April 2023

# Factors hindering knowledge sharing practices among librarians: a study of UTAUT

Ganiyu Oluwaseyi Quadri
*Quadri, Ganiyu Oluwaseyi, Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan. Nigeria*, qudriseyi@gmail.com

Adebayo Muritala Adegbore Dr
*University of Ibadan, Nigeria*, adebayoadegbore@gmail.com

**Factors hindering knowledge sharing practices among librarians: a study of UTAUT**

**[1]Ganiyu Oluwaseyi Quadri,** *Ph.D* **& [2]Adebayo Muritala Adegbore,** *Ph.D*

**[1]Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.**

**[2]Department of Library, Archival & Information Studies, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.**

*ABSTRACT*

The study investigated the factors hindering knowledge sharing practices among librarians in Nigerian federal university libraries. Methods: The study was based on post-positivism research paradigm with survey research design. The UTAUT was employed as the theoretical lens underpinning the study. All the librarians from the six federal university libraries in Southwest constituted the study population. The questionnaire and semi-structured interview were adopted for data gathering. SPSS was used to analyse the questionnaire, while the semi-structured interview was analysed through thematic content analysis. Results: The study found that majority of the respondents 80(78%) disagreed that they will not share knowledge owning to poor communication and interpersonal skills. The respondents interviewed also confirmed that trust, collaboration, reward/incentives, lack of time and fund, space and so on were identified as some factors inhibiting knowledge sharing practices among the respondents. Conclusion: The study concluded that of all the identified factors responsible for knowledge sharing practices among librarians, organisational factor received the highest ranked.

**Keywords: Knowledge sharing, Knowledge management, Librarian, UTAUT, Federal University libraries, Nigeria**

**Introduction**

Knowledge sharing is the exchange of information between two or more people. The evolution of knowledge sharing and implementation of strategies have given the rise to its manifestation as a tool for communication and initiation of knowledge. The adoption of knowledge sharing by knowledge management strategists is the tidal wave which has pave way to their success in remodeling and innovation of knowledge at their level of work which they hold. The insurgence to the need to create a culture in an organization is the underpinning activities which are embedded in knowledge practice in their daily routines to ensure knowledge management is successful. Hence, tacit knowledge can be made explicit through the knowledge management platforms.

Knowledge sharing is embedded in knowledge management which is the process of knowledge creation, acquisition, transfer, dissemination and sharing, storage, refinement and utilisation (King, Chung and Haney, 2008). Therefore, the role of knowledge management in the organisations particularly universities is to operate these processes as well as develop procedures and systems to support them, thus, effective knowledge sharing in university libraries will foster knowledge assets, improved institutional/organisational culture and structure which in turn enhances team work and job performance (King, Chung and Haney, 2008). Okonedo and Popoola (2012:2) define knowledge sharing as an activity that involves dissemination of ideas, information and values about the acuity between two parties in order to agree or disagree about a phenomenon. According to Van den Hoof and De Ridder (2004:118), knowledge sharing is the process by which individuals' exchange and share tacit and explicit knowledge as well as create new knowledge. It is therefore pertinent for librarians to share knowledge, as it will make them more valuable and productive in their respective workplace. Notwithstanding, the ability of librarians to share their knowledge with one another and other professional colleagues will in turn foster team work and enhances job productivity (Abell and Oxbrow 2001).

For effective knowledge management practices in the library, it is essential to discuss some hiccups that may affect the flow of knowledge management activities in which knowledge sharing is not an exception. Factors are view as elements that bring about certain result of cause to a particular phenomenon. There are many factors hindering knowledge sharing practices in recent year as confirmed by extant literature, some which will be discuss below.

Islam and Khan (2014) reported that the following were the factors affecting knowledge sharing activities among librarians in Dhaka University Library: individual/human factors (Behavioural pattern, mutual relationship, cooperative efforts and reliability of the individual); organizational factors (qualified professionals, staff motivation); and technological factors (digital institutional repository, access to online journals). This finding corroborated the result of Koloniari, Vraimaki and Fassoulis (2016:11) who found organisational culture to be the principal factor affecting knowledge sharing among librarians in Greek academic libraries, as it was established to have a strong positive effect on them. Biranvand, Seif and Khasseh (2015) reported that trust is the major factor that inhibits knowledge sharing amongst librarians in Iranian public libraries.

Cheng et al. (2009:313) broadly classified obstacles to knowledge sharing amongst faculty members in Malaysia to be technological, individual and as well as organisational. On one hand, Kim and Ju (2008:282) identified factors such as perception, collaboration, trust, reward system as well as channels of communication to knowledge sharing amongst academics in tertiary institutions. Ipe (2003:343) postulates that organisational culture, nature of knowledge, opportunities and motivation to share were recorded as the factors inhibiting knowledge sharing. In contrast, Majid and Chitra (2013) reported that the main obstacles to knowledge sharing amongst undergraduate students in India were lack of a sharing culture and time as well as poor depth of human relation.

Many scholars (Fan, Zhang and Yen 2014; Nooshinfard and Nemati-Anaraki, 2014) have categorised factors hindering knowledge sharing to include: lack of available resources, lack of top-level leadership, individual and organisational resistance to change, and organisational structure. Karagoz, Korthaus and Augar (2014) and Crowther (2014) identified goal problems, inadequate funding, project schedule barriers, communication factor, lack of trust, confidentiality and respect amongst organisations, absence of measurement and evaluation, and absence of sharing guidelines as the factors militating to knowledge sharing. This assertion was in tandem with Olatokun and Elueze (2012:1) who reported that incentives, management support, motivation, relationships, and structure among others were seen as factors influencing individual's readiness to share knowledge.

In the same vein, many researchers have categorised factors affecting knowledge sharing behaviour into three groups, namely, individual/personal, organisational as well as technological (Tohidinia and Mosakhani 2010; Usman and Oyefolahan 2014). The following are the three factors identified:

i.      Individual factors
ii.     Organisational factors
iii.    Technological factors

In order to grasp better understanding about the above mentioned factors of knowledge sharing, the factors were further categorized in the table below.

| Factors | Categorisation |
| --- | --- |
| Personal/Individual factors | Trust, self-efficacy, cost, altruism, personality, mutual reciprocity, job satisfaction, awareness, time, level of experience, lack of interpersonal skills, poor verbal/written communication, level of education, lack of social network, gender differences, age differences, centralization, formalisation. |
| Organisational/Management factors | Managerial implication and organisation culture/structure, reward system, policies, mentoring, inclusion of knowledge sharing as part of work process, integration of KM strategy and sharing initiatives, lack of managerial direction in relation to clearly communicating, lack of space to share and create new knowledge, inadequate infrastructure to support sharing activities, knowledge retention of highly skilled staff is not a high priority, external competitiveness within business units, hierarchical organisation structure inhibits sharing practices, communication and knowledge flows are restricted into certain directions |

| Technological factors | Availability of IT infrastructure, know-how, experience and skill with technology, the internet and intranet, IT tools, communication channel and technology support, lack of IT integration and compatibility, unrealistic IT expectations, unfamiliarity with IT, inappropriate training with regards to emerging IT. |
| --- | --- |

**Individual factor**

Individual factor is described as people who generate and share knowledge (tacit and explicit) in an organisation (Maiga 2017:30). Tohidinia and Mosakhani (2010:623) found that individual factors had a high impact on knowledge collection and donation. In corroborating the above finding, Kumaresan and Swrooprani (2013:7) found that a majority of the respondents (93%) perceived that sharing their personal knowledge will enhance their job productivity, while knowledge sharing will assist in strategic planning of the library in Qatar community. Parirokh, Daneshgar and Fattahi (2008:117) affirmed that for effective knowledge sharing, factors related to personal interest and enthusiasm of librarians should be considered.

Ugwu and Ekere (2019) reported that only education as well as work experience were found to significantly correlate with knowledge management practices of librarians in Nigeria federal university libraries. The above findings were in agreement with that of Syed-Ikhsan and Rowland (2004) who found that year of experience and educational qualification were found to be remarkable variables influencing knowledge management practices. Also, Kasim (2015) reported that gender had positive effects to knowledge sharing behaviour among private sector in Malaysia. In contrast, Ajiferuke (2003) discovered that gender, age and educational qualification as personal characteristics did not show any significant relationship with regards to knowledge management programs (that is, knowledge identification, knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation, knowledge dissemination and knowledge sharing).

**Organisational factor**

Organisational factor encompasses management support to create an environment that supports, provides, enhances, encourages and promotes adequate resources to foster knowledge sharing in an organisation particularly in the university libraries (Maiga, 2017:29). Tohidinia and Mosakhani (2010:621) reveal that among all the factors considered to influence knowledge sharing, organisational rewards did not indicate a significant connection with attitude toward knowledge sharing. However, since knowledge sharing is seen as a delicate behaviour, a successful reward must be heartening which will be goal oriented. Management/organisational support is seen as a significant variable in the knowledge sharing model that correlate individual, organisation culture and structure, mentoring, reward systems and policies made on knowledge sharing (Maiga, 2017:29).

Lawal et al. (2014:25) in a study on knowledge sharing among academic staff in Nigerian universities identified the major limitations to knowledge sharing as inadequate awareness of knowledge sharing activities among academic community as well as poor attitude among academic staff to share knowledge with one another. Abdur-Rafiu and Opesade (2015) found that academics at the polytechnic will be willing to share work related knowledge provided if the factors affecting knowledge sharing are adequately addressed. In addition, perceived behavioural control coupled with academic commitment was found to be significant in predicting the intention to share knowledge, whereas trust, attitude and subjective norms are not significant. Furthermore, academics' intention to share their knowledge is predicted by their behaviour to knowledge sharing. In contrast, Olatokun and Nwafor (2012:216) discovered that attitude does not have significant influence on employee intentions to share knowledge in the organisation.

**Technological factor**

Technology has the capability to offer quick access to large volumes of data that will enable distance collaboration and sharing that facilitates teamwork in organisations and businesses (Riege 2005:29). The author further reiterated that there is little uncertainty that technology can act as an enabler in supporting knowledge sharing activities, and thereby making it easier, faster and more effective. However, to do this, there should be appropriate implementation and suitable technology that will fit both the people and the organisation. Lee and Choi (2003:188) posited that IT is widely

used to connect people with organised knowledge so as to facilitate conversations and to generate new knowledge. In addition, the author submitted that well established IT infrastructure assists to facilitate knowledge sharing activities by connecting information communication structures like processing of data, storage and communication systems. In line with the above findings, Lee (2018) avowed that IT support as well as social interaction ties were found to positively connected with knowledge sharing practices, and that social identification, trust and the use of smart devices had positive connection with knowledge sharing.

Similarly, Azuh and Modebelu (2013:82) indicated a low level of use of ICT tools to promote and share knowledge among academic staff in agricultural education in the South-East geo-political zone of Nigeria. The study further revealed that academic staff in agricultural education in Nigerian universities are faced with some numerous challenges in terms of sharing knowledge via technology with each other. In addition, the study shows that this low-level usage of ICT infrastructure affects knowledge sharing among academic staff in agricultural education. Other impediments are inadequate time for training in ICT, technical support, age, erratic power supply, poor internet connectivity and lack of ICT skills. However, if this trend continues, librarians and other information professionals like archivist and knowledge managers in Nigeria might find it difficult to share knowledge effectively with each other using the ICT (Azuh and Modebelu, 2013).

**Objectives of the study**

The following objectives guided this study:

1. to find out what factors hindering librarians in sharing their knowledge in the federal university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria;

2. to identify types of knowledge sharing factors;

3. to ascertain UTAUT influence on knowledge sharing factors.

**Research question**

1. What are the factors hindering knowledge sharing among librarians in the Federal university libraries in South-West Nigeria?

2. Which of the knowledge sharing factors is highly ranked among librarians in the sampled institutions in South-West Nigeria?

**Theoretical Framework**

This study is underpinned by Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) propounded by Venkatech, Morris, Davis and Davis (2003). The theory encompasses eight other theory/model that has been adopted to explain technology acceptance and use behaviour. The UTAUT was inspired owing to its recency, richness, and robustness particularly when comparing to other technology acceptance theory. More importantly, UTAUT successfully described 70 percent of people's intention to use a technology while other previous models (TRA, TAM, MM, TPB, C-TPB-TAM, MPCU, IDT/DOI, SCT) was able to explain only 40 percent of technology acceptance and use (Venkatesh, et al. 2003) which make this theory suitable for the present study.

The UTAUT has four constructs and the constructs are defined as follows:

Performance Expectancy: this is defined as "the degree to which an individual believes that using the system will help him/her to attain improvements in job performance".

Effort Expectancy: is defined as "the degree of ease associated with the use of the system".

Social Influence: is defined as an "individual perception that a person who is relevant to him/her considers he/she should use the new system" (Venkatesh et al. 2003:451).

Facilitating Condition: this is defined as "the degree to which an individual believes that an organisational and technical infrastructure exists to support use of the system" (Venkatesh et al. 2003). Therefore, the present study focused on Social Influence (SI) and Facilitating Condition (FC) constructs of UTAUT which definition was operationalised as thus:

**Social Influence:** Operationalised as "a librarian perception that a person who is relevant to him/her, thinks he/she should share new knowledge". **Facilitating Condition:** is "the degree to which a librarian believes that organizational and technical infrastructures exist to support knowledge sharing".

**Methodology**

Descriptive survey research technique was employed in this study. This research method relies on questionnaire as instrument for data collection.

The population of the study comprised all the librarians and university librarians (Head of Libraries) in six federal university libraries in Southwest Nigeria. The institution involved are University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Federal University Oye, Oye-Ekiti and Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta. A total of 114 librarians in the six university libraries formed the sample for the study. Table 1 below illuminate the study population.

**Table 1: Population of the study**

| Institutions | Number of Librarians | University Librarians |
|---|---|---|
| UI | 29 | 1 |
| UNILAG | 20 | 1 |
| FUNAAB | 22 | 1 |
| FUTA | 11 | 1 |
| FUOYE | 4 | 1 |
| OAU | 22 | 1 |
| **Total** | **108** | **6** |
| **Grand Total** | **114** | |

A mixed method approach was adopted with a post-positivism research paradigm (that is, combination of quantitative and qualitative). A structured questionnaire and semi-structured interview were the instruments used for data collection, while the interview questions were open-

ended and tailored sequentially and not rigid. The researcher booked an appointment with the selected participants to gather data. The instruments were administered by the researchers, with the help of some staff in the selected university libraries so as to ensure a high rate of response. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyse the quantitative data, while thematic content analysis (TCA) was employed to analyse the qualitative data. The data was presented in tables.

**Questionnaire response rate**

In this study, 114 librarians participated in the survey. Out of 108 questionnaires administered to librarians, 102 copies were completed and useful for analysis, giving a response rate of 94.4%. For the interview schedule (qualitative), all the 6 targeted respondents completed the semi-structured interview, giving a 100% response rate. Johnson and Wislar (2012:1805) submitted that the acceptable response rate for survey should not be less than 60%. Therefore, based on the above submission, the response rates obtained for this study were considered suitable.

**Result and discussion**

The first research question sought to examine the factors hindering knowledge sharing among the librarians in the sampled federal universities in South-west Nigeria. A five-point Likert scale of Strongly agreed, Agreed, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly disagreed was used to adjudge the statement. The result is presented in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Individual factors (n =102)**

| Individual Factors (Social Influence) | Strongly Agreed | Agreed | Neutral | Disagreed | Strongly Disagreed | Mean | Std Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I do not have enough time to focus on sharing knowledge | 3(3%) | 11(11%) | 12(12%) | 42(41%) | 34(33%) | 2.01 | 1.07 |
| My colleagues do not appreciate the knowledge I wish to share | 1(1%) | 12(12%) | 8(8%) | 56(55%) | 25(24%) | 2.09 | 0.94 |
| I am not aware of the value and benefit of sharing possessed knowledge to others | 1(1%) | 6(6%) | 5(5%) | 53(52%) | 37(36%) | 1.83 | 0.85 |
| Sharing my knowledge may reduce or jeopardize others job security. | 1(1%) | 6(6%) | 7(7%) | 48(47%) | 40(39%) | 1.82 | 0.87 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I cannot share my knowledge due to poor communication and interpersonal skills | 5(5%) | 9(9%) | 8(8%) | 39(38%) | 41(40%) | 2.00 | 1.13 |
| My institution does not give me the incentive to want to share knowledge | 4(4%) | 14(14%) | 12(12%) | 38(37%) | 34(33%) | 2.18 | 1.16 |
| There are no reward incentives | 9(9%) | 26(25%) | 8(8%) | 36(35%) | 23(23%) | 2.63 | 1.32 |
| My boss/supervisor does not support my efforts to share my knowledge | 5(5%) | 13(13%) | 10(10%) | 50(49%) | 24(23%) | 2.26 | 1.11 |
| Reluctance to use technology due to lack of familiarity to knowledge sharing | 3(3%) | 15(15%) | 4(4%) | 43(42%) | 37(36%) | 2.06 | 1.12 |

Note:   Strongly Agreed and Agreed were aggregated as Agreed, while Strongly Disagreed and Disagreed were aggregated as Disagreed

Table 2 indicated that the majority 80(78%) disagreed that they do feel reluctant to use technology due to lack of familiarity, while lack of reward did not dissuade the librarians from knowledge sharing 59(58%) and lack of institutional support does not equally sway their minds regarding information sharing 72(70%).  The majority 80(78%) of the respondents equally disagreed that they will not share knowledge because of poor communication and interpersonal skills. Based on the UTAUT model which identifies SI as a construct affecting intention/behaviour to share knowledge, this finding confirmed that individual factors construct positively influence knowledge sharing of librarians.

This finding was consistent with that by Tohidinia and Mosakhani (2010:623) who reported that individual factors had high influence on knowledge donation and collection. Additionally, Kumaresan and Swrooprani (2013) and Fullwood and Rowley (2017) studies reported that SI (Social Influence) construct especially attitudes and beliefs were more essential on knowledge sharing practices amongst Qatar community library and United Kingdom academics while Ismail and Yusof (2010) avowed that a correlation exists between SI individual factors that is, trust, personality and awareness and quality of knowledge shared.

**Table 3: Organisational factors (n =102)**

| Organizational Factors (Social Influence)<br><br>Statement | Strongly Agreed | Agreed | Neutral | Disagreed | Strongly Disagreed | Mean | Std Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corporate culture in my institution does not provide sufficient support for knowledge sharing practices | 8(8%) | 15(15%) | 13(13%) | 44(43%) | 22(21%) | 2.44 | 1.21 |
| The physical work environment and layout of work areas restrict effective knowledge sharing practices | 2(2%) | 20(20%) | 8(8%) | 45(44%) | 27(26%) | 2.23 | 1.12 |
| There is no organizational policy as regard knowledge sharing | 13(13%) | 34(33%) | 13(13%) | 27(26%) | 15(15%) | 3.03 | 1.34 |
| Lack of formal and informal spaces to share and generate my knowledge | 4(4%) | 26(25%) | 12(12%) | 39(38%) | 21(21%) | 2.54 | 1.19 |
| Shortage of appropriate infrastructure to support knowledge sharing practices | 5(5%) | 38(37%) | 9(9%) | 32(31%) | 18(18%) | 2.80 | 1.25 |
| Knowledge flow and communication are restricted into certain directions (e.g. top-down) | 11(11%) | 33(32%) | 5(5%) | 36(35%) | 17(17%) | 2.85 | 1.33 |
| There are no reward incentives | 12(12%) | 35(34%) | 9(9%) | 30(29%) | 16(16%) | 2.97 | 1.32 |
| Lack of alternative power supply. | 18(18%) | 27(26%) | 4(4%) | 33(32%) | 20(20%) | 2.90 | 1.45 |

Table 3 shows that 53(52%) of the total respondents stated that there is provision of alternative power supply in their organisations, majority 53(52%) disagreed that knowledge flow and communication are restricted into certain directions, the majority 50(49%) disagreed that there was shortage of infrastructure to support knowledge sharing practices and the large proportion of the respondents 60(59%) also disagreed that there is lack of formal and informal spaces to share and generate their knowledge. Findings from the table equally indicated that the majority of the respondents 72(70%) disagreed that the physical work environment and layout of work areas restricts effective knowledge sharing practices. It was established in the UTAUT theory that SI construct influences intention/behaviour to share knowledge positively, therefore, the findings of the present study attested that organisational factors (SI) affect librarians' knowledge sharing.

The above finding was in agreement with that by Harker (2015) who affirmed that SI (organisational culture/management support) emerged as significant obstacles determining knowledge sharing activities among South African academic staff. Also, Ugwu (2016) echoed that both organisational structure and learning have positive effect with regards knowledge sharing

activities. However, Nengomasha, Mubuyaeta and Beukes-Amiss (2017) reported that FC variables such as lack of competence in ICT and technical aid, inadequate IT infrastructure, lack of personnel motivation (reward/incentives), etcetera was noted as factors to knowledge management practices in Namibia.

**Table 4: Technological factors (n =102)**

| Facilitating Condition | Strongly Agreed | Agreed | Neutral | Disagreed | Strongly Disagreed | Mean | Std Dev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| There is no IT infrastructure in place for sharing knowledge (Internet connectivity, Inadequate computers, LAN, WAN.) | 3(3%) | 17(17%) | 4(4%) | 39(38%) | 39(38%) | 2.08 | 1.17 |
| The organization does not provide technological know-how share knowledge | 4(4%) | 22(21%) | 8(8%) | 40(39%) | 28(28%) | 2.35 | 1.21 |
| I do not have sufficient technological skills to share knowledge | 4(4%) | 13(13%) | 3(3%) | 47(46%) | 35(34%) | 2.06 | 1.12 |
| Lack of technical support and maintenance of integrated IT systems to share knowledge | 2(2) | 27(27%) | 4(4%) | 38(37%) | 31(30%) | 2.23 | 1.22 |
| Lack of organizational training to use new technology to share knowledge | 6(6%) | 23(22%) | 6(6%) | 40(39%) | 27(27%) | 2.42 | 1.26 |
| I have enough Internet experience to share my knowledge | 30(29%) | 43(42%) | 6(6%) | 15(15%) | 8(8%) | 3.71 | 1.26 |

Table 4 indicates that more than half of the respondents 73(71%) have adequate internet experience. About 67(66%) of the respondents disagreed with lack of organisational training to use new technology, while 82(80%) also disagreed with lack of sufficient technological skills to share knowledge and 78(76%) disagreed with lack of IT infrastructure in place for sharing knowledge. The aggregate of the results from table 2 to 4 showed that the individual, organisational and technological factors affect knowledge sharing among librarians in federal university libraries in Southwest Nigeria positively. According to Venkatesh et al. (2003), Facilitating Condition (FC) as construct in UTAUT model play major roles in the adoption and use of technologies. Therefore,

facilitating conditions like IT infrastructure, technical know-how/skills, technical support and maintenance are prerequisites to effective knowledge sharing practices amongst librarians.

The above finding was in tandem with findings by Becerra-Fernandes and Sabherwal (2010) who discovered that FC such as IT infrastructure was found to facilitate knowledge sharing activities. Kasim (2015) also reported that the FC construct positively influences knowledge sharing by employees in Malaysia.

In order to ascertain the ranking of the effects of these factors on knowledge sharing, a descriptive analysis was conducted; the result is depicted in table 5 below.

**Table 5 Ranking of the factors affecting knowledge sharing (n= 102)**

**Descriptive Statistics**

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational Factors | 102 | 8.00 | 37.00 | 21.8039 | 7.98146 | 1 |
| Individual Factors | 102 | 9.00 | 42.00 | 18.9706 | 7.18008 | 2 |
| Technological Factors | 102 | 6.00 | 25.00 | 14.9412 | 5.13544 | 3 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 102 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5 shows that respondents' highest ranked factor that affects knowledge sharing is organisational factors with highest mean of 21.8 while individual factor yielded the mean of 18.97 and technological factors yielded 14.94. The implication of this is that organisational factors should be focused in order to further have the issues surrounding it improved.

Furthermore, in order to ascertain in-depth understanding of the study, the university librarians (Library Head) were asked the factors affecting librarian's knowledge sharing in their various libraries, their responses are presented in table 6 below. For the purpose of anonymity, the head of library are regarded as Respondent 1 to 6 respectively.

**Table 6: Interview responses on factor affecting knowledge sharing in the library**

| Respondent | Response |
|---|---|
| Respondent 1 | *Inadequate funding* |
| Respondent 2 | *Motivation and incentives* |
| Respondent 3 | Effective commitment |
| Respondent 4 | factor of trust and unwillingness to share knowledge |
| Respondent 5 | Lack of funding and reward incentives |
| Respondent 6 | Awareness issue |

As shown in tables 6, librarians in the Federal University libraries in Southwest Nigeria actually agreed to impediments regarding knowledge sharing. Respondent 1, 2 and 5 agreed that the factor such as inadequate funding, motivation as well as lack of reward incentives really affect knowledge sharing practices in their library, while Respondent 6 reported that *awareness issue* was a problem. The awareness issue was also confirmed by the quantitative data analyzed in Table 2.

**Conclusion**

The study concluded that three factors were identified to hinder knowledge sharing practices among the librarians in South-West federal university libraries, these are individual, organisational and technological factors and all of them were found to have positive influence on knowledge sharing practices. The study further concluded that of all the identified factors responsible for knowledge sharing practices among librarians, organisational factor received the highest ranked. The qualitative also compliment the quantitative data by confirming that factors such as inadequate funding, motivation and incentives, reward system, trust and willingness factor, effective commitment as well as awareness were identified as factors influencing knowledge sharing practices among the librarians in Southwest Nigeria.

**Recommendation**

1.  The study recommended that the library management should made fund available so as to enhance knowledge sharing practices in the library. This will allow librarians to attend workshops, conferences etcetera where new knowledge will be gained and share among the librarians upon return to home country.

2.  Reward incentives and motivation should be given to librarians who wish to share his/her knowledge especially tacit knowledge. This will motivate the librarian who do not wish to share his/her knowledge among colleagues to do so.

3.  The library management should endeavour to formulate functional policy that will encourage librarians to share their knowledge.

**References**

Abdur-Rafiu, M.A. & Opesade, A.O. (2015). Knowledge sharing behaviour of academics in the Polytechnic Ibadan. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). Paper 1287. Available at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3449&content=libphilprac Accessed on 17/09/2022.

Abell, A. & Oxbrow, N. (2001). *Competing with knowledge: the information professional in the knowledge management age*. London: Library Association Publishing.

Ajiferuke, I. (2003). Role of information professionals in knowledge management programme: empirical evidence from Canada. *Information Science Journal,* 6: 247-257.

Azuh, O.J. & Modebelu, M.N. (2013). Academic staff challenges to effective utilization of information and communication technology (ICT) in teaching/learning of agriculture education. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies,* 2(7): 77-83.

Becerra-Fernandes, I. & Sabherwal, R. (2010). *Knowledge management: systems and processes*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Biranvand, A., Seif, M.H. & Khasseh, A.A. (2015). Knowledge sharing among librarians in public libraries of Fars Province, Iran. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 1259. Available at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3380&context=libphilprac Accessed on 16/09/2022.

Cheng, M., Ho, J.S. & Lau, P.M. (2009). Knowledge Sharing in Academic institutions: a study of Multimedia University Malaysia. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management,* 7(3): 313-324.

Crowther, K.G. (2014). Understanding and overcoming information sharing failures. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management,* 11:131-154.

Fan, J. Zhang, P. & Yen, D.C. (2014). G2G information sharing among government agencies. *Information & Management*, 51: 120-128.

Fullwood, R. & Rowley, J. (2017). An investigation of factors affecting knowledge sharing amongst UK academics. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 21(5): 1254-1271.

Harker, L.L. (2015). *Factors influencing knowledge sharing at a selected tertiary institution in South Africa*. Unpublished dissertation (Masters). Faculty of Business and Management Science, Cape Peninsula University of Technology.

Ipe, M. (2003). Knowledge sharing in organizations: a conceptual framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4):337-59.

Islam, S. & Khan, R.H. (2014). Exploring the factors affecting knowledge sharing practices in Dhaka University Library. *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). Paper 1095. Available at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2806&context=libphilprac Accessed on 06/06/2022.

Ismail, M.B. & Yusof, Z.M. (2010). The impact of individual factors on knowledge sharing quality. *Journal of Organisational Knowledge Management*, 3(10): 1-13.

Johnson, T. P. & Wislar, J. S. (2012). Response rates and nonresponse errors in surveys. Journal of the American Medical Association, 307(17): 1805-1806.

Karagoz, Y., Korthaus, A. & Augar, N. (2014). Barriers to knowledge sharing in ICT projects. *Proceeding of the 25th Australasian Conference on Information Systems*, 8th -10th Dec. 2014, Auckland, New Zealand.

Kasim, H. (2015). Factors affecting knowledge sharing using virtual platforms: a validation of Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). *International Journal of Managing Public Sector Information and Communication Technologies*, 6(2): 1-19.

Kim, S. & Ju, B. (2008). An analysis of faculty perceptions: attitudes toward knowledge sharing and collaboration in an academic institution. *Library and Information Science Research*, 30(4): 282-290.

King, R.W., Chung, T.R. & Haney, M.H. (2008). Knowledge management and organisatiobal learning. *Omega*, 36(2): 167-172.

Koloniari, M., Vraimaki, E. & Fassoulis, K. (2016). Factors affecting knowledge creation in academic libraries. *Journal of Library and Information Science,* 48(3): 1-14.

Lawal, W.O., Agboola, I.O., Aderibigbe, N.A., Owolabi, K.A. & Bakare, O.D. (2014). Knowledge sharing among academic staff in Nigerian university of agriculture: a survey. *International Journal of Information Library and Society*, 3(1): 26-32.

Lee, H. & Choi, B. (2003). Knowledge management enablers, processes, and organisational performance: an integrative view and empirical examination. *Journal of Management Information System,* 20(1): 179-228.

Lee, J. (2018). The effects of knowledge sharing on individual creativity in higher education institutions: socio-technical view. *Administrative Science*, 8(2): 21-37.

Maiga, Z.B. (2017). *Knowledge sharing among academics in selected universities in Tanzania.* Unpublished thesis (PhD). Department of Information Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Majid, S. & Chitra, P. K. (2013). Role of knowledge sharing in the learning process. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal,* 2(1):1206-1212.

Nengomasha, C.T., Mubuyaeta, M.M. & Beukes-Amiss, C.M. (2017). Organisational knowledge management: a case study of the ministry of gender equality and child welfare (MGECW) in Namibia. *Journal for Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(1): 18-40.

Nooshinfard, F. & Nemati-Anaraki, L. (2014). Success factors of inter-organisational knowledge sharing: a proposed framework. *The Electronic Library,* 32(2): 239-261.

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* (e-journal). 865. Available at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2040&context=libphilprac Accessed on 06/06/2022.

Olatokun, W. & Nwafor, C.I. (2012). The effect of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on knowledge sharing intentions of civil servants in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Information Development,* 28(3): 216-234.

Olatokun, W.M. & Elueze, I.N. (2012). Analysing lawyers' attitude towards knowledge sharing. *South African Journal of Information Management,* 14(1): 1-11.

Parirokh, M., Daneshgar, F. & Fattahi, R. (2008). Identifying knowledge-sharing requirements in academic libraries. *Library Review* 57(2): 107-122.

Riege, A. 2005. Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(3): 18-35.

Syed-Ikhsan, S.O.S. & Rowland, T. (2004). Knowledge management in a public organisation: a study on the relationship between organisational elements and the performance of knowledge transfer. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(2): 95-111.

Tohidinia, Z. & Mosakhani, M. (2010). Knowledge sharing bahaviour and its predictors. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 110(4): 611-631.

Ugwu, C.I. & Ekere, J.N. (2019). Knowledge management for improving services in federal university libraries in Nigeria. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science,* 51(2): 356-369.

Usman, S.H. & Oyefolahan, O. (2014). Determinants of knowledge sharing using web technologies among students in high education. *Journal of Knowledge Management, Economics and Information Technology*, 4(2): 1-22.

Van Den Hoof, B. & De Ridder, J.A. (2004). Knowledge sharing in context: the influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and communication-computer-mediated communication (CMC) use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 8(6): 117-130.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. Davis, G. & Davis, F. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly,* 27(3): 425-478.