librarians willingly share
4. What methods of knowledge sharing are in use in universities in south-west zone of Nigeria?

The conduct of the study was guided by this hypothesis that was tested at the 0.05 level of significance:

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between knowledge sharing and librarians job performance in universities in the south-west zone of Nigeria.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Libraians job performance has attracted investigations from researchers in the field of library and information science. Some of the studies had established issues with librarians job performance. Igbinovia and Popoola (2016) assert that librarians' poor job performance has negatively affected the provision of effective service delivery to library users, as a declined level of library use has been the resultant effect. Amusa, Abdulsalam, and Ajani (2014) also established decline in librarians' job performance. Librarians job performance tends to have manifested in low patronage of the library and its resources by the university community members. The low patronage is attributable to users' dissatisfaction on the services being rendered by the librarians, and it points to ineffective job performance by the librarians. The cause of the decline in librarians' job performance should be a source of concern to researchers in library and information science discipline. Job performance is not an isolated occurrence but one predictable by knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing is assumed to be one of the factors affecting librarians' job performance because librarianship is a knowledge based profession, and no particular individual can claim that he possesses all the knowledge needed to cope in a profession, it is therefore desirable that that librarians engage in knowledge sharing so as to enhance their job performance. Knowledge remains an inevitable asset to any dynamic organization. It is in this light that this study is proposing to investigate librarians knowledge sharing as a determinant of librarians' job performance in South-West zone of Nigeria.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Towards answering the research questions generated and validating the raised hypothesis, the need to review relevant and related literature arose, and it was carried out. Literature on job performance and knowledge sharing were reviewed.

3.1 KNOWLEDGE SHARING BEHAVIOUR AND LIBRARIANS JOB PERFORMANCE

In any organisation or business, the human content is the most important; as they coordinate all other factors to get to the desired goals. Kuzu and Ozithan (2014) observed that in the days of globalisation and knowledge economy, businesses have come to realise that employees are the major assets. Aksoy, Ayranci and Gozukara (2016) see the rapid advancement of technology as causing structural changes in organisation; and that this has intensified competition among organisations. The competition has in turn induced the realisation of the importance of employee performance. Though, their performance is dependent on some other variables within the organisation. One of such variables is knowledge or information; as knowledge is derived from available information.

Knowledge is an important concept for the use and improvement of information and knowledge today (Zahari, Abdul Rahman, Othman & Bariamin; 2014). Globalisation and its evolved knowledge era have brought about a paradigm change in organisations' appreciation, management and evaluation of knowledge. The importance of knowledge in any organisation cannot be overrated. Zahari et al (2014) did not just see it as one of the most valuable assets of any organisation; they posit that it has become more valuable than physical assets. Knowledge can thus be described as the heart of any organisation. It is a performance driver of the organisations workforce. It is therefore pertinent that managers should be integrated in its management. The key to knowledge management is the application of knowledge sharing (Wening, Haryono & Harsono, 2016). Knowledge sharing is a daily activity which involves the exchange of knowledge between individuals (Aksoy, Ayranci & Gozukara, 2016). It is the act of transferring or distributing one's knowledge to others within a group or organisation. According to Din and Haron (2012), knowledge sharing is an important activity that enhances individual's capability to retrieve new data and resources for the purpose of learning, problem-solving and self-improvement. Knowledge sharing according to Kim and Park (2017) refers to the process of exchanging task information, expert knowledge, and feedback regarding a procedure of product in order to create new knowledge or ideas, deal with issues, and achieve common goals. Zahari, Abdul-Rahman, Othman and Baniamin (2014) related knowledge sharing with organisational competitive advantage, and they submit that knowledge sharing among different companies and departments can improve organisational processes since intangible knowledge plays an important role in achieving competitive advantage. As such, organisations should create open environments and incentive/reward system to motivate members to share their knowledge. (Kuzu & Ozilhan, 2014; Whitener, 2001).

Performance is the qualitative and quantitative expression of the extent an individual, a group, a unit or an organisation executing a particular project advances towards the predetermined goal. It is the expression of what is achieved. (Aksoy, Ayranci & Gozukara, 2016; Bas & Isik, 2014). Campbell and Wiernik (2015) posit that individual job performance should be defined as things that people actually do, actions they take, that contribute to the organisational goals. Koopmans, Bernaads, Hildelgrandt, Schaufeli, de Vet and van der Beek (2011) in their review of conceptual frameworks of individual work performance observed that no comprehensive conceptual framework for individual work performance exist and that none of the various descriptions of work performance available in literature had succeeded in capturing the complexity and full range of behaviours that constitute an employee's performance at work. They, however submit that a widely accepted definition of work performance is that of Campbell (1990) that sees individual work performance as behaviour or actions that are relevant to the organisational goals. Despite the fact that Campbell's definition was seen as popular, Koopmans et.al still submit that until now, no clear consensus exists on what exactly constitutes individual work performance. It is expected that a more reliable acceptable and universal definition of individual work performance will evolve as researches continue in this area.

Mindila, Rodrigues, McCormick and Mwangi (2014) observed that organisational policies, practices and design aspects of an organisation influence the performance of an individual or an organisation. Knowledge sharing behaviour can be embedded in library policies, with a view to encouraging librarians to share and access knowledge resident in other librarians. Knowledge sharing in libraries will lead to knowledge bank which everyone can draw from in the course of their job performance. Kearns and Lederer (2003) captured this when they asserted that it can

generate information for decision making. It is therefore pertinent that libraries embark on the adoption, promotion, and encouragement of knowledge sharing behaviour. Woerkom and Sanders (2010) perceived organisational knowledge sharing as the probable backbone of organisational learning which will bring massive benefits to such organisation. Such practices are reported to possess a positive relationship with organisational human capital (employee competencies) which enhances organisational performance (Hsu, 2008). Zahari et al (2014) advised that organisations should go beyond knowledge sharing enhancement and embark on a comprehensive knowledge sharing strategy whereby every unit in the organisation is integrated into knowledge sharing culture.

Literature revealed a few efforts in relating knowledge sharing to employee job performance. Kuzu and Ozilhan (2014) probed into the knowledge sharing and employee performance using the views of the 5-star hotel employees in Antalya, Turkey. Their study reported a correlation between knowledge sharing and employee performance. Aksoy, Anyanci, and Gozukara (2016) investigated the relationship between knowledge sharing and employee performance by using models. Their findings confirm that intra organisational knowledge sharing positively affects the employee performance. Zahari et al (2014) have ascertained that individual job performance is a prerequisite for organisational behaviour. They explored the influence of knowledge sharing on organisational performance among insurance companies in Malaysia and found a positive correlation between knowledge sharing and organisational performance. They conclude their report by claiming that most organisations acknowledge that the sharing of knowledge among employees can enhance organisational performance. In as much as the main objective of knowledge sharing is the acquisition, sharing and transferring of individual knowledge and experience into the organisational experience. This study sees a need to investigate knowledge sharing and job performance of librarians in Nigerian Universities; as the reviewed literature did not reveal that any such work had been carried out on librarians and particularly in Nigeria.

as such be summarised as attitude plus subjective norms translates to intention to carry out a particular behaviour. Applying it to knowledge sharing simply mean attitude and subjective norms will translate into the intention to share knowledge.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This crux of this study is job performance and it is anchored on the Campbell (1990) theory of job performance which is an eight factor theory of performance. The model which was designed by Campbell (1990) attempts defining and predicting workers job performance. Rather than viewing job performance as a single unified construct, Campbell conceptualized it as a multidimensional construct comprising of more than a kind of behavior. The proposed eight factor model of performance is premised on factor analytic research that aimed at capturing existing dimensions of job performance across all jobs. The factors include task specific and non task specific behaviours, communication, effort, personal discipline, team work, leadership and managerial/administrative performance. The theory believes that where workers behaviour vis a vis the factors is high, their job performance will be impressive. The implication for this study is that where librarians exhibit high quality behaviour using the factors as evaluation parameters, their job performance will be high. Knowledge sharing in this study is anchored on the theory of reasoned action which was developed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). The theory which can simply be summarised by this equation $\text{Attitude} + \text{Subjective norms} = \text{Behavioural intention}$ believes that the attitude of a person towards a particular behaviour is dictated by his beliefs of

the consequences. The intention of an individual to engage in a behaviour is influenced by positive attitude and social norms which are the degree to which an individual sees how others approve of the individuals participations in a particular behaviour. (Norfadzilah, Faizumnah, MdLazim, Noor & Nini, 2016; Bock, Zmud, Kim & Lee, 2005). The theory of reasoned action suggests that stronger intentions are determined by behaviours derived from attitudes and subjective norms. The implication of this theory for this study is that the in the face of proliferation of information sources which are either captured or available in tacit and explicit knowledge; and the strive of libraries to competitively operate in the face of business competition; knowledge sharing has become a mandatory tool in libraries organisational behaviour and performance.

5. METHDOLOGY

This study employed the survey research design in obtaining necessary data for the research effort. The population of the study is comprised of 393 librarians in the universities in south-west zone of Nigeria. The librarians work in the six (6) federal, eight (8) state and twenty-eight (28) private universities in the zone. Total enumeration was adopted as the sampling technique because of the small and manageable population.

5.1 Research Instrument

The survey instrument that was used in collecting data for this study is the questionnaire. The questionnaire is tagged 'Questionnaire on Knowledge Sharing and Librarians Job Performance Scale' (KSLJP). It is comprised of three (3) scales that were used in measuring the variables for the study. The instrument consists of two parts and three sections. The first part of the questionnaire is Section A which was designed to elucidate demographic characteristics of the respondents. This section is comprised of eight questions designed to elicit demographic information of respondents. The information desired include the name of institution and name of library, status of the respondent in the library, gender, academic qualification, length of service and area of specialisation. The second part was designed to draw out information on the knowledge sharing and job performance of librarians. The first section which is Section B was designed by the researcher and it was tagged 'Librarians Job Performance Scale'. It was designed to elicit information on the performance of librarians at their workplace and it consists of twenty-eight (28) items fashioned after Campbell's proposed job performance scale and it was measured on a 5 point Likert-type scale. Cronbach alpha method was used to determine the reliability of the scale and result is 0.90 which shows that the instrument is good and reliable as the result is above the 0.05 acceptance level of significance.

Section C of the questionnaire tagged Knowledge sharing scale is a researcher designed scale aimed at eliciting information on librarians' knowledge sharing behaviour. The scale adapted the Fishbein and Ajzen proposed theory of reasoned action. It is a 39 item Likert-type scale which is measured on 5 point Likert scale. Cronbach alpha method was used to determine the reliability of the scale and result is 0.87 which shows that the instrument is good and reliable as the result is above the 0.05 acceptance level of significance.

5.2. Method of Data Analysis.

The data collected was analysed using descriptive statistics for the research questions while regression analysis was used in the hypothesis testing. The hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS)

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of Three Hundred and Sixty (364) copies of the questionnaire were administered on the respondents; Three Hundred and Forty-Three (343) copies were retrieved. Only Three Hundred and Twenty-Nine (329) copies were found usable for analysis, as fourteen (14) copies were not properly filled and the responses to the items on the questionnaire were inconsistent. The questionnaire was used for detailed information and qualitative analysis. The results are presented in tables, frequencies and percentages for easy appreciation and understanding. The generated hypothesis for the study was tested using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Regression Analysis.

6.1 Analysis of Research Questions

Three research questions were generated for this study, the section provides the findings to the research questions.

Research Question 1: What is the extent of librarians' job performance in the universities in the South-West region of Nigeria?

Table 1: Level of Librarians job performance in Universities in the South-West region of Nigeria

S/N	Statement	VH (5) Freq/%	High (4) Freq/%	Mod (3) Freq/%	Low (2) Freq/%	VL (1) Freq/%	Mean	SD
1	Loyalty to the library	164 (49.8%)	147 (44.7%)	18 (5.5%)	-	-	4.44	.60
2	Sense of responsibility	158 (48.0%)	157 (47.7%)	14 (4.3%)	-	-	4.44	.58
3	Control and monitoring of staff in under my supervision without seeking assistance	153 (46.5%)	158 (48.0%)	18 (5.5%)	-	-	4.41	.59
4	Provision of sectional leadership and supervision of subordinate staff	152 (46.2%)	155 (47.1%)	22 (6.7%)	-	-	4.40	.61
5	Ability to work with co-workers	141 (42.9)	172 (52.3%)	16 (4.9%)	-	-	4.38	.58
6	Ability to interpret written and oral communication	153 (46.5%)	142 (43.2%)	34 (10.3)	-	-	4.36	.66
7	Work with minimal supervision	141 (42.9%)	164 (49.8%)	24 (7.3%)	-	-	4.36	.61
8	Respect for rules and regulations	143 (43.5%)	159 (48.3%)	27 (8.2%)	-	-	4.35	.63

9	Communicating effectively with all categories of staff	134 (40.7%)	176 (53.5%)	19 (5.8%)	-	-	4.35	.59
10	Performance of any duty or library routine, even, when it is not in my section	141 (42.9%)	159 (48.3%)	29 (8.8%)	-	-	4.34	.63
11	Regular and punctual attendance at meetings	139 (42.2%)	161 (48.9%)	29 (8.8%)	-	-	4.33	.63
12	Resourcefulness and creativity	129 (39.2%)	178 (54.1%)	22 (6.7%)	-	-	4.33	.60
13	Contribution to the overall development of the library	126 (38.3%)	181 (55.0%)	22 (6.7%)	-	-	4.32	.59
14	Ability to clearly communicate with colleagues and clients in writing	126 (38.3%)	180 (54.7%)	23 (7.0%)	-	-	4.31	.60
15	Application of professional and technical knowledge to library tasks and services	140 (42.6%)	151 (45.9%)	38 (11.6%)	-	-	4.31	.67
16	Effective use of library resources to achieve tasks	113 (34.3%)	197 (59.9%)	19 (5.8%)	-	-	4.29	.57
17	Punctuality and regularity at work	131 (39.8%)	164 (49.8%)	34 (10.3%)	-	-	4.29	.64
18	Understanding and execution of library routines	101 (30.7)	215 (65.3%)	13 (4.0)	-	-	4.27	.53
19	Ability to encourage and train subordinates	106 (32.2%)	203 (61.7%)	20 (6.1%)	-	-	4.26	.56
20	Ability to make oral presentations	109 (33.1%)	192 (58.4%)	27 (8.2%)	01 (0.3%)	-	4.24	.61
21	Demonstration of professionalism and integrity	88 (26.7%)	214 (65.0%)	27 (8.2%)	-	-	4.19	.56
22	Meeting approved goals and tasks completion in my section within earliest time desirable	109 (33.1%)	176 (53.5%)	43 (13.1%)	01 (0.3%)	-	4.19	.66
23	Respond appropriately to feedback on job performance	97 (29.5%)	197 (59.9%)	35 (10.6%)	-	-	4.19	.61
24	Accuracy, dependency and neatness of my job presentations	95 (28.9%)	197 (59.9%)	37 (11.2%)	-	-	4.18	.61
25	Meeting deadlines, even, under pressure	94 (28.6%)	201 (61.1%)	34 (10.3%)	-	-	4.18	.60
26	Delivery of assigned duties on schedule not minding the volume	90 (27.4%)	205 (62.3%)	34 (10.3%)	-	-	4.17	.59
27	Application of administrative knowledge to library tasks and services	87 (26.4%)	206 (62.6%)	35 (10.6%)	01 (0.3%)	-	4.15	.60
28	Being conscious of the welfare of my colleagues	90 (27.4%)	181 (55.0%)	58 (17.6%)	-	-	4.10	.66

29	Anticipation of challenges and provision of solution in advance	47 (14.3%)	215 (65.3%)	65 (19.8%)	02 (0.6%)	-	3.93	.60
Grand Mean							4.28	

Keys: VH = Very High, High = High, Mod = Moderate, Low = Low, VL = Low, Mean (\bar{x}), and S.D – Standard Deviation

Table 1 is the result of the analysis of the level of librarians' job performance. It reveals that the librarians indicated that their job performance is high with a grand mean of 4.28; as their indications on their application of professionals and technical knowledge to library tasks and services reveal ($\bar{x} = 4.31$, S.D = 0.67); application of administrative knowledge ($\bar{x} = 4.15$, S.D = 0.60), understanding and execution of library routines ($\bar{x} = 4.27$, S.D = 0.53); and effective use of library resources to achieve tasks ($\bar{x} = 4.29$, SD = 0.57) for job specific tasks. For non-job specific tasks – anticipation of challenges and provision of solution in advance ($\bar{x} = 3.93$, SD = 0.68), accuracy, dependency and neatness of job presentation ($\bar{x} = 4.18$, SD = 0.61), and demonstration of presentation and integrity ($\bar{x} = 4.19$, SD = 0.56). The table also reveals that for job performance communication ability to make oral presentation ($\bar{x} = 4.24$, SD = 0.61), ability to clearly communicate with the colleagues and clients in writing ($\bar{x} = 4.31$, SD = 0.60), and ability to interpret written and oral communication ($\bar{x} = 4.36$, SD = 0.66).

Table 1 also reveals that librarians meet approved goals and tasks within earliest time desirable ($\bar{x} = 4.19$, SD = 0.66); meet deadlines, even under pressure ($\bar{x} = 4.18$, SD = 0.60), and deliver assigned duties on schedule ($\bar{x} = 4.17$, SD = 0.59). On personal discipline – punctuality and regularity at work ($\bar{x} = 4.29$, SD = 0.64), respect for rules and regulations ($\bar{x} = 4.35$, SD = 0.63), loyalty to the library ($\bar{x} = 4.44$, SD = 0.60) and sense of responsibility ($\bar{x} = 4.44$, SD = 0.58). On peer and team work, librarians contribute to the overall development of the library ($\bar{x} = 4.32$, SD = 0.59), ability to work with co-workers ($\bar{x} = 4.38$, SD = 0.58), perform any duty or library routine, even when not in their section/unit ($\bar{x} = 4.34$, SD = 0.63); and ability to encourage and train subordinates ($\bar{x} = 4.26$, SD = 0.56).

Also revealed in table 1 is that librarians work with minimal supervision ($\bar{x} = 4.36$, SD = 0.61), control and monitor subordinates ($\bar{x} = 4.41$, SD = 0.59); and provide sectional leadership ($\bar{x} = 4.40$, SD = 0.61). They are conscious of their subordinates welfare ($\bar{x} = 4.10$, SD = 0.66).

It could be inferred that job performance of librarians in universities in South-west zone is high; as the mean for each of the items ranges between 4.10 and 4.44 which falls in the 'high' category of the rating scale. It is only on the item that sought their rating on their 'anticipation of challenges and provision of solution in advance' that the mean is 3.93 which also falls in the 'good' performance category of the scale. Thus overall, it can be deduced that they are very good in the performance of their jobs, as the average mean of their performance is 4.28 which falls into the 'high' category.

Research Question 2: What is the state of knowledge sharing behaviour of librarians in the universities in the south – west zone of Nigeria?

Table 2: Librarians' Knowledge Sharing in Universities in the South-West Zone of Nigeria.

	Statement	SA (5) Freq/%	A (4) Freq/%	D (3) Freq/%	SD (2) Freq/%)	NA (1) Freq/	Mean	SD
1	Sharing librarianship related knowledge with colleagues saves time	156 (47.4%)	167 (50.8%)	06 (1.8%)	-	-	4.56	.53
2	I know the importance of knowledge sharing in librarianship	176 (53.5%)	153 (46.5%)	-	-	-	4.54	.50
3	Sharing knowledge and experience leads to new knowledge and knowledge production	174 (52.9%)	155 (47.1%)	-	-	-	4.53	.50
4	I am willing to share knowledge because I believe its outcome is achievement and success	166 (50.5%)	163 (49.5%)	-	-	-	4.50	.50
5	Sharing knowledge in librarianship contributes to professional development and better performance	161 (48.9%)	164 (49.8%)	04 (1.2%)	-	-	4.48	.52
6	I share knowledge on library automation	164 (49.8%)	158 (48.0%)	07 (2.1%)	-	-	4.48	.54
7	I am willing to share knowledge and experience acquired in librarianship professional practice	162 (49.2%)	160 (48.6%)	07 (2.1%)	-	-	4.47	.54
8	Sharing job related knowledge makes me fulfilled	150 (45.6%)	179 (54.4%)	-	-	-	4.46	.50
9	I am willing to share knowledge to solve my colleagues problems	149 (45.3%)	180 (54.7%)	-	-	-	4.45	.50
10	I try to participate in discussion groups and workshops to share knowledge	145 (44.1%)	184 (55.9%)	-	-	-	4.44	.50
11	I share my job knowledge experience with my colleagues unconditionally	147 (44.7%)	178 (54.1%)	04 (1.2%)	-	-	4.43	.52
12	If I have job challenges, I will ask colleagues for assistance	152 (46.2%)	171 (52.0%)	06 (1.8%)	-	-	4.43	.60
13	I am willing to share knowledge because I enjoy helping others	142 (43.2%)	183 (55.6%)	04 (1.2%)	-	-	4.42	.52
14	When my colleagues encounter challenges on the job, I try to help them as much as I can	138 (41.9%)	191 (58.1%)	-	-	-	4.42	.50
15	If the need arise, I will assist my colleague with my job knowledge	137 (41.6%)	192 (58.4%)	-	-	-	4.41	.49
16	Sharing of knowledge discourages misapplication of knowledge in librarianship	145 (44.1%)	170 (51.7%)	14 (4.3%)	-	-	4.40	.57
17	I share knowledge about resource sharing	130 (39.5%)	192 (58.4%)	07 (2.1%)	-	-	4.37	.53
18	I feel knowledge sharing will enhance	127	195	07	-	-	4.36	.53

	my skills in the library	(38.6%)	(59.3%)	(2.1%)				
19	I share knowledge on collection development	135 (41.0%)	179 (54.4%)	11 (3.3%)	04 (1.2%)	-	4.34	.66
20	In my opinion, knowledge sharing has direct effect on idea generation among librarians	122 (37.1%)	192 (58.4%)	15 (4.6%)	-	-	4.33	.56
21	I am enthusiastic when colleagues freely share job related knowledge	121 (36.8%)	202 (61.4%)	06 (1.8%)	-	-	4.33	.58
22	I dislike it when colleagues hoard job knowledge	135 (41.0%)	181 (55.0%)	13 (4.0%)	-	-	4.33	.69
23	I share knowledge on cataloguing and classification	126 (38.3%)	186 (56.5%)	17 (5.2%)	-	-	4.33	.57
24	Sharing of job knowledge makes me more relevant	119 (36.2%)	190 (57.8%)	17 (5.2%)	03 (0.9%)	-	4.29	.60
25	I share academic manuscript preparation knowledge	135 (41.0%)	171 (52.0%)	11 (3.3%)	08 (2.4%)	04 (1.2%)	4.29	.75
26	I share information on reference services	140 (42.6%)	175 (53.2%)	10 (3.0%)	04 (1.2%)	-	4.27	.66
27	I am willing to share knowledge as it makes my colleagues know more about my skills	112 (34.2%)	187 (56.8%)	30 (9.1%)	-	-	4.25	.61
28	I nurse no fear sharing job related knowledge as it does not make my job insecure	110 (33.4%)	189 (57.4%)	28 (8.5%)	02 (0.6%)	-	4.24	.62
29	I am aware that my library appreciate knowledge sharing	90 (27.4%)	215 (65.3%)	21 (6.4%)	03 (0.9%)	-	4.19	.58
30	My library management encourages knowledge sharing	113 (34.3%)	177 (53.8%)	22 (6.7%)	11 (3.3%)	06 (1.8%)	4.16	.83
31	I am willing to share knowledge for obtaining reputation	79 (24.0%)	168 (51.1%)	72 (21.9%)	09 (2.7%)	01 (0.3%)	3.96	.77
32	Knowledge sharing in my library is formally recognised	57 (17.3%)	139 (42.2%)	92 (28.0)	41 (12.5%)	-	3.64	.91
33	My library has knowledge sharing policy	03 (0.9 %%)	49 (14.9%)	148 (45.0%)	112 (34.0%)	17 (5.2%)	2.72	.81
	Grand Mean						4.30	

Keys: SA – Strongly Agree, A- Agree, D- Disagree, SD- Strongly Disagree and NA Not Applicable.

Table 2 presents the status of knowledge sharing behavior of librarians in universities in South-West, Nigeria. Knowledge sharing behavior exists among the librarians. This is evidenced in the 4.30 grand mean of the knowledge sharing behavior scale. Table 2 reveals that librarians claim to possess the right attitude to knowledge sharing – sharing knowledge contribute to professional development and better performance ($\bar{x} = 4.48$, $SD = 0.52$), sharing knowledge and experience leads to new knowledge and knowledge production ($\bar{x} =$

4.53, SD 0.50); they are also willing to share knowledge. I am willing to share knowledge because I enjoy helping others ($\bar{x} = 4.42$, SD 0.52) and I am willing to share knowledge to solve my colleagues problems. They are also willing to collect knowledge if I have job challenges, I will ask colleagues for assistance ($\bar{x} = 4.43$, SD = 0.60), I am enthusiastic when colleagues freely share job related knowledge ($\bar{x} = 4.33$, SD = 0.58) organisational trust and motivation are also high.

At a glance, table 2 shows that librarians agree to positive knowledge sharing behavior in the universities as the means for the items ranges from 4.16- 4.56, and this falls into the ‘agree’ category on the rating scale. However the librarians disagree on sharing knowledge for reputation ($\bar{x} = 3.96$, SD = 0.77), and ‘knowledge sharing in my library is formally recognized ($\bar{x} = 3.64$, SD = 0.91). They disagree on ‘my library has knowledge sharing policy ($\bar{x} = 2.72$, SD = 0.81).

Research Question 3: What kind of professional knowledge do librarians share?

Table 3: Type of professional knowledge shared by Librarians

SN	Type of Knowledge	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1	<i>Academic manuscript preparation</i>	135 (41.0%)	171 (52.0%)	11 (3.3%)	08 (2.4%)	04 (1.2%)
2	<i>Resource sharing</i>	130 (39.5%)	192 (58.4%)	07 (2.1%)	-	-
3	<i>Collection Development</i>	135 (41.0%)	179 (54.4%)	11 (3.3%)	;	04 (1.2)
4	<i>Cataloguing and Classification</i>	126 (38.3%)	186 (56.5%)	17 (5.2%)	-	-
5	<i>Library Automation</i>	164 (4.8%)	158 (48.0%)	07 (2.1%)	-	-
6	<i>Reference Services</i>	140 (42.6%)	175 (53.2%)	10 (3.0%)	-	-

Table 3 reveals the kind of knowledge shared or exchanged by librarians include knowledge on manuscript preparation, resource sharing, and collection development. Others include knowledge on cataloguing and classification, library automation and reference services. This shows that no man is all knowing and that librarians in the universities possess positive knowledge sharing behavior towards effective service delivery.

Research Question 4: What methods of knowledge are in use in the libraries in universities?

Table 4: Type of professional knowledge shared by Librarians

SN	Methods	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1	<i>Online group discussion</i>	78 (23.7%)	208 (63.2%)	43 (13.1%)	-	-
2	<i>Training session</i>	120 (36.5%)	182 (55.3%)	27 (8.2%)	-	-
3	<i>Mentor-Mentee relationship</i>	74 (22.5%)	199 (60.5%)	56 (17.0%)	-	-
4	<i>Seminar/Workshop</i>	118 (35.9%)	191 (58.1%)	20 (6.1%)	-	-
5	<i>Official staff meeting</i>	96 (29.2%)	205 (62.3%)	20 (6.1%)	08 (2.4%)	-
6	<i>Unofficial verbal interactions</i>	116 (35.3%)	194 (59.0%)	11 (3.3%)	08 (2.4%)	-

Table 4 presents the method of knowledge sharing methods in use in the various university libraries. The methods include online group discussions, training sessions, and mentor-mentee relationship among the librarians. Other methods include seminar/workshop, official staff meetings and unofficial verbal interactions. With the methods in use, it will be easier for library management to ensure relevant knowledge sharing practices in their libraries.

6.2. Presentation of Hypothesis

This section of the study reports the result of the study’s hypothesis which was tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis One (Ho1):

Table 5: Regression analysis showing Knowledge sharing as a predictor of Job Performance of Librarians

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	46.469	7.320		6.348	.000
	Knowledge Sharing	.465	.044	.507	10.638	.000

$R^2 = 0.260$, $F = 113.165$

The dependent variable is job performance

In table 5, knowledge sharing accounted for 26% of the total variation on Job performance of Librarian ($R^2 = 0.260$, $P < 0.05$). This is significant. Thus, knowledge sharing among Librarians plays a significant role in influencing their level of Job Performance.

The table indicates that the analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the regression yielded a F-ratio of 114.86 ($P < 0.05$). In essence, the relative contribution of the independent variable (knowledge sharing) to the dependent variable (Job Performance of Librarian) expressed as beta weights, ($\beta = .507$, $t = 10.718$; $P < .05$). This outcome also indicates that significant influence exists between knowledge sharing and Job Performance of Librarians. Therefore, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected. What is inferred from here is that knowledge sharing behavior is a good predictor of librarians’ job performance in the universities in South-West zone of Nigeria, and it is implied that positive knowledge sharing behavior will lead to high job performance of librarians.

6.3 Discussion of Findings

This study investigates knowledge sharing as a determinant of librarians’ job performance in the South-West of Nigeria. Four research questions and one research hypothesis was tested. The discussion of findings was based on the results of the research questions and hypothesis. Research question one was formulated to establish the level of librarians job performance in universities libraries in the South-West of Nigeria. Findings in table 1 indicates that librarians in

the universities performs highly not just in the area of job specific tasks, they also perform well in the area of non-job specific tasks, communication, discipline, effort demonstration, peer and team work, supervision/leadership and management/administration. Overall, it is derived that librarians' job performance is high. The finding agreed with that of Aboyade and Popoola (2017) which found that Librarians job performance in federal universities in Nigeria is high. The finding also corroborate that of Ugwu and Ugwu (2017) which found high job performance among librarians in the South-East of Nigeria, whereas the finding is at variance with the findings of Amusa, Iyoro and Ajani (2013) that claimed that librarians' job performance in the public universities in the south-west was just fair. The study's findings on librarians' job performance also disagrees with the assumption of Igbinovia and Popoola (2016) that academic libraries in Nigeria have experienced a declined level of use as a result of poor services rendered by library personnel; and which they opined that it is the result of poor job performance. The difference in the findings could be that this particular study only investigated the job performance of librarians in the universities while those in other academic institutions like Colleges of Education, Polytechnics, Monotechnics were not considered. The variance in the studies could lead to the assumption that some other factors, aside librarians job performance contributes to the declined level of library use by the members of the university community; as librarians in the university claimed to perform highly in the application of professional and technical knowledge to library tasks and services. They also effectively and efficiently use library resources to achieve tasks. However, librarians' job performance could be challenged where library management fails in providing adequate resources for the use of the librarians.

Research question two was formulated to probe into the knowledge sharing behaviour of librarians working in the universities in the south-west of Nigeria. Table 2 indicates positive knowledge sharing behaviour among the librarians in the universities in south-west of Nigeria. The table revealed that the willingness to share job related knowledge among librarians is high. The willingness to receive or collect job related knowledge was also found to be high. It was also found that organisational trust and organisational motivation towards knowledge sharing behaviour of librarians exist. However, the existence of corporate knowledge sharing policy's existence in the libraries was found to be poor as the mean value is 2.72. It is actually the least found on the table. The study's finding corroborates Onifade (2015) submission that librarians in federal universities in Nigeria had positive perception about knowledge sharing. This study however did not align that of Anna and Puspatasari (2013) that established how existence of knowledge sharing practices in Indonesian libraries.

Research question 3 was formulated to identify the types of professional knowledge being shared by librarians in the universities. Revealed on the kind of knowledge shared or exchanged by librarians include knowledge on manuscript preparation, resource sharing, and collection development. Others include knowledge on cataloguing and classification, library automation and reference services. This shows that no man is all knowing and that librarians in the universities possess positive knowledge sharing behavior towards effective service delivery. Research question 4 was formulated to identify the methods of knowledge sharing in use in the university libraries. The methods include online group discussions, training sessions, and mentor-mentee relationship among the librarians. Other methods include seminar/workshop, official staff meetings and unofficial verbal interactions. With the methods in use, it will be easier for library management to ensure relevant knowledge sharing practices in their libraries.

This study in its bid to establish relationship or otherwise between the independent and dependent variables, formulated a research hypothesis. Hypotheses one was formulated to probe into probable influence of knowledge sharing behavior on librarians' job performance in the universities in the south-west of Nigeria. The hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between knowledge sharing behaviour on librarians' job performance in the universities in South-West of Nigeria. Table 5 explains the relationship between knowledge sharing behaviour of librarians and their job performance reveals that knowledge sharing behaviour significantly influence librarians' job performance in the universities in South-West of Nigeria. This finding predicts the rejection of the null hypotheses, and it was thus rejected. The finding implies that positive knowledge sharing behaviour of librarians in the universities will lead to improved job performance. This finding corroborated previous studies, Saeed (2016) ascertained that good disposition to knowledge sharing impact positively on the behaviour to partake in such, and that in turn enhances individual's performance. In the same vein, Akran and Bokhan (2011) established a strong relationship between knowledge sharing and job performance. Also, Koahnsal, Ahmoradd and Bohloul (2013) found that there exists a significant positive relationship between knowledge sharing and employee performance; they concluded that as knowledge sharing among individual increase, their performance too will increase.

7. Conclusion and recommendations

Knowledge has been found to be the mainstay of successful business organisations. Library and information science is a knowledge profession where vast knowledge is being continuously derived; and as such no single individual can possess all the knowledge available in the profession. Knowledge sharing had been found a good way of sharing and receiving knowledge (Tacit and Explicit). Findings in this study established the willingness of librarians in universities in the south-west zone of Nigeria in sharing and receiving knowledge. Library managements should also develop written policy on knowledge sharing in their institutions. To enhance formal knowledge sharing behaviour among librarians, university library managements should as a matter of policy create a time-table for seminars/workshops in each semester. Regular meetings should be organised to enhance knowledge sharing in the universities. Knowledge sharing has been found beneficial to institutions. It is thus imperative for university libraries to ensure the entrenchment of positive knowledge behaviour among the librarians and other category of staff towards their enhanced job performance.

References

- Aksoy, Y. Ayranci, E. &Gozukara, Ebru (2016). A research on the relationship between knowledge sharing and employee performance: the moderating role of unethical behaviours inorganisational level. *European Scientific Journal*, 12(4).Retrieved from<http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n4p335>.
- Amusa, O.I., Iyoro. A.O. & Ajani, F.O. (2013). Work environments and job performance of librarians in the public universities in South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 5(11), 457- 461
- Amusa, O. I., Abdusalam, A. A. & Ajani, F.O (2014) Occupational frustration variables of the librarians in public universities in South-West, Nigeria. *The Information Manager*, 14(1&2), 38-45

- Asr ar-ul-Haq, M ., Anwar,S., and Nisar, T. (2016). *A Systematic review of knowledge management and knowledge sharing: Trends, issues, and challenges*. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/23311975.2015.1127744>
- Awodoyin, A., Osisanwo, T., Adetoro, N. & Adeyemo, I. (2016). Knowledge sharing behaviour pattern analysis of academic librarians in Nigeria. *Journal of Balkan Libraries Union*, 4(1), 12-19
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modelling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organisational psychology. In: Dunnette M.D, Hough, L. M. Eds. *Handbook of industrial and organisational psychology*. Palo Alto, C. A. Consulting Psychologists Press. 687 – 732.
- Daland , H (2016) Managing knowledge in academic libraries. Are we? Should we? *Liber Quarterly*, 26 (1), 28-41.
- Din, N. & Haron, S. (2012). Knowledge sharing as culture among Malaysian online social networking users. *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 50, 1043-1050
- Igbinovia, M.O. & Popoola, S.O. (2016). Organisational culture and emotional intelligence as predictors of job performance among library personnel in Edo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*, 4 (2), 34-52.
- Kearns, G. S. & Lederer, A. L. (2003). A Resource-based view of strategic IT alignment: How knowledge sharing creates competitive advantage. *Decision Sciences*, 34(1), 1 – 29.
- Kim, W. & Park, J. (2017) Examining structural relationship between work engagement, organisational procedural justice, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behaviour for sustainable organisational. *Sustainability*, 9(205), 1 – 16.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaads, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C. W. & van der Beek (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: a systemic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 53(8)
- Kuzu, O.H. & Ozilhan, D. (2014). The Effect of employee relationships and knowledge sharing on employees performance: an empirical research on service industry. *Procedia- Social and behavioural Sciences*, 109, 1370-1374.
- Wang, S. & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: a review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 115-131.
- Wening, N., Haryorw, T. & Harsono, M. (2016). Relationship between knowledge sharing to individual performance: The role of organisational culture and relationship quality as moderator in family business. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 4(1), 67-78.
- Woerkom, M. V. & Sanders, K. (2010). The Romance of learning from disagreement, the effect of cohesiveness and disagreement on knowledge sharing behaviour and individual performance within teams. *Journals of Business and Psychology*, 25(1), 139-149.