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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore knowledge sharing among library staff in the University for Development Studies (UDS) which is a multi-campus university in the Northern, Upper East and Upper West regions of Ghana, with the objectives of identifying perceptions, participation and strategies employed in knowledge sharing, motivations and challenges as well as if there exist any laid down policies on knowledge sharing.

This was a qualitative study which made use of the case study design. The total population was sixty-one consisting of junior staff, senior staff and senior members of the UDS Library. The nature of data collected for the study was both primary and secondary. Questionnaire and interviews were the instruments used to gather the primary data from respondents. The data obtained from the questionnaire was analyzed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (IBM SPSS) version 23 whilst that of the interview was done using thematic content analysis. The presentation of analysis of the data obtained from the interviews were incorporated with that of the data gathered from the questionnaires in instances where the same issue was discussed. In instances where questions were not covered in both the questionnaires and the interviews, the presentation was done separately. The results were presented using tables, charts and graphs and verbatim quotations.
The major findings of the study show that, all staff of the UDS Library had a positive perception about knowledge sharing and believed that a number of benefits could be derived from engaging in knowledge sharing. These include, the opportunity to learn new skills and update what they already knew, maintain best practices and improve service delivery, retain knowledge of long serving and highly skilled staff, foster trust and unity among others. However, they registered their need for a laid down policy that would guide and motivate staff to engage in knowledge sharing. The study also revealed that there was more participation among staff within the same campus library than across and this may be attributed to the physical and virtual distance created by the multi-campus system. The channels available for knowledge sharing include face to-face conversations, emails, formal meetings, workshops/seminar/trainings, text messaging, telephone or chat groups and the preferred channel was through personal face-to-face conversations. Among the barriers to effective knowledge sharing within the library system were distance which is not helped by inadequate and poor use of technology, poor internet connectivity and poor knowledge sharing culture among staff.

The recommendations of the study include: a formal policy on knowledge sharing be developed and implemented; the culture of knowledge sharing should be encouraged among staff; reward systems should be developed for knowledge sharing; and technology enhanced communication tools should be harnessed for use by staff; and the library should support staff to acquire improved professional knowledge among others.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Information is increasingly becoming a valuable factor of production besides land, labour, capital and entrepreneurship. Nonetheless, information is processed data; facts or raw data presented systematically within a given context, but deriving meaningful linkages and applying it to decision-making to achieve a desired outcome maximizes that piece of information and ultimately generates knowledge. Knowledge is defined by the American Productivity and Quality Center (APQC) as “information in action” (cited in ODell & Hubert, 2011); thus knowledge is the outcome of a combination of information, analysis and experience to enhance productivity and innovation and provide solutions to challenges.

Activities of organizations have knowledge deeply rooted at the centre of it all. The advent and growth of the information age and the knowledge economy has steadily increased the value of knowledge and has transformed knowledge into an asset and a basic economic resource (Beazley et al., 2002, as cited in Agarwal & Islam, 2015). Knowledge has therefore become a critical resource that provides organizations with a sustainable competitive advantage in a dynamic economy. Organizations select employees possessing specific knowledge, competencies, skills, and capabilities (or help employees acquire them) depending on existing staffing and training systems which,
though essential, is inadequate to gain a competitive advantage. Organizations in general, and libraries, continuously create and store knowledge relevant to the daily operations and management of activities. Such knowledge, be it formal or informal, is critical to the growth and progress of the organization. Libraries are often referred to as knowledge storehouses and it becomes inevitable that knowledge is easily created within this environment. The ability of libraries to organize such knowledge and circulate it effectively among staff is oftentimes challenging since this is not a usual practice of librarians. Libraries across the globe are therefore seeing the need to employ some knowledge management tools and techniques so as to harness the full potentials they possess in order to better deliver services to their clientele. The creation and effective dissemination of knowledge have gradually become important elements in maintaining competitiveness and libraries need to exploit this in order to remain significant in the evolving technological era.

Nonaka and Takeuchi see Knowledge Management as the “process of applying a systematic approach to the capture, structuring, management, and dissemination of knowledge throughout an organization to work faster, reuse best practices, and reduce costly rework from project to project” (cited in Aggarwal & Islam, 2015).

Knowledge Management is therefore a “collaborative and integrated approach to the creation, capture, organization, access and use of an institution’s intellectual assets” (Grey, 1996 cited in Dalkir 2011).
Griffiths (1998, in Aggarwal & Islam, 2015) asserts that the development of knowledge management (KM) as an essential organizational tool, is a confirmation of the need for organizations to harness knowledge as a vital resource and guarantee that it is made accessible to the right people at the right time. Sharing knowledge, a key component of Knowledge Management, refers to a systematic and deliberate transfer of relevant information, expertise, ideas and suggestions generated by an individual or acquired through routine activities, or borrowed from one's social network (Bartol & Srivastava 2002). Hinds, Patterson, & Pfeffer, (2001, cited in Wang & Noe, 2010) are of the view that, organizations need to consider the means of transferring expertise and knowledge from the professionals who have it, to novices who need to know. This is important in maintaining an organization’s expertise, equipping employees as well as improving overall service quality. Sutherland and Jordaan (2004, cited in Aggarwal & Islam, 2015) argue that a key characteristic for any successful organization in the current knowledge economy, is the ability to retain knowledge. Moreover, new employees in an organization, are faced with significant challenges in trying to gain relevant knowledge to their tasks. It is therefore very important that organizations and libraries, in particular, employ certain strategies that enable them continuously equip their staff with the requisite knowledge and skills necessary for them to remain relevant to their clients in this current technological era.

The concept of a multi-campus university system (MCUS) is not a new phenomenon on the global landscape. It is widely practiced by both public and private universities
globally, but still remains an emerging practice in some parts of Asia and Africa (Dinye, 2016). According to McGuinness (1991, cited in Dinye, 2016), the introduction of MCUS into the management and administration of higher education dates as early as the 20th Century. In the developed countries like the USA, UK, Australia and South Africa, multi-campus universities are becoming an integral characteristic of higher education systems and a study by Lee and Bowen as far back as 1971 (Pinheiro, Charles & Jones, 2017) noted that almost 40% of students in American higher education were enrolled in institutions which formed part of multi-campus systems. This tells of how long the MCUS has been in existence., but the system has dominated the horizon of higher education in recent times, taking more than half of the total students who enrolled in public colleges and universities in the United States (Gade, 1993).

The multi-campus university system can simply be described as a university or a college with two or more campuses offering higher education and is governed and controlled by a single or centralized management and mission (Wu and Wu, 2013 in Dinye, 2016). In other words, it refers to a system where a university or college has two or more campuses at different locations but under the control, direction and guidance of a central management. It therefore equips the central management with the responsibility of designing appropriate organizational structures and functions to be carried out by the various campuses based on the organization’s core mission. Ardis, Hole and Manfredonia (2013, in Dinye, 2016) explain that the central management or the main campus of the MCUS is responsible for determining and apportioning responsibilities and tasks among
the various branches or campuses. The university is usually structured or organized around a centralized management or administration which is responsible for the entire coordination and management of the university as a whole, including the campuses, but the responsibility of providing teaching services rests at the campuses level while taking instructions from and reporting to the Central Administration (CA).

MCUS is considered a modern or a 21st Century model of higher education (Becker, 2015) that is gradually gaining prominence and recognition among public and private universities globally. The advent of this system of higher education is either due to predetermined efforts by stakeholders and policy makers to extend activities across multiple geographical locations, or the amalgamation of higher education institutions previously located in different areas. The increased adoption of multi-campus systems of higher education can be attributed to a need to maximize the use of existing limited resources; make higher education more accessible and closer to both urban and rural communities and students; expand educational facilities and market share; and additionally depopulate the main campus. Again, this trend can be attributed to the numerous strengths, benefits and advantages – such as the promotion of diversity; campus specialization; national integration and cohesion; and also ensuring regional balance in the provision of higher or tertiary education to communities and students - that are identified with the MCUS (Harman, 2006 in Dinye, 2016). The system, through its centralized administration or management, ensures the maintenance of quality, values, standards and mission across all the campuses without urban or rural segregation. It is
therefore obvious that the successes, benefits and impact of MCUS to students, staff, management, society and the state are numerous.

At the centre of the multi-campus university system lies the issue of geographical location. In many countries, the key motivation behind establishments of multi-campus universities concerns issues related to equity; the educational needs of disadvantaged populations (Pinheiro et al, 2017). As a result of their organizational (structural, financial, cultural, etc.) complexity, multi-campus university systems are burdened with pressures and predicaments for which no single solutions exists. Unique challenges regarding the coordination and management of activities exist due to the geographic distances between campuses. Also, the localities hosting the different campuses, possess heterogeneous external actors (public, private sectors and civil society) that differ in their response to engagement with members of the university and its activities.

Harman (2006) and Lynch, (2003) equally hold the view that multi-campus universities in recent times increase access and equity to all students, communities and regions. They also explain that the MCUS promotes diversity among students, staff and community members; eliminates discrimination in access to higher education in rural and isolated areas; and improves the lives and economic wellbeing of the natives. The system also provides for the decentralization of resources, facilities and services to the dispersed campuses or branches as they are geographically dispersed (Griffith University, 2005, cited in Dinye, 2016). In view of this, French (2003, cited in Dinye, 2016) explains that
the MCUS model allows for the delegation, according to their specific needs, of academic services, human resources and support facilities to the different campuses, but ensures that the overall management of these resources and campuses is done by a central administration.

Fei (2015) explains that under the centralized management system, the branches or campuses are regarded or treated as subordinate units. Therefore, the core or main campus is responsible for policy formulation, development planning, coordination and distribution of resources (Pelfrey, 2012), and overall administrative and management issues. Again, Ayers (2002) underscores the effectiveness of the MCUS by stating that the branches or campuses epitomize the main campus of the university. He believes that notwithstanding the occasional marginalization of the branches or campuses, they are capable of initiating and triggering change easier than the centre of the organization, that is, the central administration.

It is therefore obvious that the MCUS has a lot of difficulties and challenges as well as some remarkable benefits associated with its operations. The MCUS normally presents such universities with complexities and complications in management, decision making, communication, financial administration and allocation of resources (Dinye, 2016). Notwithstanding the management complexities of the MCUS, the continuous adoption of the system across the African Continent is vast and captivating. Perhaps, this is driven by
the rapid growth of institutions of higher education in Africa, making the MCUS an effective vessel for expanding and capturing a good proportion of the market. This, largely accounts for the increasing numbers of MCUSs in the developing world, especially sub-Saharan Africa. For instance, countries such as Kenya, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Tanzania, and Ghana are expanding the frontiers of their higher education through the multi-campus university system.

Thus, the MCUS in recent times is fast becoming the ideal structure for the operation or governance of universities in Ghana. Four out of the ten public universities (University for Development Studies (UDS), University of Education, Winneba (UEW), University of Health and Allied Sciences (UHAS) and University of Energy and Natural Resources (URNR) and seven private universities in Ghana are organized and run on the multi-campus university system.

Libraries that serve these multi-campus universities, are no exception when it comes to the administration and management. Libraries serving these multi-campus universities possess the same characteristics of their parent institutions and therefore have one central library which coordinates and manages the other campus or branch libraries. Such libraries encounter unique challenges since their services need to incorporate special as well as general approaches to service delivery. Specialized in the sense that, each campus is at a different geographical location, offers specific courses and caters for specific users.
Thus, the services provided must take into account the needs of the patrons since what may be effective in one campus may not necessarily be welcome in another. For example, it will not be very wise to replace a traditional library on a campus running adult education, with that of a purely electronic library just because the electronic library is successful on another campus which runs only undergraduate programmes and as such caters for a largely youthful and technologically inclined user group. The best would be to incorporate the two so as to meet the user needs of the adult group (who sometimes find the use of technological tools challenging). Since the library has a centre, the temptation to recruit and maintain highly skilled staff at the centre becomes eminent due to the fact that the centre usually handles and manages the activities of the other campus libraries.

The branch libraries, being an epitome of the centre, must possess most, if not all, of the expertise at the centre and should be able to provide the same services that is characteristic of the centre. This can be achieved if the library is able to circulate the knowledge, skills and expertise between and among staff at all the campus libraries. The library must therefore ensure that the centre does not hoard expertise to the detriment of the other branches. It then becomes imperative that such multi-campus libraries, diffuse knowledge in ways that effectively impact not just the central library, but the branch ones as well, since the branches are an epitome of the parent/central library.
1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AREA

1.2.1 The University for Development Studies (UDS)

The University for Development Studies (UDS) was instituted in May 1992 under the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) Law 279 as a fully-fledged multi-campus, multi-site institution and began academic work in September 1993 with the first batch of forty (40) students admitted into the Faculty of Agriculture, Nyankpala Campus (Student’s Handbook, University for Development Studies, 2016). The University blends academic work with community outreach in order to provide practical and meaningful competencies for the development of Northern Ghana, in particular and the country as a whole. Due to its multi-campus feature, UDS does not have its administration, faculties, schools and centres at one central location but rather has them spread out on various campuses at different locations. It therefore has four (4) campuses (Navrongo in the Upper East Region, Wa in the Upper West Region and Nyankpala and Tamale in the Northern Region) housing eight (8) faculties, five (5) schools, two (2) institutes and one (1) centre (University for Development Studies, 2017). With a teaching staff population of 520 and student population of 17,023 (University for Development Studies, 2017), the UDS offers programmes such as Medicine, Allied Health Sciences, Education, Agriculture, Renewable Natural Resources, Agribusiness and Communication Sciences, Planning, Development Studies, Law, Business Studies, and Mathematical and Computer Sciences. The subject coverage of the University is broad with a strong emphasis on Development Studies.
1.2.2 The University for Development Studies (UDS) Library

The University for Development Studies Library was set up in 1993 to support teaching, learning, research and knowledge dissemination. The UDS Library System comprises five Libraries with a total stock of 55,000 volumes, providing information and bibliographic support for all Faculties, Schools, Institutes and Centres on all the campuses. These include books purchased and those received through exchanges and donations. The Main library of the UDS is located at the Nyankpala Campus of the University in Tamale. The Main library co-ordinates and complements the activities, services and operations of the libraries on the other campuses. The main library houses all the units and departments that cater for the provision of services to the University’s academic community. The Library staff are therefore spread on all campuses with the greater concentration of staff at the Centre.

With the evolution of the digital era, libraries are challenged with providing and making accessible, online resources to users and also equipping their staff with the needed and relevant skills to operate in the digital environment if only they are to remain important to their users. The UDS Library with its aim to always achieve this goal makes sure that resources, both online and offline, are readily made available to students and faculties all the time to enhance teaching, research and learning. As part of its staff development efforts, the University Library organizes and encourages staff to attend workshops, attachments, professional seminars and in-service training. Various staff of the Library...
have been sponsored nationally and internationally to attend different scholarly and professional workshops and seminars. The Library also assists faculty members who conduct research in any area of interest by providing them with quality and relevant information to enrich their study. Students on the other hand, are also assisted on how to use the available databases to search for information. In the process of rendering services to the users, the opportunity is also taken to educate users on the need to effectively use the Library’s resources.

The Library therefore begun automating its operations and services in September 2017 with the launch of the circulation model as part of the first phase of the automation project. The other modules will be introduced subsequently.

1.2.2.1 The Library Board

The Library Board is the highest decision making body of the University library. All policies, guidelines and structures are presented to the Library Board and only implemented per the approval and recommendation of the board

1.2.2.2 Staff

The staff of the library comprises Professional and Paraprofessional librarians, Library Assistants and Technicians. They are categorized under senior members, senior staff and
junior staff. The total population is 61 made up of 14 senior members, 26 senior staff and 21 junior staff. The Nyankpala Campus Library had 28 staff, Dungu Campus Library had nine (9) staff, Tamale campus B Library had 3, Navrongo Campus Library had 8 and the Wa Campus Library had 13 staff.

1.2.2.3 Collection Development Department (CDD)

This department is responsible for all print operations and services of the UDS Library. It comprises the acquisitions, cataloguing, readers advisory and serials units of the library.

1.2.2.3.1 Acquisitions Unit

The Acquisitions Unit caters for new additions to the library’s stock either through purchases, donations or exchanges. They also deal with publishers and book suppliers. The unit identifies gaps in the library’s collection and makes the necessary arrangements to fill such gaps. Additionally, they identify potential publishers of electronic databases and in consultation with the e-resources librarian and the University Librarian, acquire them for the library.
1.2.2.3.2 Cataloguing Unit

The Cataloguing Unit are responsible for classifying and cataloguing all the library’s material for proper storage and retrieval. Classification is done according to the Library of Congress (LC) classification scheme. All material for the various campus libraries are processed here and afterwards, distributed to the respective campuses.

1.2.2.3.3 Readers’ Advisory

The Readers’ Advisory is the front office of the Library. It is the first point of contact between the users and the library. The Readers’ Advisory handles circulation activities, reference and user services and library instruction. This unit spearheads the use of the online public access catalogue (OPAC) for easy retrieval of needed information resources.

1.2.2.3.4 Serials

The Serials Unit, is similar to the readers’ advisory but whereas the latter deals with only books and reference materials, the former handles periodical resources like journals, reports, theses, dissertations, handbooks, conference proceedings and other publications.
1.2.2.4 Information Services Department (ISD)

The Information Services Department (ISD), is the umbrella under which all technology enhanced units and services fall. It is charged with the responsibility of improving access to technology and the incorporation of technology enhanced tools to improve library operations and service provision. It comprises the institutional repository, the electronic resources, the technical services as well as the income generation units.

1.2.2.4.1 Institutional Repository Unit

The Institutional Repository (IR), manages and disseminates the intellectual output of the academic community. It serves as a showcase of the research and academic activities ongoing within and among members of the University community. Aside collection, management and dissemination of these items, the IR ensures the long term preservation of research output. It is free and open access, thus all items in the repository can be accessed globally.

1.2.2.4.2 Electronic Resources Unit

The Electronic Resources Unit ensures access to online resources for teaching, learning and research purposes of the university community. The unit works closely with the technical services unit to enable access to the subscribed journal databases of the library.
The library has access to over 25 subscribed and free e-journal databases that provide access to over 120,000 research journal articles. Periodic trainings on effectively using the library’s databases are carried out to improve usage.

1.2.2.4.3 Technical Services Unit

The Technical Services Unit (TSU) is the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) stronghold of the UDS Library. TSU ensures the smooth operations of the systems, software and hardware needed to enhance day-to-day activities of the library. The unit organizes periodic training for staff on the use of new systems and services.

1.2.2.4.4 Income Generation Unit

The Income Generation Unit is charged with the task of identifying and implementing services and strategies that can enable the library generate income to supplement the inadequate budgetary allocations.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A variety of scholars have conducted studies on knowledge sharing in academic libraries in Africa and the world. In 2009, Plockey, conducted a research as part of a Masters’
thesis on knowledge sharing among library staff at the Balme Library, University of Ghana, Legon where she identified employee perceptions on knowledge sharing, strategies employed as well as challenges encountered. Muchaonyerwa (2015) in a doctoral research, studied knowledge sharing strategies among library staff in 4 universities in Kwazulu-Natal Province in South Africa, making comparisons as to what existed in these four university libraries. Again in 2015, Aggarwal and Islam extended their study to cover knowledge sharing in academic libraries from 35 countries in 6 continents, emphasizing on retention and transfer of knowledge. Other studies such as Dube and Ngulube (2012), Nove and Puspitasari (2013), Balagué, Düren and Saarti, (2016) and Burnette (2017) all consider knowledge sharing in academic libraries in one university or a comparison between universities. Seeing that the MCUS is gaining prominence around the globe, not much can be seen on knowledge sharing in libraries serving such multi-campus universities.

The UDS Library, like its parent institution, runs a multi-campus system in the northern part of Ghana. As such it has a central library on one campus and satellite libraries on its other four campuses. The central library is located at the Nyankpala campus and houses almost, if not all, of the various units and departments that make up the UDS integrated library system. All the products, services and innovations that are offered are developed and deployed here. Being a service organization, the library and its staff are dedicated to the provision of information resources and services on all its campuses to support teaching, learning and research of the various faculties, schools, institutes and centres.
Knowledge of staff is acquired or upgraded through education, training, professional development and experience. Staff apply this knowledge to enhance their output and improve service provision. Majority of the staff are concentrated at the central Library which coordinates the activities of the other campus libraries. In a multi-campus system, the other campus libraries are a reflection of the centre at their locations and as such must exhibit the qualities of the centre. However, this does not seem to be the case as the staff at the campus libraries struggle with effectively handling new services and innovations to users. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the library staff are able to share their acquired knowledge with each other and ensure that the requisite know-how and expertise are not hoarded or concentrated at one location (most often than not, at the centre) to the detriment of the other campuses and their services provision.

Effective dissemination builds upon employees’ knowledge base and increases productivity therefore, how knowledge is shared among staff of the UDS Library in their multi-campus setting so as to enhance efficient and effective services delivery not only at the centre, but on the other campuses as well is the focus of this study.

1.4 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to explore knowledge sharing among library staff in a multi-campus environment such as the University for Development Studies.
1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Specifically, the study sought;

1. To identify library staff perceptions, participation and strategies employed in knowledge sharing with each other.
2. To identify the motivations that contributed to knowledge sharing among staff of the UDS library.
3. To find out if there existed laid down policies for knowledge sharing.
4. To identify challenges to knowledge sharing among the library staff.
5. To make recommendations based on the findings of the study.

1.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

According to the Oxford Online Dictionary, a theory is an assumption or a system of ideas proposed to explain something, especially one based on general principles independent of the issue of interest.

A theoretical framework can simply be described as the structure that can hold or support a theory of a research study. It introduces and defines the theory that explains why the research problem under study exists (Swanson, 2013). The theory that underlies this study is the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). This theory is derived from the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) proposed by Martin Fishbein and Icek Ajzen in 1980 to
predict a person’s intention to engage in a behaviour at a specific time and place. The TPB concept was introduced by Icek Ajzen in 1985 through his article "From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behaviour", and it improves on the predictive power of the Theory of Reasoned Action by including perceived behavioural control.

This theory tries to explain an individual’s ability to exert self-control over all of his/her behaviours. An individual’s behavioural intent lies at the core of the TPB. The probability that the behaviour will have the expected outcome plus the subjective assessment of the costs and the benefits of the outcome are what influences behavioural intentions. This is to say that; a person’s behavioural intentions results from his/her perceived expected outcome as well as the costs or benefits of such an outcome to the individual.

The Theory of Planned Behaviour maintains that motivation (intention) and ability (behavioural control) determine behavioural achievement. According to the theory, an individual’s personal attitude towards a behaviour, the subjective norms that influence the behaviour as well as the individual’s perceived behavioural control, are the major predicting factors that influence whether or not a person engages in any behaviour. There are six constructs that underpin the TPB and collectively influence an individual’s intentions and engagement in a behaviour or activity.

1. Individual attitudes – Attitudes are the degree to which a person has a positive or negative evaluation of a behaviour of interest. It involves a consideration of the
outcomes of performing the behaviour, either favourable or not. Where the evaluations of the outcome are positive, the individual tends to develop positive attitudes towards that behaviour and in instances where such evaluations are negative, then the attitude towards the behaviour becomes negative.

2. Behavioural intention – these are the motivational factors that influence an individual’s given behaviour where the stronger the intention to perform the behaviour, the more likely the behaviour will be performed and vice versa.

3. Subjective norms - these are the individual’s belief about whether most people in their inner circles support or condemn the behaviour. Thus, whether peers and significant people in their life (family, spouses, friends, etc.) think he/she should engage in the behaviour.

4. Social norms – This takes into account the customary codes of behaviour in a group or people or larger cultural context. Social norms are considered normative or standard among a group of people. Thus, whether a behaviour is practiced or encouraged by a group an individual belongs to (family, workplace, social group etc.) or not, can influence an individual’s behavioural intentions.

5. Perceived power – this refers to when an individual perceives the existence of some factors that may aid or hinder performance of a behaviour and the belief in one's ability to face these factors. Perceived power contributes to the individual’s perceived control over each of these factors.

6. Behavioural control – Here, a person's perception of the ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour of interest is considered. Perceived behavioural control
varies across situations and actions, which results in a person having varying perceptions of behavioural control depending on the situation. This construct of the theory was added later, and created the shift from the Theory of Reasoned Action to the Theory of Planned Behavior.

Below is a diagram depicting the theory of planned behaviour.

![Diagram of Theory of Planned Behaviour](image)

*Adapted from Ajzen (1991).*

From the diagram above, the first predictor of a person’s intention to engage in a behaviour and ultimately actually engaging in the behaviour is the personal attitude. The personal attitude is an individual’s stance about a particular behaviour. This personal
attitude is influenced by the outcome beliefs and the outcome evaluations. The outcome belief here refers to the individual’s belief, either positive or negative, in the outcome of engaging in such a behaviour while the outcome evaluations is how worthwhile the individual considers the outcome of the behaviour to be. Therefore, a positive outcome belief and a positive outcome evaluation leads to a positive intention to engage in a behaviour. For example, if Jane believes engaging in exercise is a positive activity (positive outcome belief) and at the same time will help her lose weight (positive outcome evaluation), then she is more likely to develop positive behavioural intentions towards exercise which can ultimately lead to her exercising.

The next predictor of behavioural intention is the subjective norms. Subjective norms are the individual’s personal opinion on an issue, what the individual believes to be normal for him/her. These subjective norms are influenced by normative beliefs and the individual’s motivation to comply. The normative beliefs are made up of all the information given to the individual by different people in their close circles. Thus whether friends, family, colleagues or significant others view the behaviour as favourable or not. Then the motivation to comply comes from the individual’s interpretation of this information and acting upon it. For example, friends tell a teenage boy that smoking is good and they all engage in it whilst his mother speaks against it (normative belief). If this boy’s motivation is to belong in a group with his friends and he has a conflict with his mother (motivation to comply), then he is more likely to listen to his friends and actually engage in smoking.
The third predictor of behavioural intention which distinguishes the theory of planned behaviour from that of reasoned action is the perceived behavioural control. This personal control belief is influenced by self-efficacy beliefs and perceived external barriers. Self-efficacy beliefs are the extent to which an individual feels confident or otherwise in his/her ability or competence to engage in a behaviour despite obstacles. The perceived external barriers are those obstacles or factors that are perceived to prevent the individual from achieving that behaviour. These barriers are perceived by the individual and may not necessarily be true. For example, a feeling that one cannot overcome an addiction to smoking (self-efficacy belief) coupled with the fact that smoking reduces anxiety (perceived external barrier), will lead to a negative control belief that will negatively influence the individual’s intention to quit smoking.

Nathan Smith (2013), in a tutorial on an introduction to the Theory of Planned Behaviour at the University of Birmingham, focused on the three predictors of intentions, behavioural attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control. He however categorized the factors influencing these predictors of behaviour into affective and instrumental for behavioural attitudes and injunctive and descriptive norms for subjective norms.

Behavioural attitudes according to Nathan, refers to how a person thinks and feels about a behaviour and reflects the expectations and evaluations of this behaviour. The individual’s behavioural attitude can be split into affective attitudes and instrumental attitudes. The affective attitude is whether the individual thinks the behaviour to be
enjoyable or not whilst the instrumental behaviour is whether the individual thinks the behaviour is beneficial or harmful to him/her. These two distinctions are not always clear cut and an individual may have a mixture of affective and instrumental attitudes.

The subjective norms, he continues, refers to the extent of support that the individual receives from significant others, that is, spouses, family, friends, role models and so on. This can also be classified as injunctive or descriptive norms. Injunctive norms refer to whether or not significant others encourage the individual to engage in the behaviour whilst the descriptive norms constitute whether or not significant others or people in the individual’s social group actually engage in the behaviour.

The final contributor to behavioural intention is the perceived behavioural control. The extent to which a person feels capable and has confidence in his/her ability to execute that behaviour plays a central role in whether or not the person intends to and actually engages in the behaviour. The individual needs to be confident in his/her ability to overcome external barriers and challenges in engaging in the behaviour.

Bringing the different constructs of the theory of planned behaviour together as a whole, it means that when an individual identifies a behaviour to be enjoyable and to have good benefits, gets support from people in their close circles who engage in it and feels competent and confident in his/her ability to execute the behaviour and overcome obstacles associated with it, it will lead to a strong positive intention to engage in the behaviour and ultimately performing the behaviour.
Relating this theory in the context of this study, the theory of planned behaviour can be used to predict whether or not, library staff will engage in knowledge sharing with colleagues. For example, Jane is a Librarian in a College library and has learnt some new search techniques for information retrieval from scholarly databases. Jane personally enjoys sharing or teaching what she knows to colleagues and she believes that it will improve service delivery to library patrons (positive personal attitude). Jane’s boss encourages her to teach her colleagues what she knows but no one in the library actually share their knowledge or expertise with others (positive injunctive norms and negative descriptive norms). But Jane knows she is competent and capable of teaching these search techniques to her colleagues and she is comfortable using the computer and the internet (positive behavioural control). Therefore, though a negative descriptive norm exists, it is outweighed by a positive attitude and positive behavioural control and therefore a strong intention for Jane to teach her colleagues the new search techniques exists, and ultimately leads to her spending an hour of her mornings within a week, teaching her colleagues.

Academic Libraries must strive to provide the right environment that will be conducive to influence their staff to engage in knowledge sharing. Though, libraries will not have a direct control over the individual’s personal attitude towards knowledge sharing, they can influence the individual’s subjective norms and perceived control behaviours. By encouraging a knowledge sharing culture among staff within the library, the individuals will be motivated to comply positively with sharing their knowledge and when there exist
the requisite channels of communication that facilitate knowledge sharing as well as the
necessary training to effectively use these channels, then the library will succeed in
generating a positive behavioural control and subjective norms of the individual which
will ultimately lead to a knowledge sharing behaviour.

Despite this theory’s predictive ability of behaviour, Jokonya (2017) does not agree that it
is a complete solution to predicting an individual’s behaviour since other salient factors
exist that the theory does not capture. These include habits, emotions, individuals’ levels
of adaptation, learning and reinvention as well as the lack of knowledge of relationships
between the theory’s predictors. Jokonya (2017) asserts that the aforementioned factors
can independently influence an individual’s behaviour irrespective of attitudes, subjective
norms and perceived behavioural control. For instance, an 18-year-old boy can commit
murder, not out of his personal attitude or subjective norms, but rather out of anger and
pain (emotions) inflicted by the victim.

Although, the theory of planned behaviour has a few shortfalls, it has been widely used to
predict with a high degree of accuracy, behavioural intentions based on the three
predictors (attitudes, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control) across many
fields of knowledge.
1.7 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of this study was restricted to the University for Development Studies due to its multi-campus, multi-site nature. This study was guided by and confined to the five stipulated objectives which sought a comprehensive exploration of the research problem.

1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research is distinctive because its emphasis is on knowledge sharing in a multi-campus university, unlike majority of studies that focus on individual universities or comparison between universities. It therefore draws out the unique strategies and challenges faced within a multi-campus university as well as provide a basis for further research.

This study is significant because it reveals the strategies by which the UDS Library staff share the knowledge they acquire among themselves within and across campuses in order to enhance innovation, human resource development and ultimately improve service provision.

It also identifies the motivations for knowledge sharing and the challenges that are encountered as well as proposes solutions to these challenges.
It further supports guidelines/procedures and policy development for the UDS Library on knowledge sharing activities among staff.

The study reviews relevant literature and draws out strategies that other institutions have successfully implemented and how it can be applicable to the UDS situation.

Although studies on knowledge sharing have been carried out in different academic libraries across the globe, there is limited research on this topic in Ghana. This study therefore adds to existing literature on knowledge sharing in Africa, Ghana and the University for Development Studies.

1.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

This research was purely for academic purposes. The researcher did not violate privacy of respondents, duly acknowledged all sources of information and treated all respondents with extreme professionalism and confidentiality.

A letter from the Department of Information Studies, University of Ghana, introducing the researcher and the purpose for the research, was presented to the University Librarian of the UDS for approval to conduct the study.

Respondents were also adequately informed about the purpose of the research and were given the opportunity to consent or decline to be part of the study. To ensure respondents
anonymity, no personal information was collected that could link respondents to the questionnaire. The interview respondents were also coded to protect their identities.

1.10 DESCRIPTION OF CHAPTERS

The study was organized into six chapters.

Chapter one contains the introduction, the background of the study area, the problem statement, the purpose, the research objectives, the theoretical framework, the scope, the significance of the study, ethical consideration and the definition of some key terms.

Chapter two covers the literature review on knowledge sharing among library staff in general and specifically within academic libraries, from a Global, African and Ghanaian perspective. Some of the topics covered include the types of knowledge, knowledge sharing strategies, challenges to knowledge sharing and motivations for sharing knowledge.

Chapter three is the research methodology and includes the research approach, the research design, selection of case, population, sampling technique, data collection instruments and presentation of data analysis.

Chapter four presents the analysis of data and findings of the research work.

Chapter five is the discussions of the research findings.
Chapter six is the summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations.

1.11 DEFINITION OF TERMS

KNOWLEDGE: Knowledge is the facts, information, and skills acquired through experience or education; the theoretical or practical understanding of a subject. For the purpose of this study, knowledge is limited to the professional and technical information, skills and expertise that library staff acquire to enhance their productivity.

KNOWLEDGE SHARING: Knowledge sharing is the process of mutually exchanging knowledge and jointly creating new knowledge (van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004 cited in Gagne, 2009). It is an activity through which knowledge (namely, information, skills, or expertise) is exchanged among people, friends, families, communities or organizations.

KNOWLEDGE SHARING STRATEGIES: Knowledge sharing strategies (KSS) refers to approaches employed in sharing individual or group knowledge to achieve organizational goals and objectives with regards to knowledge assets. According to Carrillo, Anumba and Kamara (2000 cited in Muchaonyerwa, 2015), organizational strategies provide a framework that guides decision making processes and it determines what plans should be undertaken to achieve organizational objectives.
MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: This refers to a university or a college with two or more campuses offering higher education and is governed and controlled by a single or centralized management and mission (Wu and Wu, 2013 in Dinye, 2016). In other words, it refers to a system where a university or college has two or more campuses at different locations but under the control, direction and guidance of a central management.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A literature review can be regarded as an assessment of a research field that addresses some research questions. In a scholarly paper, the literature review is the portion which presents an overview of the current knowledge, substantive findings, theoretical and practical contributions to a particular topic of interest. In research, the goal of a literature review is primarily to facilitate the identification and evaluation of related studies in a research discipline. It ensures that key topics and variables related to the research problem which possess a high tendency of influencing the problem, are discussed. The literature review needs to be critically carried out (Henning, 2004) so as to demonstrate how the research being undertaken, is related to previous studies. It is also very essential that the strengths and weaknesses of previous works be presented, including lapses and bias, and justifiable arguments be taken into account by referring to previous studies (Kemoni, 2008 cited in Muchaonyerwa, 2015). Thus, a good literature review recognizes the diverse opinions, findings and schools of thought by a variety of authors on the research topic (Stilwell, 2000 cited in Muchaonyerwa, 2015).

Literature reviews typically do not report new or original experimental work but rather make use of secondary sources. Various articles, books and other resources from both
print and online sources were consulted. Similarities and differences are drawn as well as recommendations made on knowledge sharing in general and the library in particular.

The study reviewed literature in order to gain a better understanding of knowledge sharing in a multi-campus university. A review of literature is necessary to inform the study on the history of developments on the subject, the theory and philosophies, the current trends and the research methods previously used. Thus, gaps in the body of research on a subject can be identified and the linkages to the research can be drawn. This study generally considered the review of literature along the following broad subject themes for easy presentation and understanding.

The study reviewed relevant literature on the following key sub-topics;

- Knowledge (definition, types, characteristics and modes of acquisition)
- Knowledge management (definition, components, importance and challenges)
- Knowledge sharing (definition, benefits, strategies, motivations, and challenges)
- Knowledge sharing and academic libraries
- Knowledge sharing and multi-campus university systems
- The way forward for knowledge sharing in academic libraries
2.2 KNOWLEDGE

To gain a better outlook of knowledge sharing, it is of essence that the concept of knowledge be explored so as to provide the vital background understanding for the study. Knowledge is a multi-disciplinary concept that is present in majority, if not all disciplines and many attempts to define knowledge from these perspectives has been made.

From the educational perspective, knowledge can be defined as “a complex of socially constructed evaluations connected to a body of knowledge that is transmitted” (Brabander, 2000). Thus, it is a multifaceted social assessment of a body of knowledge. Educators in recent times, refer to content knowledge in order to clearly distinguish knowledge from skills. Thus content knowledge is what teachers teach and expect their students to learn in any given subject field and include the theories, concepts and principles that are imparted in specific academic courses (https://edglossary.org).

In the field of business, knowledge is described an individual’s interpreted information; an understanding that stems from a person’s combination of data, information, experience and individual interpretation. In the context of an organization, knowledge is the totality of what is known and resides in the employees’ intelligence and capabilities. In contemporary times, knowledge has become recognized as a factor of production (knowledge capital) different from labour (https://www.businessdictionary.com).
Perhaps, the most comprehensive definition of knowledge is within the field of philosophy. The discipline in itself is known as *epistemology*, derived from the Greek words *episteme* meaning knowledge and *logos* which means a word or reason. Thus knowledge is at the core of philosophy and various authors have tried to allocate an acceptable definition as to what constitutes knowledge. According to Pardi (2011), three conditions need to be satisfied in order for any individual to claim that he/she knows something. Thus, for us to term something as knowledge, there must be belief, truth and justification. A belief can be referred to as the state of thinking something to be true without the necessary empirical evidence to support it. Truth can be seen as something that is factual and accepted as the original or standard whilst justification is the act of proving or showing the factual nature of something. He further states that for one to possess knowledge, the individual needs to believe in that information and accept is as being the fact or the original and also be able to prove or show that the piece of information is factual. However sometimes, individual’s knowledge base can stem from a belief and a truth without any necessary justification.

Some authors have also tried to explain knowledge by differentiating it from data, information and wisdom. The basis for an understanding of knowledge management theory in organizations is dependent on the nature of and the relationships between data, information, knowledge and wisdom (Alavi & Leidner, 2001 cited in Muchoanyerwa, 2015). There have been numerous attempts to define these concepts. Zins (2007, cited in
Sarrafzadeh, 2008) argues that, though these basic concepts are interrelated, the nature, as well as their meaning, of the relationships among them is contentious.

A hierarchical view is necessary to understand the relationship between data, information, knowledge and wisdom which is traditionally referred to as the DIKW pyramid. Widespread literature shows references to a knowledge hierarchy but generally Ackoff is given credit for the first academic publication.

Figure 2.1. The knowledge pyramid (Adapted from Ackoff 1989)

This traditional DIKW pyramid has some basic definitions of the key concepts. It views data as facts which are discrete, basic and objective for instance the who, what, when, where, etc. about something. Information is data that is interconnected in a given context for easy presentation (for example, describing a specific person by the linking the who,
what, when and where data at a specific time). Knowledge, on the other hand, is that presented information that has been socially understood and explains the how and the why about something or offers understanding and insights into something whilst wisdom can be referred to as placing knowledge into a specific normative framework that enables the knowledge to be applied to different (not necessarily) intuitive situations (Jennex & Bartczak, 2015).

According to this interpretation, data is considered as information’s raw material and information as knowledge’s raw material (Zins, 2007 cited in Sarrafzadeh, 2008). Thus, data are facts which can be organized purposefully and positioned in a given context and be transformed into information. Knowledge is derived from information through social interaction (Alavi & Leidner, 2001 cited in Muchaonyerwa, 2015).

2.3 TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE

Two kinds of knowledge distinguished by the Japanese scholars Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), have ruled discussions on the nature of the knowledge in knowledge management globally; the explicit and the tacit. In later years, it has been widely accepted by various scholars that knowledge primarily exists in either an explicit form or a tacit form.
2.3.1 Explicit knowledge

Knowledge essentially documented is termed as explicit. This is often available in our manuals, memoranda, regulations, standard operating procedures and so on (United States office of personnel management, 2011). Explicit knowledge is a representation of that knowledge content which has been captured in a physical form such as words, writings, audio recordings, or images and is usually confined within tangible or concrete media and it is usually acquired pensively either by mathematical proof, logical reasoning and scientific methods, or by referring to cultural or historical practices. Skyrme (2001) describes it as that knowledge which can easily be coded and organized for easy retrieval, such as those found in documents and databases.

Explicit knowledge, according to Capurro (2004 cited in Mayekiso, 2013), is also referred to as ‘information’ often found in a digital format. It was noted by Nonaka & Toyama (2003) that expressing tacit knowledge is not only through the spoken and written word, but can take the form of drawings and art as well. Such explicit knowledge tends to be universal since it is recorded knowledge and it can easily be extracted, communicated and coded (Sarrafzadeh, 2008).

The major feature of explicit knowledge, according to Sunassee & Sewry (2003), is the ability to easily disseminate it through diverse formats since it is ordered and systematic. Explicit knowledge can be easily articulated and captured and is frequently found in libraries (Dillon, 2007).
2.3.2 Tacit knowledge

Tacit knowledge, unlike the explicit one, denotes that aspect of inherent knowledge which an individual makes use of to arrive at some form of interpretations, decisions or judgments about issues (Evans, Dalkir & Bidian, 2014). The process of documenting such unspoken knowledge is challenging perhaps because, it is not readily recognized as knowledge or it is difficult to describe the concept to be documented. Tacit knowledge is difficult to articulate, put into words, text, or drawings.

Nonaka and Takeuchi are of the view that, tacit knowledge is highly personal and can be very difficult to express in a formal context. An individual’s subjective insights, instincts and intuitions are categorized under this form of knowledge (Nonaka & Takeuchi 1995). Tacit knowledge is basically instinctive and stems from frequent and constant practice making it very valuable but at the same time, difficult to transfer to others.

In essence, tacit knowledge resides in the minds or the heads of the owners and as such can sometimes be very difficult to express to another person. This means that, whilst a particular content may be explicit for one person, the same can be tacit for another. It is difficult to articulate tacit knowledge or to put it into words, text, or drawings. Thus, individuals who possess highly skilled knowledge, experience, and expertise may find it harder to articulate their know-how unlike novices who, in an attempt to learn new things by following a manual or process, can easily express it in order to seek approval or correction. Typically, the more tacit knowledge is, the more valuable it tends to be. When
reference is made to knowledge as against know-how (that is, knowledge of a thing as opposed to knowledge of how to do that thing), it portrays the value of such tacit knowledge which often results in some observable action as individuals understand and consequently make use of the knowledge. Another perspective is that explicit knowledge is a representation of the final end product, while tacit knowledge is the know-how or all of the processes that were required in order to produce that final product.

2.4 CHARACTERISTICS OF KNOWLEDGE

Though it is very difficult to identify, some common features exist that are characteristic of knowledge, be it explicit or tacit. According to Dalkir (2011), these knowledge characteristics include:

- The use of knowledge does not result in it being consumed.
- The transfer of knowledge does not result in it being lost.
- The ability to make use of knowledge is scarce, though knowledge is abundant.
- The organizations’ valuable knowledge walks out the door at the end of the day.

Knowledge is not something that can be consumed totally if it is used. Unlike commodities which will deplete as it is used, the knowledge still exists in whatever form whether it is being used or not. In contrast, the continuous use of knowledge rather increases the knowledge base since it means the individual gets to put such knowledge to
active use over and over again. As the saying goes, “practice makes perfect” therefore the more you put the knowledge to use, the better the individual is at becoming an expert with that knowledge.

Transfer or sharing of knowledge does not result in losing it. Many people feel that transferring or sharing their knowledge with others can result in them losing what they know which is a false assumption. Some also believe that, sharing what you know with someone is like emptying your glass of water into that of your colleague’s. That leaves you with an empty glass.

Knowledge is very abundant. With the dawn of the information and knowledge age, the rate of creation of new knowledge is growing at an exponential rate and as such, individuals are faced with information overload. Individuals are unable to cope with the rate at which new knowledge is created and as such, the ability to effectively make use of the available knowledge becomes problematic. In essence, just a small amount of the total knowledge generated per day is actually utilized. Individuals need to obtain better ways of sifting through chunks of data available and recognizing that which is of necessity.

At the end of the working day, the organization’s most valuable assets leave. As tacit knowledge resides in the minds of the user or knower, every organization’s most valuable business asset is the employee and in instances where the individual is on leave, travels, resigns or dies, the organizational tacit knowledge dies with him/her.
2.5 KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION

It is essential that individuals acquire the requisite knowledge to enhance productivity and re-use best practices. Knowledge acquisition is important for knowledge sharing because it is only when one possesses knowledge that one can effectively share it with another. An activity that involves the finding and acquiring of knowledge in knowledge-based resources can be termed as acquisition (Mohammad, Hamdeh and Sabri, 2010).

Knowledge which has been created needs to be captured and this process consists of the extraction of tacit knowledge from individuals, documenting it in order for knowledge to be shared among employees (Mpofu, 2011). Various authorities have attempted to categorize the methods by which individuals are able to acquire knowledge either professionally or personally. According to Reeti (2016), tenacity, authority, intuition and science are the major ways by which individuals can acquire knowledge and this is based on Kerlinger’s summary of the writings of the philosopher, Charles Pierce in 1973.

2.5.1 Tenacity, Authority, Intuition and Science

The first method of acquiring knowledge, according to Reeti (2016), is through tenacity. This is a situation in which what is known to the individual or group is classified as truth. There is no verification and no questioning. Acquiring knowledge through tenacity consist of hearing a piece of information repeatedly to the extent that it is believed to be
the truth, although contrary evidence exists, there still pertains a sort of stubborn adherence to the belief. Validity of statement is mostly due to tradition and belief. It had been considered true over time. It worked with the mindset that it worked for their grandparents, their parents and it should work for them too. For instance, a black cat is a bad omen and 13 is an unlucky number. Advertisers are fond of using this tenacity method where they repeat their catchphrase for a certain product frequently till consumers associate it with the product and in turn, begin to believe that the product meets its assertions. The challenge with gaining knowledge through tenacity is that there is no way of validating the claims, since no evaluation of such knowledge’s accuracy exists.

Authority is another method in which truth is recognized through a reliable source such as God, tradition, or public consent. According to Reeti (2016), here, information is considered valid due to authority of source. But one authority cannot be considered authority for all. It depends on situation and the type of knowledge sought. Many authority sources exist around us for example, parents, teachers, doctors, superiors and so on. These are usually people that we believe possess superior knowledge and we therefore accept whatever they say to be the truth. Where the perceived authority figure is indeed an expert on the subject, it may not be a problem, but challenges arise in instances where the perceived authority figure does not possess the requisite knowledge about what he or she is communicating. For example, an illiterate farmer talking about the economic state of the country obviously shows that the person may not necessarily possess all the right details to make the information imparted valid.
Intuition is another method by which individuals can acquire knowledge. When knowledge is gained by way of intuition, it implies that the individual holds knowledge about something without being consciously aware of where such knowledge came from (Reeti, 2016). It is popular for people to make decisions based on “an inner feeling” most often by saying something like “I don’t know, it just came to me, and I know it’s true”. Sometimes, intuition is not just based on an “inner feeling” but oftentimes on observable events. It is not systematic so maybe not possible to forecast.

Science is probably the most justifiable means of acquiring knowledge. It can be defined as a process for describing truth that produces results which can be verified by others and is self-correcting. Leedy and Ormrod’s (2012) defined scientific research as a procedure where an attempt is made to systematically find, and with the support of factual evidence, answers to questions or solutions to a problem. Data is collected by scientists (making empirical observations) and these data are used to test hypotheses. A prediction regarding the outcome of a study is a hypothesis. This prediction usually shows the potential relationship between at least two variables (an event or behavior with at least two values). They are stated in a way that will facilitate testing and make use of observation-based logical arguments. In science, the objective of hypotheses testing is to propound or prove a theory. Theories help in the organization and explanation of the data gathered in the course of carrying out any research studies. In addition, theories produce new knowledge by directing researchers toward specific issues of the world.
There is no doubt that, tenacity, authority, intuition and science are indeed ways by which individuals acquire knowledge.

However, for the purpose of this study, the methods by which library staff acquire professional knowledge can be categorized into two by the researcher – formal and informal. This is from the perspective of how individuals acquire either tacit or explicit information, skills and expertise in their line of work to enhance productivity and efficiency.

2.5.2 Formal and Informal Methods of Knowledge Acquisition

The formal methods can be described by the researcher as those that are laid down, procedural, according to some system. This information is usually explicit in nature and may include formal education, trainings, workshops, conferences and seminars.

Formal education consists of an individual pursuing a formal library and information science programme at an accredited institution of higher education. In most cases, this is a diploma, undergraduate or postgraduate degree awarded by the institution. It is the basic foundational requirements for a career in librarianship (American Library Association, 2006) in most countries of which Ghana is no exception. There are most institutions across the world that offer such programmes. Formal education equips the individual with the basic and fundamental information, skills and expertise (professional
knowledge) that is required to enhance job performance. For example, individuals gain the knowledge of basic cataloging and classification to equip them on the job.

Training, workshops, conferences and seminars (at the local, national and international levels) are also one of the formal ways by which library staff acquire professional knowledge related to their jobs. These could be in the form of in-service training or continuing professional development. These are meant to either refresh existing knowledge or add up new knowledge to what already exist. For example, with the growth in technology, many libraries are organizing in-service trainings to equip their staff with the requisite additional ICT skills that is needed to drive their services provision.

The informal methods, according to the researcher, consist of those who do not follow any laid down procedure and are at the discretion of the learner. The information acquired here is usually tacit in nature and include mentorship, networking and personal development.

Mentorship is a way by which individuals acquire knowledge. Mentoring primarily entails identifying and nurturing and individual’s potential. This can be long-term where the goals may change but are always set by the learner. According to the Institute of Continuing Education and Interdisciplinary Research (ICEIR, 2012), mentoring is a developmental partnership whereby an individual (usually an experienced person called the mentor) imparts skills, knowledge, perspective and information to nurture the
personal and professional development of the other party (that is, the less experienced one called the mentee). Here, a more experienced librarian identifies the potential of a less experienced one and provides the necessary guidance in relation to professional knowledge.

Networking can be described as an activity purposefully carried out to grow, support and maintain relationships of trust with other people in a professional circle to further one’s goals. Networking fosters ideas exchanges among people or groups with a common interest (www.investopedia.com). Librarians develop professional networks with colleagues in other institutions by way of tapping into the knowledge that exist there. Through networking one obtains information and tacit knowledge, builds expertise in a field, establishes new professional relationships and strengthens existing ones. It is important that library staff be able to build and maintain professional networks with colleagues so as to acquire knowledge from the experiences of others and apply them in the line of duty. For example, if one library uses videos for library orientation and it registers a high success rate, then another library can follow suit because the networking has given the opportunity for them to learn from the first library. However, if no networking opportunity existed, then the second library would never be privy to valuable such information.

Personal professional development in this context relates to the individual’s personal desire and effort to acquire professional skills, information and knowledge to enhance
his/her job performance. This is usually internally motivated and stems from the person’s inner aspiration to improve upon his/her knowledge base. It is usually evident in reading professional books, keeping abreast of trending issues, seeking clarification from higher authority on issues and so on. However, personal professional development encompasses all the other knowledge acquisition method (both formal and informal) and as such, is encouraged.

2.6 KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Dalkir (2011) noted that knowledge management as a concept is not a new phenomenon since it consists of a synthesis of known strategies, tools, and techniques. It makes inferences from a variety of fields such as anthropology and sociology, education, organizational science, technical writing, cognitive science, journalism, information technologies, information and library science and training among others. This makes knowledge management multidisciplinary in nature and as such, a look is taken at some of the definition in various fields.

The view of knowledge management in business has two primary aspects; first is to handle knowledge components of any business activity in such a way that it can be explicitly reflected in the business policy, strategy and practice across the various levels of the organization; and, linking an organization’s intellectual assets—both explicit (recorded) and tacit (personal know-how)—to achieve positive business results. (Evans et al, 2014)
The technologists also perceive knowledge management as a process whereby information is transformed into actionable knowledge and available for those who can apply it to do so in a usable form.

Evans et al (2014) views knowledge management as an approach to manage systematically, the use of information so as to offer an uninterrupted flow of knowledge to the right people and at the right time.

A lot of benefits can be derived from knowledge management in any organization and this also holds true for any academic library (Sarrafzadeh et al., 2010). However, in the field of information and library science, knowledge management can be described as creating knowledge, and maintaining an environment that will encourage knowledge creation, sharing, learning, enhancement, organization and utilization for an organization’s benefit and that of its customers (Abell & Oxbrow 2001, cited in Sarrafadez, 2008). Thus knowledge management involves organizations creating enabling environments in order to create, share, store and utilize knowledge to achieve the organizational goals.

2.6.1 Components of Knowledge Management

The United States Office of Personnel Management, (2011), recommend that shared knowledge when used and reused, produces more value. To maintain this consistent value
an environment of trust and motivation for people to share and use knowledge should exist. Thus, there must be systematic processes available for finding and creating knowledge and the relevant technology needed for storage, retrieval and dissemination of such knowledge. In essence, knowledge management is made up of three key components; the people, the processes and the technology.

The people in this context, have to do with the employees who are referred to as the ‘knowledge assets’ of organizations (Evans et al, 2014). Individuals in the organizations are those who make use of the data and information and transform it into actionable knowledge. The people are a core component of knowledge management since they possess the valuable tacit knowledge the organization thrives on.

Knowledge exists within or outside organizations. The difficulty is in the acquisition, organization, availability and accessibility and actual use. The processes therefore, that organizations use to do all these is another key component of knowledge management (Timbrell, Delaney, Chan, Yue and Gable, 2005). These include knowledge audits that allows organizations to identify and detect needed knowledge, knowledge maps created for quick access to knowledge, encouraging communities of practice for sharing individual tacit knowledge, documenting best practices and lessons learned, content management for currency and relevance, storytelling, encouraging individual learning to facilitate knowledge transfer and use (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). All these processes
enable organizations capture tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge so that it can replicated, shared and consulted over time.

Technology is very critical in organizing, storing and accessing explicit knowledge. It is a means by which people can share their tacit knowledge directly without physical presence. Technology enhances value of knowledge as there is an increase in accessibility, reduction of time and effort needed to record and facilitation of interactions between and among customers, partners, employees and management. Technology’s role in knowledge management cannot be overemphasized for the success of any knowledge management strategy if organizations want to gain a competitive advantage.

2.7 IMPORTANCE OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

The growing importance of knowledge management as part of the activities of organizations can be attributed to the globalization of business, where today’s organizations are more global—multisite, multilingual, and multicultural in nature. Strategies therefore, need to be implemented by organizations in order to harness the potential of its knowledge workers and propel organizational success. For example, multinational organizations need to be able to manage the explicit and tacit knowledge
generated in ways that can maintain best practices and increase efficiency and productivity.

Dalkir (2011) posits that one of the major importance of knowledge management to organizations is to prevent “Corporate amnesia.” This term refers to the loss of organizational knowledge through employees leaving with valuable tacit knowledge. The workforce is highly mobile, thereby creating issues of knowledge continuity for any organization and demands continuous learning from the knowledge worker. It is therefore critical to the continuity of any organization.

Advances in technological has revolutionized the entire globe. There is an abundance of information and knowledge is constantly being created and circulated (Evans et al, 2014). People are more connected and expectations are higher. Organizations need to be able to manage information and knowledge in ways that will not lead to overload but can filter out those that are relevant and applicable within the work environment. Knowledge management is therefore one of the responses to the numerous challenges encountered in the quest to manage a complex, information-overloaded work environment.

Knowledge management has immense benefits not only for the individual employees and the organization, but for communities of practice. Dalkir, (2011) refers to this as a three-tier view of knowledge. Knowledge management ensures better decision making and problem solving which enables people work better and save time, a sense of community
bonds is built among individuals within organizations, updated people’s knowledge and makes available the opportunity to contribute. In communities of practice, professional skills are developed, peer-to-peer mentoring is promoted, effective networking and collaboration is facilitated, professional codes of ethics are developed and a common language exists. Organizations effectively manage knowledge to inform strategy (Timbrell et al, 2005), quickly solve problems, diffuse best practices, improve knowledge rooted in products and services, synthesize ideas and increase opportunities for innovation. This enables organizations have an upper hand over their competitors and build organizational memory.

2.8 CHALLENGES OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

In order for knowledge management to succeed, it has to tap into what is important to knowledge workers—what is of value to them and to their professional practice as well as what the organization stands to gain (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). It is important to get the balance right. If the knowledge management initiative is too big, it risks being too general, too abstract, too top-down, and far too remote to catalyze the requisite level of support from individuals. If the initiative is too small, however, then it may not be enough to provide sufficient interaction between knowledge workers to generate synergy (Timbrell et al, 2005). The KM technology must be supportive, and management must commit itself to putting into place the appropriate rewards and incentives for knowledge
management activities (Evans et al, 2014). Last but not least, participants need to develop skills in order to participate effectively in knowledge management. These skills and competencies are quite diverse and varied, given the multidisciplinary nature of the field, but one particular link is often neglected, and that is the link between knowledge management skills and information professionals’ skills. Knowledge management has resulted in the emergence of new roles and responsibilities, and a great many of these roles and responsibilities can benefit from a healthy foundation based not only in information technology (IT) but also in information science (Evans et al, 2014).

2.9 KNOWLEDGE SHARING -

Knowledge sharing is at the heart of knowledge management (Sarrafzadeh, 2008) and knowledge management initiatives are most likely to be introduced and succeed in organizations (of which the library is no exception) that possess a knowledge sharing culture (Taher 2006). Though the widespread notion of ‘knowledge is power’ exists, a more recent strong conviction is that the value of knowledge increases when it is shared (Dube & Ngulube, 2012). Thus, the question then becomes, what is knowledge sharing? Why should one share knowledge? How can knowledge be shared? And what prevents knowledge from being shared?
Wang and Noe (2010) posit that knowledge sharing is the vital channel through which employees can contribute to knowledge application, innovation, and ultimately the competitive advantage of any organization.

According to Zheng (2017), knowledge sharing is different from knowledge transfer and knowledge exchange although these terms have been used interchangeably. Knowledge transfer involves the sharing of knowledge source and the acquisition of knowledge source (Wang & Noe, 2010). It is used to describe the movement of knowledge between different units, departments and organizations rather than individuals (Wang & Noe, 2010). Knowledge sharing is thus the process that an individual’s knowledge turns to be understood, absorbed and used by others (Ipe, 2003). It is conscious activity that involves one person having knowledge and another person acquiring knowledge.

Knowledge sharing refers to the provision of task information and know-how to help others and to collaborate with others for problem solving, innovation or implementation of policies or procedures (Wang & Noe, 2010) and it can occur through written or face-to-face communications by documenting, capturing or organizing knowledge for others to make use of or networking with other experts (Cummings, 2004; Pulakos et al., 2003). Kim and Lee (2006) also describe knowledge sharing as the ability of employees to share their work-related experience, expertise and know-how with other employees through informal (or formal) knowledge sharing within or across team or work units.
From the above definition of knowledge sharing, we can conclude that; 1) knowledge sharing is a major individual behavior; 2) knowledge sharing is a voluntary, proactive, activity that involves two parties where one has the knowledge and the other learns 3) knowledge sharing is controlled by environmental systems or procedures, such as legal, ethical standards and code of conduct or behaviours; 4) the outcome of knowledge sharing is mutually beneficial to the parties involved and it creates new knowledge.

2.10 FACTORS INFLUENCING KNOWLEDGE SHARING

A number of factors exists that influence knowledge sharing and knowledge sharing behaviour of individuals in any organization. Ipe (2003) sums these factors up as the very nature of the knowledge being shared, the individual’s motivation to share such knowledge, the opportunities available for sharing, and the work environment culture.

2.10.1 The Nature of Knowledge

Tacit and explicit forms are the two main forms in which knowledge exists. As organizations continue to recognize the importance of knowledge, different values are placed on the different forms of knowledge within organizations. The nature of knowledge, (tacit or explicit) and the value accrued to it, significantly influences the way knowledge is shared among people within organizations. Explicit knowledge is
essentially in a more codified form such as in manuals, handbooks, organizational policies and therefore sharing such knowledge is viewed to be relatively easier. Sharing explicit knowledge can be through intranets, online correspondence and so on. Tacit knowledge, however, resides in the minds of the individual and can be shared through interactions, trainings, workshops and so on. Thus the nature of the knowledge to be shared, is a determining factor in the strategies, processes and channels to be employed to effectively achieve the set goal.

2.10.2 Motivation to share

People are not likely to share knowledge without strong personal motivation (Stenmark, 2001 cited in Ipe, 2003). This means that people tend to view their knowledge as priced possessions and as such, need strong motivation to let go of such knowledge. Motivational factors that encourages knowledge sharing among persons can be classified as internal and external factors. Internal factors include the individual’s perception of the power attached to the knowledge and the expected reciprocation of sharing. Having specialized knowledge can sometimes make individuals feel very powerful and in turn negatively or positively affect knowledge sharing. For example, a library staff who possesses some expert knowledge in information communication technologies (ICTs) and is always the one people go to for any ICT issue, with time the person will begin to feel all important and powerful and this can affect the willingness to share such knowledge with colleagues. Sharing in essence, will mean that the sort of perceived power attached
to the employee will be reduced since others would gain such knowledge and apply it. Also, the extent of expectation of reciprocity can affect knowledge sharing. When an individual feels that, as he/she shares their knowledge, colleagues will return the favor by also sharing what they have, then it can affect the knowledge sharing activities positively. However, when colleagues constantly hoard their information, it becomes a deterrent to the individual willing to share.

External factors include relationship with the recipient and rewards for sharing. The kind of relationship that exist between the knowledge giver and the knowledge recipient has a great impact on knowledge sharing. Most importantly is the element of trust. The trust between the giver and the receiver is essential for any form of knowledge sharing to take place. If a cordial relationship and trust from both parties exist, then there will be no difficulty in sharing their knowledge with each other but in cases where both parties are antagonized, then knowledge sharing becomes problematic. Also, the individual’s attitude and perception towards knowledge sharing can either hinder or facilitate it. The perceived rewards for engaging in knowledge sharing also affect the process. When individuals perceive certain personal benefits associated with a knowledge sharing behaviour, they become motivated to share. This could be extrinsic in the form of incentives like allowances, opportunities to participate in conferences, recognition among others, or intrinsic like self-satisfaction.
2.10.3 Opportunities to share

Opportunities to share knowledge will consist of both formal and informal opportunities. These formal opportunities include, but are not limited to, training programs, structured work teams, and technology-based systems that enable the sharing of knowledge and are designed to explicitly acquire and disseminate knowledge. Personal relationships and social networks are informal opportunities that promote learning and the sharing of knowledge. Such formal opportunities are present in most organizations and mostly focus on explicit knowledge whereas the informal ones facilitate peer-to-peer learning and mutual exchange of knowledge.

2.10.4 Culture of the work environment

Organizations are made up of diverse groups of individuals from different backgrounds coming together to work towards the achievement of a set goal. The individuals in the organization, over time, develop certain norms, values, practices and assumptions that guide or shape their activities. This can be referred to as the organizational culture. It is how individuals in the organization act, their expectations of each other as well as how they interpret each other’s actions (Mayekiso, 2013) and sometimes there are even further subcultures within the main organizational culture. This culture affects knowledge sharing because it determines the social context in which sharing behaviour can thrive or otherwise. If an organizational culture emits openness, trust, cordiality, reciprocity,
fairness and encouragement, then it becomes more likely that individuals will be at ease to share their knowledge. A knowledge sharing work culture means that the necessary tools to facilitate and encourage knowledge sharing exist and thus motivates individuals to share.

2.11 KNOWLEDGE SHARING STRATEGIES

A strategy is an actionable plan implemented to achieve organizational goals and objectives. Thus, knowledge sharing strategies (KSS) are said to be all the things that an organization needs to do regarding its knowledge assets, in order to achieve organizational goals and objectives (Muchaonyerwa, 2015) and direct decision-making processes.

University libraries have a major task of leveraging the available knowledge efficiently and effectively to enhance teaching, learning and research of the institution. It is critical that university libraries implement knowledge sharing strategies in order to assist in transforming them into knowledge sharing organizations (Maponya, 2004). Muchaonyerwa (2015) summarizes knowledge sharing strategies into the channels of communication (communities of practice, social networks and storytelling) and enabling knowledge sharing strategies (including knowledge repositories, staff training/human resources development, performance evaluation/appraisal, mentorship programmes, succession planning and job rotation policies).
2.11.1 Channels of communication strategies

a. Communities of Practice (CoPs) - Communities of practice (CoPs) are voluntarily and can be formal or informal groups of individuals with related interests, ideas and goals. CoPs guarantee that organizations are able to exploit knowledge that has been collectively generated. The use of the internet or intranet, discussion groups or other technology assisted communications mediums are dominating (such as blogs) in exchanging ideas, information and knowledge.

b. Social Networks - Social networks are a more formalized organizational dimension of knowledge sharing. They are categorized under Web 2.0 technologies that facilitate communication, knowledge sharing, collaboration and interaction among users with a common interest or goal irrespective of geographical location (Balubaid, 2013 cited in Muchaonyerwa, 2015). These include Facebook, Twitter, online blogs, electronic bulletin boards, knowledge directories among others.

c. Storytelling - Here, an individual who has had the opportunity to attend an event/conference/seminar or training is allowed to present the knowledge acquired to colleagues who did not attend within the organization. Storytelling is an in-depth discussion that occurs in the course of or after a project, workshop or an activity has been completed with the aim of capturing valuable lessons (Faul
and Camacho, 2004 cited in Muchaonyerwa, 2015). Stories are a way of transferring an individual’s tacit knowledge to another and it enables people to learn through other peoples’ experiences.

2.11.2 Enabling Knowledge Sharing Strategies

These knowledge sharing strategies focus mainly on gaining competencies and they consist of policies, knowledge repositories, performance evaluation processes, staff training and human resources development, succession planning, mentorship programmes and job rotation policies.

a. Knowledge Repositories - Knowledge repositories exist to ensure that an organization’s relevant operational knowledge is properly documented to prevent ‘corporate amnesia’ challenges and to facilitate training and orientation for new employees. According to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), the documentation of operational knowledge assists employees to internalize personal experiences and deepen their tacit knowledge base. Knowledge management systems (KMS), databases, internet etc promote the indirect sharing of one’s personal experiences and transfer of explicit knowledge to other people. With complete documented knowledge, it becomes easier to channel explicit knowledge to those who need it.
b. Staff training/Human Resources Development - Training is one of the most effective ways by which employees update their professional skills and share knowledge through the exchange of experiences and new ideas. Equipping staff with the needed skill and competencies to effectively make use of the available facilities (for example, ICTs) is very critical to effectively sharing knowledge.

c. Performance Evaluation and/ Appraisal Strategy - This is where individuals are encouraged to participate in sharing tacit knowledge by a performance-based pay rewarding system. Thus, rewards and recognition for an employee’s contributions is a signal for other employees as to the value the organization places on knowledge sharing and as such, serves as a motivation to them.

d. Mentorship Programmes - Mentoring involves two individuals, one senior and more experienced and one with less experience. The mentor (senior person) guides and shares experiences and skills with the junior person. Purposeful mentoring enables more experienced employees to share their knowledge, specific insights and skills with their juniors so as to retain knowledge when eventually the experienced person leaves the organization.
e. Succession Planning - It refers to organizations attempts to plan for future replacements with regard to retirements, deaths, serious illnesses or promotion and any new positions by equipping the right number of people with the needed skills. It usually occurs with leadership planning where managerial personnel are fully utilized in developing mentorship programmes, identifying and coding high potential employees’ expertise and creating a supportive organizational knowledge sharing culture.

f. Job Rotation - This involves the periodic transfer of individuals within the different units/sections in an organization. Job rotation in libraries provides the opportunity for employees to acquire the necessary skills and competencies from their experiences and expertise, improve their appreciation of the entire library’s operations and creates avenues for the sharing of knowledge of new skills and competencies learnt as well as helping employees become acquainted with operations of the library’s different units and sections.

2.12 BENEFITS OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING

Knowledge sharing is important because it enables the knowledge residing with individual employees to be transferred to the organization, where it is converted into economic and competitive value for the organization (Lin, 2007). Collaborations between individuals possessing diverse and different knowledge bases, according to Cohen and
Levinthal (1990), enhances the ability of an organization to innovate far beyond what any one individual can achieve. Boland and Tenkasi (1995) further asserted that for a product to be successful and an organization to gain a competitive advantage, often results from a synergy of individual employees with diverse knowledge collaborating toward common achievements. Knowledge sharing also leads to the dissemination of innovative ideas and is considered critical to creativity and subsequent innovation in organizations.

2.13 CHALLENGES OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING

Makayiso (2013) referring to Kakabadse, Kouzmin & Kakabadse (2001) sums up the barriers to effective knowledge sharing as the people involved, management of the organization, organizational structure and the knowledge itself.

With people, some of the challenges that exist include, but are not limited to, apathy to change where individuals resist change because they do not understand or accept the change, time and resources where there is limited time and resources to support knowledge sharing activities and low motivation to share or learn from others. Constant staff turnover is another huge challenge for organizations since people who leave carry valuable organizational knowledge away and deepen corporate amnesia and organizations will constantly have to transfer knowledge to new employees and teach older employees new ideas.
Management of an organization could present a different set of hindrances to knowledge transfer such as the fear of giving up power, where those at the management level see the knowledge they possess as power and as such, sharing weakens that power. Also, the difficulties of passing on power from one to another hinders effective knowledge sharing as well as trying to challenge the traditional company style of doing things.

Organizational structures can be inflexible and fragmented which places a strain on knowledge sharing activities especially in instances where there is a failure to invest in relevant systems that would facilitate knowledge sharing among employees.

The nature of the actual knowledge itself can be a hindrance to effective knowledge sharing because it can be difficult to extract knowledge from individuals, categorize it, reward individuals for sharing, understand, manage and ensure that knowledge is shared between key knowledge groups and made readily available. The ways of sharing tacit knowledge differs from that of explicit and as such can pose some challenges to effective knowledge sharing.

**2.14 KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND ACADEMIC LIBRARIES**

University libraries are knowledge based systems which integrate activities such as creating, collecting, organizing and distributing knowledge to faculty, students and researchers to accomplish their core goals. Traditionally, libraries were storehouses of
large volumes of information resources (such as books, maps, journals etc) but the introduction of the knowledge based economy, has radically changed the role of libraries and information professionals and libraries need to devise means and strategies by which they can adapt to the changing work environment and remain relevant to the user.

Knowledge sharing is one of the efficient ways (in the face of low budgetary allocations) by which libraries can enhance their knowledge assets (employees) in order to improve services provision. Besides, technological advancements coupled with information users possessing high technology literacy, academic libraries have to adjust the means and ways they provide information to their clients. However, Sarrafzadeh, Martin & Hazeri, (2010) affirm that knowledge sharing activities are rather uncommon in academic libraries. In most cases, the library lacks the required infrastructure to promote effective knowledge sharing within the organization.

Various studies have been conducted on knowledge sharing in academic libraries across the globe. Nove and Puspitasari (2013) studied five academic libraries in Surabaya, Indonesia who had been engaging in some form of knowledge sharing over 12 months with the aim of describing these knowledge sharing activities including strategies for knowledge sharing, the technology used, and the purposes, benefits, as well as the obstacles of knowledge sharing. The study found that the libraries had different names for the existing knowledge-sharing programs and they allocated regular time for knowledge sharing activities. Furthermore, the use of social media for knowledge sharing was
evident in some libraries as well as the building of knowledge worker groups. Every library staff was encouraged to get involved in knowledge sharing with the aims of sharing best practices and lesson learnt. The knowledge sharing obstacles identified include the fact that not many librarians could express their ideas (shy/silent), and some of them treated this sharing activity as a mandatory activity. However, according to data finding, most libraries did not process or organize the knowledge sharing result seriously, they only put emphasis on the knowledge sharing for knowledge exchange. The absence of documentation and organization of new knowledge derived from these activities makes the open access is almost impossible.

Aggarwal and Islam (2015) conducted the first empirical study in the area of knowledge retention in libraries by bringing together the perspectives of libraries across the world (35 countries in 6 continents). Their study investigated into how libraries prevent the loss of knowledge with people leaving or resigning, and the strategies adopted to retain this knowledge and to transfer organizational knowledge to new employees. The study found that documentation, training and digital repositories were the primary strategies used. Knowledge retention and transfer were being poorly done and very few libraries had a formal knowledge management (KM) process. The study then proposed a theoretical framework for knowledge retention and transfer in libraries.

Another study was conducted by Magaret Burnette in 2017, on knowledge sharing in academic libraries with the focus on exploring the nature of tacit knowledge sharing
among library colleagues, whilst centering on the characteristics of tacit knowledge and contextual factors such as organizational culture or the mentor/mentee relationship. This study identified three thematic areas in knowledge sharing. First was the influence of organizational culture and the importance of trust on knowledge sharing behavior. Second, was the value of teamwork and the significance of mentor/mentee roles surface as significant drivers of tacit knowledge exchange. Last but not least was a better understanding of the nature of tacit knowledge as it relates to types of knowledge and characterizations of experience and expertise.

In Africa, quite a few studies have been conducted on knowledge sharing in academic libraries and they include, but are not limited to, the following.

Mayekiso (2013) focused on knowledge sharing practices in university libraries with special reference to the University of South Africa (UNISA) Library as part of a master degree dissertation at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. The aim of the research project was to establish whether the UNISA Library was open to knowledge sharing practices, whether there was the need for knowledge management and more specifically for a knowledge sharing strategy. Mayekiso tried to establish the extent to which knowledge sharing practices occured among professional library staff in their day-to-day activities. The results of the study revealed that knowledge sharing in the library occurred in an informal way. A number of challenges and barriers that acted as an impediment to successful knowledge sharing activities were identified and they include a lack of a clearly defined knowledge sharing strategy, the organizational culture and structure.
Mayekiso proposed that a road map outlining the steps that should be followed to attain a satisfactory level of knowledge sharing at the UNISA Library as well as an environment where there is an open transfer of knowledge from experts to the less knowledgeable, be implemented. It was further argued that for this to succeed, senior management would have to promote the process and outline the importance of knowledge sharing activities for the UNISA Library and an institution of incentives to ensure effective knowledge sharing could be considered.

Ndakasharwa Muchaonyerwa (2015), a PhD student at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa also attempted to study knowledge sharing among library staff in university libraries in Africa, generally, and South Africa in particular. This was influenced by the post-1994 merger of universities in South Africa, resulting in the integration of staff with different skills and aptitudes from different universities. The study investigated knowledge sharing strategies in University Libraries in KwaZulu-Natal Province of South Africa specifically focusing on four Universities namely; Durban University of Technology (DUT), the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), the Mangosuthu University of Technology (MUT) and University of Zululand (UNIZULU). The findings of the study revealed that the knowledge that was generated and acquired was not subsequently shared; university libraries lacked knowledge management policies and strategies to harness staff expertise for enhanced service delivery. The organizational culture and structure were not conducive for knowledge sharing and also, staff needed to be trained to engage meaningfully in knowledge management activities, including
knowledge sharing. The study recommended formulation of strategies that would encourage knowledge sharing and should include rewards, new skills development and team work.

Plockey (2009) also studied knowledge sharing in academic libraries, specifically Balme Library of the University of Ghana. Her study explored knowledge sharing among staff of the Balme Library and the measures in place to promote the sharing activities. The findings revealed that although the library staff engaged in the sharing of some knowledge, it was not formalized and also most of the needed structures and strategies were not in place to facilitate these sharing activities. The recommendations from this study included awareness creation, marketing of communication channels available and formulation of sharing policies that will mandate staff to share their information and knowledge with colleagues for the betterment of the library as a whole.

Though these studies (among others), have tried to understand and explore knowledge sharing as a whole in academic libraries, there is still room for further research into how the nature of multi-campus systems affect knowledge sharing and knowledge sharing behaviours of library staff, which is the prime focus of this study.
2.15 KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND THE MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Managing knowledge is an imperative for large organizations in which such barriers as geographical and functional distances inhibit workers from knowing the work of others and benefiting from it. Multi-campus system of higher education is one of such establishments that needs strategic knowledge sharing in order to transcend the constraints of geographical boundaries. Since the other campus libraries in a multi-campus university system are an epitome of the center, it is imperative that services, skills and expertise must be replicated on all campuses. This can be done by implementing policies that will ensure that explicit knowledge is extracted, codified and made available to all staff across campuses, whilst ensuring the capture and dissemination of tacit knowledge by the use of relevant information and communication technologies (ICTs) so as to ensure continuity, productivity and better service delivery.

2.16 THE WAY FORWARD

In light of the above, academic libraries, as one of the central units of academic institutions, face the challenge of having to align their goals with the expanded role that these institutions of higher learning have adopted. Historically the value of libraries as custodians of information and knowledge has been to identify, organize, describe, and provide systems that make it easy for the university community to access this information
and knowledge (Hayes & Kent, 2010). However, Parirokh, Daneshgar, & Fattahi (2008) advocate that academic libraries should move from playing an informational role to assuming a “resource-based and collaborative” role. This they claim will necessitate collaboration among librarians when they perform their tasks, which in essence will require knowledge sharing capabilities among themselves. Besides, with the advent of advanced technological innovations coupled with the emergence of the technologically literate information user, academic libraries have to change the means and ways they provide information to their clients.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Key to any research process is the plan, outline and procedures to be adopted in achieving the research goals or objectives. It is crucial to lay down empirical plans and procedures for any research process that spans the steps from broad assumptions to detailed methods of gathering data, analysis and interpretation (Creswell, 2014). This chapter explains the blueprint of this study; research design, procedures for data collection, analysis and interpretation. It includes the population, sampling and sampling techniques and data collection instruments.

3.2 RESEARCH APPROACH

According to Rajasekar, Philominathan & Chinnathambi (2013), research methodology is a systematic way to solve a problem. It is a science of studying how research is to be carried out. Essentially, the procedures by which researchers go about their work of describing, explaining and predicting phenomena are called research methodology. It is also defined as the study of methods by which knowledge is gained and the logic behind the use of these methods (Kothari, 2004). There are three distinct approaches to conducting research; qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches. The
research methodology used for this study was a mixed method approach combining both qualitative and quantitative methods.

Qualitative research, aims at gathering data on opinions, attitudes and other qualitative phenomenon. It is used to gain an understanding of underlying reasons, opinions, and motivations. Qualitative research is an approach for exploring and understanding the various meanings individuals or groups attribute to a social or human problem (Creswell, 2014). It provides insights into the problem or helps to develop ideas or hypotheses for potential quantitative research. Quantitative methods, on the other hand, are those research methods that use numbers as its basis for making generalizations about a phenomenon. It focuses on facts and figures that support hypothesis of a phenomenon. The mixed method approach, as its name suggest, makes use of both qualitative and quantitative tools and methods throughout the period of carrying out the study.

This study made use of qualitative methods to reveal individuals’ perceptions, motivations and unique challenges regarding the sharing of knowledge with colleagues whiles the quantitative methods present statistical data on knowledge acquisition, motivations, challenges and strategies of sharing. The use of a mixed method approach for this study is backed by the fact that both qualitative and quantitative methods possess their own shortcomings which may not present a holistic understanding of the research problem. A mixed method approach helps to exploit and harness the weaknesses and strengths of the individual methods (Walliman, 2016), thereby holistically exploring
knowledge sharing among library staff in a multi-campus university environment. Using quantitative methods alone will only explore the research problem on a statistical basis (for example, preference for using a particular communication channel) and will omit the underlying reasons why such findings were arrived at (thus, factors that influenced this preference). Making use of purely qualitative methods will limit the study to discovering individuals’ opinions, ideas, perceptions and attitudes and will eliminate any chance of statistics for generalization. Since the study is focusing on library staff in a multi-campus university environment, it is important and necessary to capture the various unique issues that may emerge from the different campuses and compare the results from the different approaches (Walliman, 2016), to arrive at an empirical conclusion.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design is the overall plan for obtaining answers to the questions being studied and for handling some of the difficulties encountered during the research approach. This study made use of a case study design. Nicholas Walliman (2016), explains case study research as a situation of studying a social group, community, system, organization, institution, event or even a person or type of personality within their own context in order to make assessments and comparisons. Starman (2013) citing Messec (1998) also views case study as a description and analysis of an individual matter or case with either a theoretical purpose (identifying variables, structures, forms and orders of
interaction among the participants in the situation) or a practical purpose (assessment of performance of work or progress in development). Yin (2004 cited in Plockey, 2009), views a case study as an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context. The case study is used when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly defined and when multiple sources of evidence are used. Of all the above definitions of case study research, the common trait that runs through borders on studying a phenomenon within its natural context. Thus the case study design was chosen for this study with the purpose of exploring knowledge sharing among library staff within their natural context of an academic library in a multi-campus university whiles focusing on the perceptions, participation, strategies, motivations and challenges encountered.

3.3.1 SELECTION OF CASE

This study takes on a case study approach. The justification for the selection of the University for Development Studies as a case for this research stems from the fact that the UDS is a multi-campus, multi-site public institution of higher education (specifically, a University) in Ghana.

According to the National Accreditation Board, four out of the ten public universities in Ghana currently run a multi-campus system; University for Development Studies (UDS),
University of Education, Winneba (UEW), University of Health and Allied Sciences (UHAS) and University of Energy and Natural Resources (UENR) (www.nab.gov.gh).

The University for Development Studies (UDS) and the University of Education, Winneba (UEW) were established in 1992 and have been in existence for over 20 years unlike UHAS and UENR which were established in 2011 (7 years ago). Whereas, the UDS was established as a fully-fledged University, the UEW was initially a University College borne out of an amalgamation of seven institutions, formerly known as the Specialist Training College (STC), National Academy of Music (NAM) and Advanced Teacher Training College (ATTC) all located at Winneba; School of Ghanaian Languages at Ajumako; College of Special Education, Mampong-Akwatim, St. Andrews Agricultural Training College, Mampong-Ashanti; and the Kumasi Advanced Technical Teacher’s College (KATTC), Kumasi (University of Education, Winneba Handbook, 2015).

The University for Development Studies was thus, the first multi-campus University established in Ghana. Its library has been operational right from its inception, with the necessary structures to support the University’s multi-campus nature and selecting UDS Library as the case for this research provides some valuable insights and benchmarks for the other existing multi-campus universities and future ones in Ghana, Africa and beyond.
3.4 POPULATION

A research population can also be known as a distinct group of individuals or objects that possess similar characteristics (Blakstad, 2008). All individuals or object components of any definite population usually exhibits a common, binding characteristic or trait.

Panneerselvam (2011) defines a population as “the entire spectrum of a system of interest”. Simply put, the population refers to the total range of individual units that comprise the group of interest.

For this study, the population was limited to the staff of the UDS library on all campuses. The total number of staff was 61.

Table 3.1: UDS Library Staff distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nyankpala Campus</th>
<th>Dungu Campus</th>
<th>Tamale Campus</th>
<th>Navrongo Campus</th>
<th>Wa Campus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Members</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UDS Library, 2018
3.5 SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

Sampling is the process of selecting a subset of randomized number of members/elements of the population of study and collecting data about their attributes (Panneerselvam, 2011). This is to say that sampling involves the choosing of a number of members of the population at random, to represent the population for the purpose of data collection. Sampling is usually carried out when the population under study is large and may not be feasible to collect data from all individual elements. Alternatively, when dealing with relatively small and manageable populations, the entire population can be used in a process called census. A census can be described as the process of obtaining responses from/about each and every individual member of the population (Panneerselvam, 2011). It is worth noting that, a census may involve a fairly large population, as in that of a country, but this is necessary since data is collected from each member of the population.

The total population for the study was 61 comprising senior and junior staff, as well as senior members of the UDS library. Due to the small and manageable size of the population, data was collected from each member of the population.

3.6 DATA COLLECTION

The quality of data determines the extent to which managerial decisions are reliable and dependable (Panneerselvam, 2011). The raw material of research is data. This can be
likened to the iron ore that contains gold. Thus this ore (the data) has to be mined (collected) with excavators (instruments), and will then go through a refining process (analysis) to generate the finished product, gold (results). Data collection is therefore an integral component of the entire research process and must be carried out meticulously and judiciously with the right instruments so as to enable generalizations and testing.

Data collection talks about the methods and approaches a researcher employs to obtain relevant information regarding the major ideas of the hypothesis of the study so he or she can demonstrate whether or not the hypothesis can be verified (Alreck & Seatle, 1985; Denscombe, 2014).

3.6.1 Nature of Data

It is important to be able to distinguish between the different nature and types of data because this has critical implications for their reliability and for the sort of analysis to which they can be subjected. In distinguishing data by type, the focus will be on primary and secondary data. Primary data are those facts that have been observed, experienced or recorded close to the event of interest and are the nearest one can get to the truth whereas secondary data are the written sources that interpret or record primary data (Walliman, 2016). For example, one may have a more appropriate and complete knowledge of what transpired at a political rally if he/she were present in person rather than reading the
newspaper report on the event the next day. Not only will the information from the newspaper be brief and less abundant, but it will be embellished by the commentator’s interpretation of facts.

Another distinction of data which influences the kind of analysis that it can be subjected to is by nature, that is, either qualitative or quantitative data. Qualitative data refers to that kind of data that is not numerical whilst that of qualitative is numerical (McLeod, 2017). Quantitative data can be subjected to statistical analysis processes and measurements but qualitative data can only be reported in the language of the informant.

Primary, secondary, qualitative and quantitative data was collected for this study and was gathered from both primary and secondary sources.

3.6.1.1 Primary Data

Primary data refers to data collected from the field under the control, direction and supervision of the researcher/investigator. Such data is mostly collected for the first time and fresh in nature (Panneerselvam, 2011). Some researchers argue that once the data has been collected then it assumes a secondary type since it has been recorded, interpreted and documented by someone. However, Walliman (2016) argues against this claim.
saying that primary data are not the actual event but a record of it that is as close to the actual event as possible; the first and immediate recording.

There exist many ways of collecting and recording primary data, and some are more reliable than others. The four basic methods for data collection are observation, participation, measurement and interrogation/interview (Walliman, 2016). Observation involves the record of events, situation or things using the researcher’s own senses without necessarily engaging directly in the event, situation or thing (sometimes with the help of an instrument like a camera, tape recorder, microscope etc., (Walliman, 2016)). Participation however, involves the researcher directly taking part in an activity, event or situation and recording or documenting data. Measurement, according to Walliman (2016) refers to records of amounts or numbers (e.g. population statistics, instrumental measurements of temperature, mass etc.).

The data collection methods used to gather primary data from the UDS Library staff was by the use of semi-structured questionnaire, and that from the Librarian, Heads of Departments and Campus Librarians was through semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire for this study was distributed by research assistants at the various campus libraries, whilst the interviews were conducted face-to-face by the researcher.

The use of semi-structured questionnaire was motivated by the fact that the population was literate and did not need translation or explanation of the questions. It also saved the researcher time and cost since it did not require the physical presence of the researcher.
However, the questionnaire did not allow for extensive expression by respondents on the research problem.

The interviews, on the other hand, provided an in-depth understanding of the research problem from the view of the respondents. It allowed for detailed expression and understanding. It was however time consuming for both the researcher and the respondents.

3.6.1.1.1 Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire administered for this study was designed with the research objectives in mind and divided into five sections. The first section focused on the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Demographic data such as gender, age, campus, rank/position, educational background and length of service were solicited.

Section B presented issues on knowledge acquisition, section C looked at perception and participation in knowledge sharing, whilst section D considered the motivations for engaging in knowledge sharing. The final section, E, focused on the challenges respondents face in knowledge sharing.

Copies of the questionnaire was distributed to the respondents by help of some research assistants at the various campuses and after answers were obtained, they were returned to the researcher for analysis to begin.
3.6.1.2 Interview

Another method employed in collecting the primary data for this study, were interviews. These interviews were semi-structured in nature. A semi-structured interview is a method of data collection where a predetermined set of open-ended questions are combined with the opportunity for the interviewer to probe further responses on particular issues. Semi-structured interviews allow room for the interviewee to express his/her thoughts and ideas with ease and allows the researcher probe further for clarification.

The interviews were steered by an interview guide containing twelve questions on the research problem but allowing for further questions and probes where necessary. The researcher recorded the answers by the use of a recording device which was complemented with note taking so as not to lose any vital piece of information.

3.6.1.2 Validation

Validation of research instruments is where the research instrument is initially tested to ascertain whether or not the right data would be gathered, before the full scale study begins. It helps in eliminating ambiguity and clarifies questions to respondents.

For this study, the researcher initially distributed 10 copies of the questionnaire to the Library staff at the Nyankpala Campus and interviewed one Head of Department. This was to ensure that all questions asked were the right ones and that respondents could understand and provide the needed information. By this, the researcher was able to
rephrase some questions so as to make the meaning clearer to respondents before full data collection begun.

3.6.1.3 Secondary Data

Secondary data, on the other hand, deals with data that has already been collected by a person/organization other than the researcher/investigator. These are usually found in books, journals, reports, correspondence and so on. The secondary data was collected from documents (such as reports, memos etc) of the UDS Library and the University in general. Additional information was pursued from books, reports, online journal databases and other electronic resources to support the primary data and to inform the literature review.

3.7 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis is the process of extracting from the given data, relevant information, from which a summarized and comprehensible numeric description can be formulated (Nsowah-Nuamah, 2005). Data collected must be classified and presented in a meaningful format in order to provide insight into the research problem. The data gathered from the administration of the questionnaire for this study was analyzed by use
of IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (IBM SPSS) version 23 software and Excel and the results were graphically presented using tables, charts and graphs.

That data which was gathered by use of the interviews were analyzed by thematic content analysis. Thematic content analysis is a method of analysing written, verbal or visual communication messages with the aim of capturing hidden patterns in the data in relation to the research objectives so as to arrive at an empirical conclusion. For this study, the researcher, focused on an inductive approach to analyze the data, thus coding the data was done without trying to fit it into any pre-existing coding frame or according to the researcher’s analytic preconceptions. The results from the thematic analysis was presented using verbatim quotes which depicted the identified concepts.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings from the analysis of data gathered for the study. The quantitative data was analyzed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (IBM SPSS) version 23. The qualitative data was coded to ensure respondent’s anonymity (see appendix III) and analysed using thematic analysis. The analysis of the data obtained from the interviews have been incorporated with that of the data gathered from the questionnaires in instances where the same issue is being addressed. In instances where questions were not covered in both the questionnaires and the interviews, the presentations are covered separately. The results are presented using tables, charts and graphs and verbatim quotations.

The data presentation has been organized under the various sections of the questionnaire. That is, background information of respondents, knowledge acquisition, perception and participation of staff in knowledge sharing, strategies and motivations for knowledge sharing and the challenges of knowledge sharing.
4.2 RESPONSE RATE

A total of 54 copies of the questionnaire, were distributed among the UDS Library staff across the campuses. Twenty-five copies of the questionnaire were distributed at the Nyankpala Campus library, 8 at the Dungu Campus library, 2 at the Tamale Campus B library, 7 at Navrongo Campus library and 12 at the Wa Campus library of the University for Development Studies. Out of the total of 54, 49 were returned and subjected to data analysis using the SPSS software. Seven respondents were interviewed for this study and they were the University Librarian, the Heads of Collection Development Department (CDD) and Information Services Department (ISD), and the Campus Librarians of Wa, Navrongo, Dungu and Tamale Campus B. The response rate for the questionnaire was 49 out of 61 which represents 80.3% whilst that of the interviews was 7 of 7 (100%). Thus, the total responses on which this data analysis is based, was 56 out of the total population of 61. Thus, the study returned an excellent response rate of 91.8%.

4.3 BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS

4.3.1 Gender of Respondents

The Table 4.1, shows the gender of respondents who took part in this study.
Table 4.1: Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018*

The results showed that 34 (69.9%) of the respondents were male whilst the females were 15 (30.6%). Out of the 7 who were interviewed, 2 were male and 5 were female. In total, the males were 36 (64.3%) and the females were 20 (35.7%). The number of males far exceeded that of females.
4.3.2 Age of respondents

The Figure 4.1 represents the age ranges for the staff of UDS library

Figure 4.1: Bar graph showing the age range of UDS Library staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2018

Eight (17.4%) respondents were within the age range of 21-29, 26 (56.5%) were between the ages of 30-39, 10 (21.7%) were also between 40-49 whilst 1 (2.2%) each was recorded for the ages of 50-59 and above 60 years respectively. This showed that the UDS Library had a predominantly youthful population (between 30-39). The interviews however, did not inquire the age of respondents.
4.3.3 Campus of respondents

Table 4.2 shows the distribution of respondents on campus basis.

Table 4.2: Campus of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyankpala Campus</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa Campus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungu Campus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navrongo Campus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamale Campus B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*

Respondents from Nyankpala campus were 23 (46.9%), Wa Campus had 11 staff (22.4%), 7 (14.3%) were from Dungu Campus, Navrongo campus library had 6 (12.2%) and 2 (4.1%) were from Tamale Campus B. The campus that recorded the highest number of staff was the Nyankpala campus (main library) followed by the Wa, Dungu and Navrongo Campuses respectively. The Tamale Campus B had the least number of staff.
4.2.4 Designation of Respondents

The designation/rank of the respondents ranged from Campus Guard to Senior Assistant Librarian.

Figure 4.2: Line graph showing rank of respondents


From Figure 4.2 above, the UDS Library had 2 (4.2%) respondents at the rank of campus guard, 8 (16.7%) were Junior Library Assistants, the Library Assistants were 7 (14.6%), 1 (2.1%) Senior Bindery Assistant and 12 (25%) Senior Library Assistants. Principal and Chief Library Assistants were 7 (14.6%) and 4 (8.3%) respectively, whilst Junior and Senior Assistant Librarians were 6 (12.5%) and 1 (2.1%) respectively.
Of the 7 interviewees, 5 were Assistant Librarians with 1 Senior Assistant Librarian in addition to the University Librarian. The ranks of Junior Assistant Librarian, Assistant Librarian, Senior Assistant Librarian and University Librarian are all categorized as Senior members. Senior, Principal and Chief Library Assistants are categorized as Senior staff and the remaining ranks are categorized as Junior staff. The Senior members are mostly professional librarians with at least a Master’s degree in Library and Information Science and are part of the top management of the Library, heading the various units and sections. The senior and junior staff are para-professionals with various educational levels and they provide support to the senior members in the day-to-day activities of the Library. This is presented in the Table 4.3 below;

Table 4.3: Categories of staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of staff</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018*
Table 4.3 revealed that, the majority of the respondents were senior staff, 24 (42.9%) whilst the senior members were the least, 14 (25%).

4.3.4 Unit of Respondents

The library had various units and sections that handled specific operations and services. The Figure 4.3 below shows the various units and the distribution of staff within the units.

Figure 4.3: Pie chart showing staff distribution per unit/section

Twenty-eight (57%) of staff across the campuses work with the reader services units. The acquisitions, institutional repository and technical services had 3 respondents which represented 6% each whilst the cataloguing, electronic services and serials each had 6 (13%), 4 (8%) and 2 (4%) respectively. It is however of importance to note that the other campus libraries only had reader services units where the staff took up cataloguing and serials duty as well. The Nyankpala Library was the only one which had well defined units and departments. This accounted for the high numbers of staff at the reader services units.

4.3.5 Educational level of staff

The study also took into account the level of education of respondents by trying to identify the highest qualification obtained by each staff. The results showed that most of the respondents had formal education at various levels ranging from WASSCE to Masters Degrees.
Respondents who possessed Higher National Diploma (HND) and Diploma certificates respectively were 6 (12.2%), 12 (24.5%) had various Undergraduate degrees, 16 (32.7%) had Master’s degrees, 5 (10.2%) and 3 (6.1%) respondents had WASSCE/SSCE and O level/A level respectively whilst only 1 (2.1%) possessed a Post-Graduate Diploma. The data gathered revealed that a higher number of staff at the UDS Library had master’s degrees which showed that the staff were highly educated and thus possessed some level of specialized knowledge that could be shared with colleagues. The 7 interviewees possessed degrees in Library and Information Studies at the Masters level (MA and MPhil) whilst two were PhD candidates. Therefore, the top hierarchy of the library were
professional librarians with deep knowledge and understanding of the kinds of skills, information and expertise necessary to enhance job performance.

4.3.6 Length of service of staff in the UDS library

The study sought to identify the number of years that respondents had worked with the UDS Library and the results are presented in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Length of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*

Respondents had worked at the UDS Library for varying number of years. The lowest being one year and the highest being over twenty years. Table 4.4 above shows the number of years respondents had worked in the library in ranges of five year periods. Out of the total respondents, 12 (24.4%) had been working with the library for between 1-
5 years, 22 (44.9%) had been with the library for 6-10 years, 4 (8.2%) had worked for 11-15 years, 5 (10.2%) had also been with the UDS library for 16-20 years whilst 4 (8.2%) had worked over 20 years.

From the interviews, it was indicated that all interviewees, with the exception of two of the Campus Librarians, had at least 10 years of working experience with the UDS Library. This showed that majority (22 respondents) had at most 6-10 years of work experience and it placed them in a very good position to understand the internal processes and procedures that took place within the library.

4.4 KNOWLEDGE ACQUISITION

In order for an individual to be able to actively participate in sharing knowledge, he/she needs to first acquire it because as the saying goes “you cannot give what you do not have”. Therefore, the study tried to find out the ways by which staff acquire the professional information, expertise and skills that are necessary to enhance their job performance and increase productivity.

4.4.1 Modes of knowledge acquisition

The study tried to determine the modes by which respondents of the UDS Library acquire professional knowledge related to their jobs.
They were given the following pre-determined responses to select from and they were allowed multiple choices.

Table 4.5: Professional knowledge acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/conferences/seminars</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Forty respondents each indicated that the highest mode by which they acquired their professional knowledge was through workshops/conferences/seminars and personal development respectively. Thirty-seven of the respondents acquired their professional knowledge through formal education (diplomas, degrees etc.), whilst another 37 also indicated in-service training. Thirty-one was recorded as those who gained their professional knowledge through interaction with colleagues. Therefore, the highest mode of knowledge acquisition for respondents was through attending workshops/conferences/seminars and also personal development which recorded the highest frequency of 40, whereas acquiring from colleagues ranked least.
The results from the interviews also showed that the current modes of knowledge acquisition for staff available at the UDS library included mostly in-service trainings, then seminars and workshops and formal education.

Interviewee 2:

“From time to time, refresher courses are organized. Librarian asked the various heads to organize training within the units to help other staff gain knowledge, as in what they need to know about their jobs”

Interviewee 3:

“The introduction of the library seminar series is one of the formalized ways, then also staff meetings, though not often and also staff are encouraged to further their education”

Interviewee 6:

“Workshops, trainings and seminars”

Interviewee 7:

“In-service trainings especially on the IT things, like the KOHA we are currently using”

This buttressed the recorded modes of knowledge acquisition. However, the interviews revealed that the highest mode is through in-service trainings (all seven respondents affirmed this), whereas the other staff reported that it was through workshops/conferences/seminars and personal development.
4.4.2 Opportunity for formal education

The study also tried to assess the opportunities for respondents to participate in formal education during their period of work at the library. Those who had taken advantage of these opportunities were required to state the programmes they pursued.

The responses are displayed in Figure 4.5 below.

Figure 4.5: Bar graph showing opportunity for respondents to pursue formal education

Source: Field survey, 2018

Figure 4.5 above showed the results obtained when respondents were asked if they had had any opportunity to pursue further formal education in the period working with the
UDS Library. The responses recorded for those who had the opportunity to pursue formal education was 36 (78.3%), whilst those who had not were 10 (21.7%).

The interviews reported that staff were encouraged to further their education at various levels when the need arose. It was however self-sponsored, since the University could only allow an individual time off work to study under certain conditions but would not cater for fees and other expenses.

Interviewee 1:

“Staff are encouraged to go to school if the opportunity presents itself. But they have to cater for the expenses themselves. The University only grants study leaves or sometimes staff can use their annual leave to study, that is, sandwich, part-time or distance programmes.”

It was very encouraging to see that majority of staff (36) of the UDS Library had been given the opportunity to further their education. This meant staff were given the opportunity to acquire some form of knowledge and skills.

A probe to further understand the reasons why 10 (21.7%) had not had such an opportunity is presented in Figure 6 below.
Figure 4.6: Bar graph showing reasons for not pursuing formal education

The chart showed that, 5 (50%) indicated financial challenges as the hindrance to their pursuing further formal education during the period that they had been working at the UDS Library. This could be attributed to the earlier revelation from the interviews that the University did not cater for staff educational expenses but only gave permission off work, in the form of study leave and annual leave to study. This meant that staff had to bear the entire cost of enrolling and pursuing any form of formal education. A lack of interest in further education, no straight directive from management and the unqualified status for study leave with pay recorded 1 (10%) response each whilst 2 (20%) respondents indicated personal reasons.
This is necessary since staff are required to cater for fees and other expenses themselves and therefore getting a study leave with pay for the period of the study programme would be a great financial support.

Aside trying to find out if staff had the opportunity for formal education, the researcher also inquired as to the programme studied. Table 4.6 below shows the specific programme of study that respondents had the opportunity to be enrolled in and completed.
Table 4.6: Programme studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA Information Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND Secretarial And Management Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Development Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Human Resource Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Information Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Integrated Development Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Information Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Business Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Integrated Management Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Social Change Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bcom Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed Early Childhood Education And Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bsc Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Management Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND Management Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND Advanced Painting And Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HND Procurement And Logistics Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Management Information Systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil Population Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil Development Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil Information Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msc Environmental Science, Policy And Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC Information Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*
Table 4.6 above is ranked in descending order according to the corresponding frequency of responses. The highest programme studied by staff of the UDS Library was MA Information Studies which recorded 14 (31.1%). This infers that majority of the staff have had adequate professional knowledge and skills related to their jobs. It is worth noting that though the total number of responded who indicated that they had pursued formal education in Figure 4.5 above were 36, some had had multiple opportunities for academic progression.

Figure 4.7 below gives a broad picture as to the opportunities that staff had taken advantage of to pursue various academic programmes at different levels.

Figure 4.7: Level of programme

Source: Field survey, 2018
From Figure 4.7 above, the highest record 44% was for programmes at the Masters level. This was closely followed by 31% at the Bachelors level, 16% for Higher National Diploma (HND), 7% for Diploma programmes and 2% for Post-Graduate Diploma (PGD). This is a significant sign of the support the Library has given to its staff in terms of gaining additional knowledge and skills that can be applied to enhance job performance.

4.4.3 Opportunity to attend trainings, workshops and seminars

The study also tried to identify the kinds of opportunities that existed for respondents to attend trainings, workshops and seminars since this was listed as one of the major avenues for knowledge acquisition and was affirmed by the results of the interview. These were grouped into internal, external and international opportunities. Internal referred to those that were organized for staff by the Library, external were those organized outside the library and by institutions other than UDS or the UDS Library and finally, the international ones focused on those organized outside the country or by international organizations. Trainings, workshops and seminars were collectively referred to as trainings.
4.4.3.1 Internal trainings, workshops and seminars.

This focused on the trainings, workshops and seminars organized by the UDS Library for its staff either on their own campus or on a different campus. Respondents were asked whether they had been given the opportunity to attend trainings organized by the library on their own campus and the responses are presented in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7: Opportunity to attend training on respondents’ campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*

When respondents were asked if they had had the opportunity to attend any trainings organized by the library on their campuses, 45 (91.8%) respondents answered yes to the question and 3 answered no representing 6.2% whilst 1 (2.0%) provided no response. This revealed that majority of respondents have had the opportunity to attend trainings organized by the library on their campuses. When probed further to give reasons for the negative response, only one out of the three who responded “no” stated that the
opportunity to attend was not available. This is indicative of the availability of these training opportunities at the various campuses to cater for the staff there.

The study went further to try to identify if opportunities to attend trainings at different campus libraries existed since UDS is a multi-campus University and if so, which of the campuses had respondents visited. Figure 4.8 below illustrates the responses.

Figure 4.8: Bar graph showing the opportunity to attend training on a different campus

\[\text{Training on different campus}\]
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Twenty-six (53.1%) of the respondents indicated that they had not had any opportunity to attend trainings on any campus other than theirs. The remaining 23 (46.9%) however, responded that they had had such opportunities. This means that just about 47% of respondents have had the opportunity to move to a different campus to attend a training,
workshop or seminar organized by the Library whilst 53% have never had such an opportunity.

From the interviews, it was noted that, whenever there was a training at any of the campus libraries, all staff were required to participate but in instances where the training was at a different campus, a selected few represented (due to time and cost challenges).

Interviewee 4:

“I usually select one person to attend and then staff who return from training workshops are tasked to train others during staff meetings and this is captured in the minutes so the staff is obliged to do so.”

Interviewee 5:

“We can’t all go to Nyankpala so mostly Alfred goes to attend these trainings”

Respondents who replied positively were further required to state the campus on which they attended these trainings, workshops and conferences.
 Seventeen (68%) of the respondents indicated the opportunity they had was to attend trainings at the Nyankpala Campus, 3 (12%) each indicated they had the opportunity to attend at Dungu and Wa campuses respectively, whilst 2 (8%) had attended such trainings at the Navrongo campus. Although the respondents who responded to this question were 23, the responses as to which campus they visited totalled 25 because some had visited more than one campus. By inference, it can be said that more trainings had being organized at the Nyankpala campus which is the central Library as compared to the other campus libraries.
The researcher further tried to identify the reasons why 53% of the respondents had not attended any trainings, workshops or seminars at a different campus. The results are shown in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: Reasons respondents had not attended training on a different campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most workshops are organized at the center (Nyankpala campus)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been no opportunity available</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not selected to attend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not make time to attend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information on such was available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such trainings were for senior staff and senior members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Out of the total of 26 respondents, 19 (73.1%) gave different reasons why they had not attended any trainings on a different campus whereas 7 (26.9%) did not provide any response. The highest response recorded had a frequency of 6 and a percentage of 23% and that was the fact that most of these trainings, workshops and seminars were organized at the central library (Nyankpala campus) and as such most of the staff there
did not need to move to another campus to attend such trainings. Another 5 (19.2%) responded that there had been no opportunity available for them. Three (11.5%) also indicated they had not been selected to attend any training on a different campus. This particular point is affirmed by the campus librarians who said they usually had to select some staff to attend trainings at the centre anytime it came up. Two (7.7%) had no idea why, 1 (3.8%) could not make time to attend, 1 (3.8%) indicated that no information was available while yet another thought it was only for senior staff and senior members (3.8%).

The researcher also tried to identify the capacity in which staff participated at these trainings that had been organized by the library either on the respondents’ campus or on a different campus. The following results were obtained:

Figure 4.10: Bar graph showing the capacity in which staff participated in such trainings

Forty-six of the respondents provided responses to the question of how they participated in these trainings, workshops and seminars. Three gave no response. Forty of the respondents said they took part in these trainings as participants, which represented 87% whilst 6 (13%) have been facilitators. This shows that a very small number of staff have had the opportunity to facilitate trainings for their colleagues.

4.4.3.2 External and International trainings, workshops and seminars.

This focused on the trainings, workshops and seminars organized by other local-based institutions as well as international organizations that were hosted locally or internationally. The results are shown below;

Figure 4.11: Bar graph showing opportunity to attend external trainings

Twenty-nine (59.2%) indicated that they had had the opportunity to attend trainings organized by institutions other than the UDS whereas 20 (40.8%) responded in the negative. A greater percentage of respondents (59.2%) had taken advantage of opportunities to attend external trainings. This shows that the Library is not just undertaking internal staff development through in-service trainings, but has gone a step further to harness the potentials that existed regarding knowledge and skills learnt from other institutions.

Figure 4.12: Pie chart showing opportunity to attend international trainings

Source: Field survey, 2018
When respondents were asked if they had had the opportunity to attend any international trainings by way of knowledge acquisition, 40 (82%) respondents indicated that they had not whilst a minority of 9 (18%) respondents indicated they had.

The study then tried to find out how often respondents rated their participation in both external and international trainings. The responses are shown in the Table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9: How often staff participated in external and international trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>External trainings</th>
<th>International trainings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often (at most 5 times in a year)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often (at most 3 times in a year)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often (at most twice in a year)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely (once a year)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*

In Figure 4.11, 29 respondents indicated that they had had the opportunity to attend trainings organized by external institutions and the responses in Table 4.9 above presents the frequency with which respondents took part in such trainings. One (3.5%) respondent
indicated that the opportunity was very often (at most 5 times in year), 2 (6.9%) respondents also indicated that the opportunity came often (at most 3 times in a year), whilst 22 (75%) respondents also responded that such opportunities were not often (at most twice in a year). 4 (13.8%) respondents did not respond.

Regarding the opportunities to attend international trainings, only 9 respondents indicated that they had had such opportunities, out of which 4 (44.4%) respondents confirmed that such opportunities were not often (at most twice in a year). The remaining 5 (55.6%) respondents indicated that the opportunity was rare (once in a year). This meant that staff at the UDS Library did not often get the opportunity to participate in international trainings or those organized by external institutions other than theirs.

It then became necessary to identify some of the reasons that accounted for such low levels of participation by staff in external and international trainings. The results are shown in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10: Reasons for not participating in external trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No available opportunity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No invitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity and cost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information on such</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of these workshops are for senior staff only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful application</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*

Nine respondents (31%) indicated there was no available opportunity, 3 (10.3%) respondents recorded that they had not had any invitation and 2 (6.8%) respondents cited proximity and cost as the reason for not participating in such trainings. One (3.5%) respondent each cited lack of information, unsuccessful applications, no idea and the notion that these trainings are only for senior staff respectively, whereas 11 (37.9%) did not respond.
Table 4.11: Reasons for not participating in international trainings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never been invited</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never been selected</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not organized by the library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No official staff development is available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunity to participate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is usually based on qualification, merit and personal effort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity to attend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such trainings are for senior staff and senior members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful application</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The highest reason recorded for why staff did not attend international trainings was because they had not been invited indicated by 19 (47.5%) responses or they were not selected to attend (3 (7.5%) respondents). Some also indicated that such trainings were not part of any official staff development, the Library did not organize such trainings and there was limited opportunity (2 (5%) respondents respectively). A few of the respondents indicated that reasons included a lack of capacity, qualification, merit and personal effort, trainings were for a particular group of staff (senior staff and senior
members) and unsuccessful applications and these recorded 1 (2.5%) each respectively among others.

Based on the available modes of knowledge acquisition and the few barriers previously mentioned, respondents were required to make suggestions to improve upon the acquisition of the professional information, skills and expertise that were vital for enhancing output and ultimately improving services provision.

These suggestions are presented in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12: Suggestions on improving knowledge acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent training and workshops should be organized</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness creation about such training programmes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage cordial working relationships and promote a knowledge sharing culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage personal development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to attend external trainings should be given to all staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor further/formal education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible policies should be put in place to encourage knowledge acquisition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic rotation of staff and training venues between campuses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor participation in external and international trainings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid insubordination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective monitoring and evaluation of knowledge acquired to know the impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful mentoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular staff meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology advancement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*
Most of the respondents were of the view that more training and workshops should be organized frequently to serve as a refresher or to teach them new things. Awareness creation about training programmes should be made available for staff to participate in, a cordial working relationship should be encouraged, a knowledge sharing culture should be promoted and personal development should be encouraged. Opportunities to attend external trainings should be given to all staff, sponsoring further/formal education should be improved, flexible policies should be put in place to encourage knowledge acquisition, there should be periodic rotation of staff and training venues between campuses, participation in external and international trainings should be sponsored, insubordination should be avoided, effective monitoring and evaluation of knowledge acquired should be improved, purposeful mentoring, regular staff meetings and technology advancement among others were recommended by respondents as ways to improve knowledge acquisition.

4.5 PERCEPTION AND PARTICIPATION IN KNOWLEDGE SHARING

This study tried to identify the perceptions of respondents of the UDS Library on knowledge sharing. The study also tried to find out the extent to which staff at the library were actively participating in knowledge sharing within campuses or across campus.
4.5.1 Benefits of sharing Knowledge

All those who responded to the questionnaire indicated that sharing knowledge was beneficial not only to the individuals directly but to the institution as well.

Respondents were allowed multiple choices and some of these benefits are highlighted in Table 4.13 below.

Table 4.13: Some benefits of knowledge sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn new or update existing information, skills and expertise</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain best practices and improve service delivery</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve understanding of organizational goals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge retention of long serving and highly skilled staff</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster trust and unity</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid duplication of efforts and processes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Fifty (20.4%) of the respondents indicated that the first benefits derived from engaging in sharing knowledge was that it enhanced the learning of new and also the updating of existing information, skills and expertise required for work. Thus, sharing helped
respondents learn new things that they previously did not know and it also helped them update what they already knew. Forty-four respondents (18%) further stated that knowledge sharing helped maintain best practices and improved service delivery. Thus, they were able to know and use best practices that enhanced service delivery. Forty-three (17.6%) indicated that it also improved understanding of organizational goals, 37 (15.1%) indicated that it retained knowledge of long serving and highly skilled staff, 37 (15.1%) maintained that it fostered trust and unity and 31 (12.7%) also indicated that it avoided duplication of efforts and processes.

From the interviews, all respondents agreed that there were immense benefits associated with knowledge sharing.

Interviewee 4:

“Retain knowledge of retired/older staff that enhances continuity and increases productivity”

Interviewee 1:

“Though Knowledge Sharing is important, it shouldn’t replace individuals search for knowledge on their jobs. They need to build on existing knowledge”

Interviewee 3:

“Knowledge shared is knowledge gained. The more you share the more internalized it becomes. So it is beneficial to the individual. It avoids duplication, increases
transparency, since everything is known to everyone. Staff are empowered to work better and increase productivity and it eliminates unhealthy competitions there is no need to hoard so you appear important than others”

Interviewee 2:

“Yes a lot of benefits. Helps in building confidence and continuity. There are older people who have the knowledge of the technicalities of the organization and the new ones bring in new ideas.”

Interviewee 5:

“Oh yes. A lot of benefits. There is exchange of ideas, improves individual skills, peer to peer facilitated learning, creates quality staff, improves performance and enhances output”

Interviewee 6:

“Skills and knowledge transfer”

Interviewee 7:

“It improves efficiency, increase innovation and save time. It also helps staff to solve problems, learn new things and increase understanding”

One of the interviewees pointed out that though knowledge sharing was important, it should not replace individuals’ search for knowledge about their jobs. People needed to
build on existing knowledge, information and skills for the job and not just rely on what others shared with them.

4.5.2 Perceptions of staff

The study tried to identify staff perceptions that could influence the extent to which staff would engage in knowledge sharing or otherwise. Staff were asked some questions and the answers were ranked from strongly disagreed to strongly agreed in order to determine the degree to which these statements would affect the individual’s participation in knowledge sharing. The results are represented in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14: Perception of staff on Trust and Information Shared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am an important part of my institution and I do my job well</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (8.2%)</td>
<td>9 (18.4%)</td>
<td>35 (71.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my colleagues to do their job</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>6 (12.2%)</td>
<td>25 (51%)</td>
<td>15 (30.6%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the information received from co-workers is trustworthy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 (26.5%)</td>
<td>21 (42.9%)</td>
<td>14 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the expertise of my colleagues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>29 (59.2%)</td>
<td>16 (32.7%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I face difficulties at work, I know that my colleagues will help me</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>23 (46.9%)</td>
<td>22 (44.9%)</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues do not try to deceive for their own profit</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>5 (10.2%)</td>
<td>19 (38.8%)</td>
<td>20 (40.7%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From Table 4.14, respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statement that they believed they were an important part of the library and they believed they did their jobs very well. The motive behind this statement was to identify the extent to which respondents were confident in their abilities. Out of 49 responses to this, 1 (2.0%) respondent strongly disagreed, 4 (8.2%) were neutral, 9 (18.4%) staff agreed and 35 (71.4%) staff strongly agreed that they were an important part of the
library and they did their jobs very well. Thus, the majority of staff (35 staff) believed that they had the ability to perform their duties well.

Another statement that respondents were faced with was the extent to which they trusted their colleagues to do their jobs. This was to identify the extent of confidence in their colleagues’ abilities to also perform their own duties. Out of the responses, 1 strongly disagreed and another disagreed to the statement, representing 2.0% each. Six were neutral which represents 12.2%, another 25 staff agreed, representing (51%) whilst the remaining 15 strongly agreed to the statement making up 30.6%. The results showed that respondents trusted the abilities of their colleagues to perform their duties since the highest response recorded showed most staff agreeing to the statement.

The respondents were further asked to rank the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statement that they felt the information received from co-workers was trustworthy. This was to determine the extent to which respondents trusted and placed value on the information received from colleagues. Thirteen (26.5%) staff took a neutral position on the statement, 21 (42.9%) staff agreed to the statement and the remaining 14 (28.6%) were in strong agreement. Although a greater number of staff agreed to this statement (21 and 14 respondents), it is quite disturbing that about a quarter (¼) of staff (13) of the library either cannot decide whether to agree or disagree with the statement or they are just sitting on the fence unconcerned.
In trying to determine the level of trust respondents have in the expertise of their colleagues, two (2) of the staff were neutral, representing 4.1%, 29 (59.2%) staff agreed to the statement and 16 (32.7%) strongly agreed. Thus, respondents trust the expertise of their colleagues since the highest frequency obtained was 29 for those agreeing to the statement.

Then also, the study tried to find out the level of cooperation and support that respondents believed existed among themselves by asking them to rate how much they agreed or disagreed with the statement that “If I face difficulties at work, I know that my colleagues will help me out”. The responses recorded showed 1 person strongly disagreeing (2.0%), 2 took a neutral position (4.1%), 23 staff agreed to the statement (46.9%) whilst 22 also strongly agreed (44.9%). Therefore, there exist high levels cooperation and support for staff from colleagues per adventure any difficulty arises.

Finally, respondents were asked to respond to the statement that “My colleagues do not try to deceive for their own profit”. Two respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively representing 4.1% each, 5 were neutral on the statement (10.2%), 19 agreed to the statement representing 38.8% and 20 strongly agreed making up 40.7%. The results show that staff believed that their colleagues would not intentionally deceive them for their own profit and as such, a certain level of trust existed.
4.5.3 Participation in knowledge sharing

The study further tried to determine the library staff’s extent of participation in knowledge sharing activities either within the same campus or across campuses. The table below shows the results.

Table 4.15: Extent of respondents’ participation in knowledge sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of ....</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely (Once a month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (2-3 times a month)</th>
<th>Often (once a week)</th>
<th>Very often (2-3 times a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving knowledge from colleagues in same library</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>3 (6.1%)</td>
<td>5 (10.2%)</td>
<td>3 (6.1%)</td>
<td>11 (22.4%)</td>
<td>25 (51.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using knowledge from colleagues in same library</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>3 (6.1%)</td>
<td>4 (8.1%)</td>
<td>8 (16.3%)</td>
<td>29 (59.2%)</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving knowledge from colleagues in other campus libraries</td>
<td>13 (26.5%)</td>
<td>19 (38.8%)</td>
<td>5 (10.2%)</td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2 (4.1%)</td>
<td>4 (8.1%)</td>
<td>5 (10.2%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using knowledge from colleagues in other campus libraries</td>
<td>14 (28.5%)</td>
<td>12 (24.5%)</td>
<td>5 (10.2%)</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>3 (6.1%)</td>
<td>9 (18.4%)</td>
<td>5 (10.2%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data gathered showed that, receiving knowledge from colleagues within the same campus library was a daily ritual. This is evident in the data results where 25 (51%) respondents indicated that they received knowledge from colleagues within their own library daily, 11 (22.4%) respondents reported that it was very often (2-3 times a week), 3 (6.1%) respondents specified that it was often like once in a week, another 5 (10.2%) respondents also indicated sometimes like 2-3 times a month, 3 (6.1%) said it was a rare occurrence (once a month) whereas 1 (2.0%) indicated that it was something that had never happened.

On the extent of use of such knowledge received from colleagues in one’s library, 1 (2.0%) respondent indicated that there had never been any chance to use such knowledge, 2 (4.1%) respondents stated that they rarely used such knowledge, 3 (6.1%) respondents indicated that such knowledge was sometimes used, 4 (8.1%) respondents used this knowledge often, 8 (16.3%) used theirs very often and 29 (59.2%) respondents claimed such knowledge they receive from colleagues within the same campus library was used daily. These results showed that there was a high level of participation in knowledge sharing among staff on the same campus libraries.

The study tried to determine the extent of staff participation in knowledge sharing across campus libraries. The results in table 4.15 above showed that 13 (26.5%) respondents never received any form of knowledge and information from colleagues on other campuses, another 19 (38.8%) rarely did, 5 (10.2%) sometimes received such knowledge, 1 (2.0%) respondent often received it, another 2 (4.1%) respondents further stated that
they received this knowledge from colleagues in other campus libraries very often and 4 (8.1%) respondents said it was a daily thing.

On the use of such knowledge received, 14 respondents (28.5%), stated that they had never used knowledge from colleagues on other campus libraries, 12 respondents (24.5%) rarely used such knowledge, 5 (10.2%) sometimes used it, 1 (2.1%) respondent often did, 3 (6.1%) used it very often and 9 (18.4%) respondents indicated that they had used such knowledge on a daily basis. These showed that majority of staff had not received professional knowledge from their colleagues at the other campus libraries.

From the interviews, the researcher tried to find out the extent of participation in knowledge sharing and Interviewee 2 had this to say;

“Most of the staff are very apathetic towards improving upon their professional knowledge. They sit in their offices and do only what is assigned them, they don’t try to find out about anything. People limit themselves to only the sections they find themselves in and don’t try to find out anything elsewhere. We don’t know whether people are just being apathetic, or are not interested in the job or maybe the work setting is not encouraging enough.”

Interviewee 3:

“Individuals’ perception makes it difficult to transfer knowledge, since they only share with friends”
Interviewee 2:

“People feel threatened when others try to know what they are doing.”

Interviewee 6:

“Some staff who are just not willing to either share or receive knowledge”

4.6 Strategies and Motivations for Knowledge Sharing

The study looked at the strategies available at the UDS Library to facilitate knowledge sharing among its staff and the motivations that drive staff participation in knowledge sharing.

Figure 4.13: Bar graph showing the available channels for knowledge sharing
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Thirty (12.7%) respondents made use of chat groups in sharing their knowledge with colleagues, another 30 (12.7%) used the telephone as a medium of sharing their knowledge, 20 (8.4%) and 32 (13.5%) of staff made use of SMS and e-mails respectively. Personal conversations as a channel for sharing knowledge was affirmed by 44 staff (18.6%) whilst through trainings and formal meetings each recorded 41 (17.3%) and 40 (16.9%) respectively.

Respondents were then required to state the top three channels they regularly used. This is presented below in Figure 4.14;

Figure 4.14: Preferred knowledge sharing channels

Figure 4.14 shows that the most preferred channel of sharing knowledge among staff of the UDS Library was through personal face-to-face conversations which was represented by 28%. This was closely followed by workshops, trainings and seminars which recorded 21% and then formal meetings recorded 17%. It was interesting to note that the use of emails as a preferred channel of sharing knowledge recorded as low as 7% regardless of the advances in technology for communication.

The findings from the interview revealed that, the institution of the library seminar series (a platform which allowed staff share their research findings with their colleagues) was one of the major channels through which the library management encouraged knowledge sharing among staff. Colleagues could ask questions and make contributions that will refine such works. Other senior academic staff (sometimes outside the library) were invited to sit on a panel with the goal of constructively criticizing staff research works to direct and polish staff research knowledge and skills. Aside gaining and sharing knowledge, this library seminar series encouraged more publications from staff.

Interviewee 1:

“We have re-instituted the library seminar series so that staff can present their thesis and research papers for colleagues to learn from. Luckily for us, some top members of faculty are very instrumental on issues concerning the library and as such they are always available to participate in these seminars. The main aim is to develop staff research skills and encourage them to publish more.”
Interviewee 3:

“The introduction of the library seminar series is one of the formalized ways”

Interviewee 7:

“The library seminar”

Interviewee 6:

“Library seminar and through WhatsApp”

The study went further to note if the staff were aware of any official documented procedure or structure for knowledge sharing in the library.

Table 4.16: Existence of formal policy on knowledge sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The responses recorded showed that 10 (20.4%) of the respondents indicated that they were aware of the existence of such a policy on knowledge sharing in the library.
Thirteen respondents (26.5%) however disagreed with this assertion whilst the remaining 26 (53.1%) had no idea.

The responses gathered from the interview showed that 2 interviewees stated that indeed the library had a knowledge sharing policy, 3 replied no and the other 2 had no idea if any such policy existed. The University Librarian brought finality to this by saying that there was no formal policy stipulating the details of knowledge sharing among staff. What existed was the Library’s strategic plan but even that was too general to classify it as containing a formal knowledge sharing policy. There were however other informal guidelines in place, that included; library seminars, organizing training for those who did not attend an event so that the one who had the opportunity to, could share what was learnt with colleagues and personal interactions.

Interviewee 1: “Nothing formal by way of policy in place. Except a section in the strategic plan on staff development, that supports formal education and training or workshops.”

Interviewee 2: “The library does not yet have any knowledge sharing policy that I know of. What we have is the strategic plan but that does not cover the details of knowledge sharing.”

Interviewee 3: “No the library has no policy on knowledge sharing”

Interviewee 4: “I have no idea if one exists or not. I have not asked”
Interviewee 5: “Yes”

Interviewee 6: “Yes”

Interviewee 7: “Am not certain”

Staff who responded ‘No’ were also required to state what was the current interim practice in the library and the following responses were obtained;

Table 4.17: Procedures currently available for Knowledge Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emailing, telephone calls, WhatsApp and SMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal memos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings, WhatsApp, emails, face to face</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media platforms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and seminars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018*

The procedures that were in place to facilitate knowledge sharing, as indicated by respondents included emails, telephone calls, social media platforms, meetings, workshops and seminars, internal memos and face to face conversations.
Staff were further required to share some of the motivations that facilitated their engagement in knowledge sharing activities with colleagues either on the same campus library or on a different campus library. The responses obtained are shown in Table 4.19 below;

Table 4.18: Comparative personal motivations for knowledge sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves knowledge base and enhances productivity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved performance and service delivery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation and respect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to learn from colleagues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cordial working environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages innovation with different skills and experiences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing knowledge is a source of empowerment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage learning and correct mistakes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps achieve the vision and mission of the library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues sharing with me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost the library's image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*
The motivations for staff to share their knowledge with colleagues were numerous but the highest recorded was that it improved the individual’s knowledge base and enhanced productivity, this recorded 11 (20.8%) responses. Other motivations included, but were not limited to, improved performance and service delivery, appreciation and respect, personal satisfaction, colleagues’ willingness to learn, cordial working environment, innovation, empowerment, encouraged learning and correcting mistakes, helped achieve the vision and mission of the library and it had the ability to boost the library's image.

The study also tried to identify if other motivations to engage in knowledge sharing existed from the support of the institution. Thus, if the institution made it conducive for staff to engage in knowledge sharing. Respondents were presented with a set of statements of which they were to agree or disagree to. Table 4.20 below shows the results.
Table 4.19: Institutional motivations for staff to engage in knowledge sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job role allows me to share knowledge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(38.8%)</td>
<td>(55.1%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to necessary communication tools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(18.4%)</td>
<td>(48.9%)</td>
<td>(24.5%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is enough time to share knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
<td>(16.3%)</td>
<td>(48.9%)</td>
<td>(22.4%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*

From Table 4.19, when respondents were asked to rank the extent to which their job roles allowed them to share knowledge with colleagues, 1 (2.0%) respondent took a neutral stance, 19 (38.8%) agreed that indeed their job roles allowed them to share knowledge with each other whilst 27 (55.1%) of them strongly agreed to the statement.

On whether or not respondents had access to the necessary communication tools to engage in knowledge sharing, 2 (4.1%) disagreed with the statement, 9 (18.4%) took a neutral position, 24 (48.9%) agreed to the statement and the remaining 12 (25.5%) indicated that they strongly agreed with the statement.
Finally, agreement or otherwise as to whether there was enough time available to share knowledge, recorded responses as follows; 1 (2.0%) strongly disagreed, 3 (6.1%) disagreed, 8 (16.8%) were neutral, 24 (48.9%) agreed and 11 (22.4%) strongly agreed.

This showed that, the library had also been making the effort to create an enabling environment that could encourage and facilitate knowledge sharing among employees. This is evident in the results recorded for all three statements trying to identify the extent of institutional motivations, which yielded high positive results.

### 4.7 Challenges of Knowledge Sharing

Finally, the study tried to determine the challenges that staff faced in the sharing of their professional information, skills and expertise with colleagues either on the same campus or across campuses.

Table 4.20: Challenges to knowledge sharing with colleagues within the same library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*
Eighteen (36.7%) of respondents indicated that they faced some form of challenges in sharing their knowledge with colleagues within the same library, whilst 27 (55.1%) did not face any significant challenges and 4 (8.7%) gave no response. Some of the challenges outlined by staff that hindered smooth knowledge sharing with colleagues on the same campus included, but were not limited to the following:

- Apathy and lack of interest from colleagues
- Closed administration
- Gossiping and tale bearing
- Lack of appreciation from colleagues and management
- Personal behavioural attitudes of some colleagues
- Poor internet connectivity
- Poor knowledge sharing culture
- Resources and time due to varying works schedules
- Poor value of knowledge
- Political affiliations
- Staff duty rotation
- Lack of a smart phone to access social media platforms as communication channels
- The notion that junior staff have no knowledge
- The notion that the seniors know best
- Unwillingness to consult when in need of information

Table 4.2: Challenges to knowledge sharing with colleagues at other campus libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2018.*

Sixteen (32.7%) respondents indicated that they faced challenges in sharing knowledge with colleagues from other campus libraries and 28 (57.1%) respondents stated that they did not face any such challenges whereas 5 (10.2%) did not respond.

Respondents were asked to state some of the challenges they faced in sharing knowledge with colleagues on the other campuses. These included;

- Distance barriers due to the institution’s multi-campus nature
- Improper use of technology and poor internet connectivity
- Inadequate communication and technology tools
• Limited opportunity to meet all staff from the various campuses and interact

• Interest

• Irregular trainings at the campus level

• Poor knowledge sharing culture among staff

• Resources

• Contacting staff at the various campuses was challenging (email address or phone number)

• Time consuming since most workshops were at Nyankpala and required staff on the other campuses to travel

• Unhealthy competitions among colleagues

Finally, staff were asked to make some suggestions on improving knowledge sharing within the same campus library or across campus libraries. The following suggestions were made;

• A formal knowledge sharing policy should be implemented to ensure a knowledge sharing culture is built and sustained.

• Acknowledging the input and efforts of everyone
• Adopting other social media platforms and not only WhatsApp for sharing information

• At least all staff should be given the opportunity to be invited to attend trainings

• Avenues should be created to bring staff together at least once a year to encourage interaction and build cordial relationships among staff (staff durbars, annual general meetings etc.)

• Creation of a library blog for staff to periodically make available opinions on issues and trends in the profession.

• Discourage gossiping and tale bearing

• Encourage those who attend external and international workshops to share what they acquire with the others

• Frequent training and workshops to improve on staff professional knowledge base

• Inviting resource persons to provide trainings in areas staff lack expertise

• Opportunity should be given for staff to present theses and research papers at seminars and encourage collaborative research.

• Periodic meetings for brainstorming on trends in the profession

• Personal development should be encouraged
• Recognition for those who share their knowledge (in the form of incentives for facilitators)

• Seminars should not be centered at Nyankpala, but should be rotated to encourage inclusiveness

• Sensitization of staff on the importance of knowledge sharing

• Strong collaboration among the different units in the library should be encouraged

• Superiors should recognize the knowledge level of every staff

• Improving technology infrastructure and encouraging its use among staff

• Training should target specific levels so it can be effective (senior staff, junior staff, senior members, technical staff etc.)

• Transparency in management

• Unity and respect should be encouraged among staff.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the discussion of findings from the data collected for this study. This includes both qualitative and quantitative data and it is discussed around the themes of the five stipulated objectives guiding the study.

5.2 Demographic profile of respondents

The number of male employees outnumbered that of the females (64.3% males and 35.7% females) and though most studies portray librarianship as a female career (Yousaf, Tariq & Soroya, 2013; Bird, 2007: Mars, 2018) the case was different in the UDS library. Respondents had worked for varying lengths of time (minimum 1 year, maximum 20 years) with majority having between 6 and 10 years of work experience. Most staff were professionals with a qualifying library degree (40% refer to Table 4.7) at the master’s level (Figure 4) and majority fall below 40 years of age (Figure 1). The senior staff made up the bulk of staff categories whilst senior members were the least. The staff belonged to various units but there was a greater concentration in the reader services unit (Figure 3).
5.3 To identify library staff perceptions, participation and strategies employed in knowledge sharing

The first objective of this study was to identify the perceptions, extent of participation and strategies employed in knowledge sharing among staff of the UDS library. For easy discussion of the findings, this objective is further broken down into three broad themes; perceptions about knowledge sharing, participation in knowledge sharing and strategies employed in knowledge sharing.

5.3.1 Perceptions about knowledge sharing

Perceptions can be described as opinions or views that people have which guide and shape the way they behave or react to certain situations or instances. These perceptions may either reflect the reality or not. The study tried to identify the kind of perceptions that staff of the library had towards knowledge sharing with colleagues. It was important to determine the views of staff on knowledge sharing because that would in turn influence the extent of participation.

Section 4.4.1 presents the analysis of findings on the perceived benefits of knowledge sharing. A 100% positive response to whether there were any benefits associated with knowledge sharing was obtained (all study respondents through the questionnaire and the interviews agreed that knowledge sharing has benefits). From the theory guiding this
study (the theory of planned behaviour according to Ajzen, 1991), it is posited that when an individual perceives benefits associated with any behaviour, then that person is more likely to engage in the behaviour. As library staff perceive certain benefits associated with knowledge sharing, then obviously, a positive likelihood to adapt a knowledge sharing behaviour becomes eminent. Staff who responded to the questionnaire revealed that, the greatest benefit derived from knowledge sharing was that it provided the opportunity for them to learn new skills and update what they already knew. In essence, new developments in the profession were made known to them and they were also able to refresh and update previously acquired knowledge to improve upon their services delivery.

This is very important since the introduction and massive technological developments translates new and dynamic roles for librarianship and the profession must strive to remain relevant in the midst of all these threats to its continuous existence. They further stated that it helped maintain best practices and improved service delivery. Thus, they were able to know and use best practices that enhanced service delivery. It also improves understanding of organizational goals, retains knowledge of long serving and highly skilled staff, foster trust and unity and also avoids duplication of efforts and processes.
Interviewee 2;

“It seems now, more of younger ones are coming into the system and the older ones are phasing out so knowledge sharing will help build leadership since the knowledge gap between these two groups will be bridged”.

This is a very important point since capacities of potential staff must be built to take up leadership positions and help to prevent corporate amnesia (Dalkir, 2011).

Section 4.4.2 presents the analysis of findings on the perception of staff towards sharing knowledge with colleagues. From the results, it reveals that majority of staff perceived themselves to be confident and capable enough to carry out their duties. When people feel they are an important part of an organization and they are able to perform their duties satisfactorily, it boosts their confidence and in turn fuels their self-efficacy beliefs. From the theory of planned behaviour, one of the major predictors of a behavioural intention is perceived behavioural control (influenced by self-efficacy beliefs and perceived external barriers). Self-efficacy beliefs are the extent to which an individual feels confident or otherwise in his/her ability or competence to engage in a behaviour despite obstacles. Therefore, such high positive responses from staff are an indication that staff possess high self-efficacy beliefs and as such can have a positive influence on behavioural intention to engage in knowledge sharing effectively.
The same section also tried to determine the levels of trust that existed among staff. Trust has been proven to be one of the major determining factors in knowledge sharing in organizations. Trust makes it easier for people to share what knowledge they possess and for others to receive (Ipe, 2003). From the findings of the study, staff indicated that they trusted the capabilities, expertise and information that colleagues possessed and as such indicates that they will be more willing to share what they have and receive knowledge from colleagues with ease.

Furthermore, perceptions about support from colleagues was also sought. The higher percentage of respondents, 47.9%, agreed that anytime they faced any form of work related challenges, they trusted that colleagues would help them out whilst 41.7% strongly agreed that colleagues will not deceive them for personal profit. These can be associated with the tenets of subjective norms, a component of the theory of planned behaviour. These subjective norms are influenced by both injunctive and descriptive norms according to Smith (2013). Whilst the injunctive norms refer to whether or not significant others encourage the individual to engage in the behaviour, the descriptive norms constitute whether or not significant others or people in the individual’s social group actually engage in the behaviour. As individuals receive the necessary support from colleagues, it is indicative of descriptive norms and once colleagues engage in such behaviour, it naturally motivates the individual to comply with such knowledge sharing behaviour. Also, as Ipe (2003) projects, the expectation of reciprocity is a factor that influences an individual’s motivation to engage in knowledge sharing. Once a high level
of trust exists, and colleagues engage in knowledge sharing behaviour, then the expectation of reciprocity increases and will positively influence that individual to engage in knowledge sharing.

5.3.2 Participation in knowledge sharing

Another issue this study sought to uncover was the extent of participation by the staff of the UDS Library in knowledge sharing activities. For the staff to effectively participate in knowledge sharing, they needed to be equipped with the necessary skills, information and expertise. The study thus tried to identify the kind of professional knowledge that staff possessed or acquired that could be shared.

The major modes of professional knowledge acquisition, according to respondents of the questionnaire, was through attending workshops/seminars and conferences as well as through personal development (21.6% respectively). Opportunities were mostly available to attend such trainings organized by the library on their campus but limited opportunities existed for attending at other campuses. Respondents were also of the view that opportunities for external and international training programmes were rather limited and as such they had to rely only on the local ones. Though the library encouraged staff to pursue formal education and attain additional certificates, some staff could not take advantage of these opportunities due mostly to financial constraints.
A response from Interviewee 1 indicated that;

“Staff are encouraged to go to school if the opportunity presents itself. But they have to cater for the expenses themselves. The University only grants study leaves or sometimes staff can use their annual leave to study, that is, sandwich, part-time or distance programmes.”

Thus, if a staff is not financially capable of bearing the cost of such formal education, then the opportunity is lost.

Most of the UDS library staff had various degrees at the master’s level with the majority possessing Master of Arts in Information Studies, which is an accepted minimum professional qualification for a career in librarianship (American Library Association, 2006). They were therefore, in a good position to transfer the knowledge they possess to others who were para-professionals. Thus, respondents had acquired the necessary skills, information and expertise needed to drive a successful career in librarianship.

Referring to section 4.4.3, respondents were asked to rate the extent of their participation in knowledge sharing within their campus libraries as well as across campuses on a six-point scale (ranging from never to daily). The results showed higher levels of participation among staff at the same campus library, with 52% admitting to receiving some form of knowledge from colleagues within the same campus library daily and 61.7% using such knowledge on a daily basis. However, lower levels of participation
were recorded across campuses, 9.1% received such knowledge daily and 20.5% used it daily. This is indicative that receiving knowledge from colleagues at other campus libraries was extremely rare on a daily basis but the little that was received was being utilized. This correlates to the benefits earlier discussed where staff perceived that knowledge sharing actually enabled them learn new and update existing information, skills and expertise as well as help maintain best practices and improve service delivery. Thus no matter how small the information or how irregular it was, staff still valued it and as such, more opportunities to share should be frequently available.

However, it is not surprising that the results of the study revealed that less participation existed across campuses. It is evident from Pinhiero, Charles and Jones’ (2017) study of multi-campus university systems that geographic distances create challenges with respect to the coordination and management of activities and as such, in one way or the other, influences participation in knowledge sharing.

The results also showed that respondents attended trainings in capacities of either a participant or a facilitator. A higher number of responses were recorded as participants, 40 (87%) whilst a few were sometimes facilitators, 6 (13%). This indicates that the opportunities available for staff to spearhead such in-service trainings are limited. It appears that a limited few are usually chosen to lead; this may be due to the kind of technical expertise the person possesses or the section the person belongs to. For instance, having specialized ICT skills will make one the point person for most ICT
trainings. It would however be encouraging if other staff are identified for their knowledge in certain areas and given the opportunity to facilitate some refresher trainings so as to boost confidence and encourage inclusiveness.

Though the results from the questionnaire are indicative of high participation in knowledge sharing, the interviews paint a different picture.

Interviewee 2 had this to say:

“Most of the staff are very apathetic towards improving upon their professional knowledge. They sit in their offices and do only what is assigned them, they don’t try to find out about anything. People limit themselves to only the sections they find themselves in and don’t try to find out anything elsewhere. We don’t know whether people are just being apathetic, or are not interested in the job or maybe the work setting is not encouraging enough.”

Interviewee 3:

“Staff like to stay in their corners and not try to know what is going on around them. So you see that there exist some smaller inner groupings of staff who only communicate or share their knowledge with each other and ignore the rest. This is not a good practice.”

Interviewee 6:

“The information on capacity building is non-existent since staff tend to keep to their corners and do not want to share with others.”
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Interviewee 4:

“We those on the other campuses know virtually nothing that is happening at the center. Sometimes you are asked some questions by faculty on new developments in the library and you have nothing to say because you are in the dark on it. Timely information needs to be circulated.”

Interviewee 7:

“Sometimes we at the campus look ‘stupid’ because we have no idea what is going on and we cannot contribute or defend anything. This makes us look bad and affects the library’s image.”

The first two statements were indicative that those at the management level were of the view that staff did not engage in sharing or asking for information at all which is not a good practice. It also showed that the trust and unity seems to be fragile, if staff tend to keep to smaller circles and stay within the sections they work in. This may be due to the fact that, since no formal knowledge sharing policy exists, management may be finding it difficult, if not impossible, to track and monitor such activities among staff. It is very necessary therefore that stringent measures be implemented to discourage segregation among staff and encourage openness and foster trust and unity. This could be done in the form of periodic job rotations (Muchaonyerwa, 2015).
The latter statements indicated that knowledge sharing across campuses was very low, and corroborates results obtained from the questionnaire. These statements depict how staff at the various campus libraries feel isolated and estranged in a remote location (Pinhiero, Charles and Jones, 2017) away from the center of the multi-campus system. Management, therefore needs to take a critical look at coordination and integration activities so as not to let campus libraries function independently but as parts of a whole.

5.3.3 Strategies for knowledge sharing

A library that does not have formal knowledge sharing strategies in place fails to influence its staff’s intellectual capital for new innovation and creativity (Holsapple, 2003, cited in Muchaonyerwa, 2015).

Strategies available to encourage knowledge sharing are very necessary to improve participation. Referring to section 4.5, the study tried to identify the channels available in the UDS library through which staff could share their knowledge with colleagues either on the same campus or across campus libraries. The channels available include face-to-face conversations, emails, formal meetings, workshops/seminar/trainings, text messaging, telephone or chat groups.

The most preferred channel for communication or sharing knowledge was through personal face-to-face conversations, followed by workshops/seminars/trainings then
formal meetings. The preference for personal touch as opposed to abstract communication modes (emails, texts, telephone) affirms that human beings are social beings and as such individuals tended to rely more on informal relationships for communication, such as storytelling (Muchaonyerwa, 2015).

This confirms Plockey’s (2009) findings that staff at the Balme Library of the University of Ghana preferred face-to-face communication. This tendency for personal interactions works well within campus libraries but is not very convenient across campuses due to differences in geographical locations, time and resources. Thus reducing active participation in knowledge sharing across campuses. It is however very interesting to note the low patronage of technology enabled communication channels. One would have thought that technological advancements would be harnessed to bridge the distance gaps existing in the multi-campus system but the situation was different for the UDS library.

Since multi-campus university systems require a well-established communication network to ensure fast responses and quick decisions (Dhliwayo, 2014) and technology has broken the boundaries of traditional communication strategies, the UDS Library needs to effectively use available technologies (web 2.0 and 3.0 tools) to enhance smooth communication across its campus libraries.

However, the interview results revealed that one of the major strategies for knowledge sharing was the institution of the library seminar series.
Interviewee 3:

“The re-introduction of the library seminar series is one of the formalized ways of sharing knowledge. It was instituted by the former librarian, but with time it became less effective. Now the present librarian has re-introduced it and it is really good.”

Interviewee 2:

“From time to time, refresher courses are organized. Librarian has also asked the various heads to organize training within the units to help other staff gain knowledge, what they need to know about their jobs.”

Interviewee 1:

“We have re-instituted the library seminar series so that staff can present their thesis and research papers for colleagues to learn from. Luckily for us, some top members of faculty are very instrumental on issues concerning the library and as such they are always available to participate in these seminars. The main aim is to develop staff research skills and encourage them to publish more.”

This points to the fact that the formalized strategy in place currently is the library seminar series. It was also revealed that a WhatsApp chat group existed for knowledge and information sharing.

Interviewee 5:

“The library’s WhatsApp platform is there but it is not effectively used.”
Interviewee 4:

“The WhatsApp platform is a good avenue to share knowledge but some staff are abusing it by posting unrelated things which then discourages its use”.

The existence of a WhatsApp platform means that some form of social networks for knowledge sharing exists as discussed in chapter 2. However, more could be done to encourage social networks among staff.

5.4 To identify the motivations that contribute to knowledge sharing among staff of the UDS Library.

The motivations that contributed to staff participation in knowledge sharing, from the study findings include the fact that knowledge sharing improves knowledge base and enhances productivity, improves performance and service delivery, there is appreciation and respect for the giver, personal satisfaction, colleagues’ willingness to learn from the knowledge giver, cordial working environment, innovation, sharing knowledge as a source of empowerment, encouraging learning and correcting mistakes, helps achieve the vision and mission of the library and it has the ability to boost the library's image. Of all these motivations, respondents indicated the highest motivator was increasing their knowledge base and enhancing productivity.
As discussed under the characteristics of knowledge in Chapter 2, sharing does not result in losing knowledge but rather in internalizing it and deepening ones understanding thus, value of knowledge increases when it is shared (Dube & Ngulube, 2012).

The issue of colleagues’ willingness to learn as a form of motivation goes back to affirm the issue of reciprocity (Ipe, 2003) that influences the extent of knowledge sharing. If individuals perceive that colleagues are willing to receive and share with them then it further motivates their interest and their participation in knowledge sharing activities.

The motivations on the part of the institution were looked at in the terms of job role, communication tools and time. Respondents replied in the affirmative that their job roles included opportunities to share knowledge with colleagues, the necessary tools that would enhance communication and knowledge sharing existed as well as ample time to engage in knowledge sharing. This meant that, the organizational support for knowledge sharing existed and as such served as a motivation for staff to engage in knowledge sharing.

The interviewees could not really say much about what motivated the staff to engage in knowledge sharing but rather proposed measures that could be implemented to enhance staff motivations. These include;

- A formal knowledge sharing policy could serve as an encouragement
Develop reward systems – not necessarily monetary eg. Staff that are able to present more papers at the seminar for a year could be rewarded or the facilitators of training workshops could be financially rewarded since some of the knowledge gained is through personal efforts.

Encouragement from bosses/heads/colleagues but especially bosses. People should not be tagged as dunderheads so everyone should receive equal encouragement

Acknowledge individual talent /efforts by way of appreciating when they share their skills and experiences (especially the older staff).

Make available the right platforms or channels to share (encourage the use of more technology driven channels of communication).

Encourage those who share to continue (when important information is shared on the WhatsApp platform, it should receive commendation)

It could be taken into consideration during assessment for promotion

Create enabling work environments that foster unity and encourages teamwork.
5.5 To find out if there exists laid down policies for knowledge sharing.

The third objective of this study was to find out if the UDS Library had any formal policy on knowledge sharing or knowledge management in place that captured the key essentials of knowledge sharing.

Section 4.5 presented responses on respondents’ awareness of any formal knowledge sharing policy. The popular view held was one of no idea of the existence of such a policy by 53.1% of the staff, followed by 26.5% who indicated none existed whilst another 20.4% stated that it did exist. This is clearly indicative of the fact that the staff had not received proper communication on a policy regarding knowledge sharing. The results from the interviews also towed along similar lines.

Interviewee 1: “Nothing formal by way of a policy in place. Except a section in the strategic plan on staff development, that supports formal education and training or workshops.”

Interviewee 2: “The library does not yet have any knowledge sharing policy that I know of. What we have is the strategic plan but that does not cover the details of knowledge sharing.”

Interviewee 3: “No the library has no policy on knowledge sharing”

Interviewee 4: “I have no idea if one exists or not. I have not asked”

Interviewee 5: “Yes”
Interviewee 6: “Yes”

Interviewee 7: “Am not certain”

The above responses also communicated that those in management did not have clear information on any such policy which is evident in the conflicting responses. However, the conclusion is that such a policy did not exist in the UDS Library with inference from the response of the University Librarian.

5.6 To identify challenges to knowledge sharing among the library staff.

The challenges or perceived barriers to effective knowledge sharing among staff of the UDS Library was studied from two main perspectives; within individual campuses and across campuses. This was necessary due to the multi-campus nature of the library.

Referring to the presentation of results in section 4.6, a higher percentage of 57.1% revealed that they did not really face any challenges sharing their knowledge with colleagues in the other campus libraries as compared to 55.1% who indicated that challenges existed with sharing their knowledge within the same campus library. This disagrees with Pinheiro, Charles and Jones’ (2017) assertion that in multi-campus systems, more often than not, there are unresolved tensions between core (main campuses) and the peripheral campuses that in turn can affect smooth operations.
Mayekiso (2013) concludes that barriers to knowledge sharing can be categorized into people, management, organizational structure and the knowledge itself.

With regard to barriers on the same campus, those that were raised pertained generally to people; apathy and lack of interest from colleagues, gossiping and tale bearing, lack of appreciation from colleagues and management, personal behavioural attitudes of colleagues, poor knowledge sharing culture among staff, poor individual value of knowledge, political affiliations, the notion that junior staff have no knowledge and the seniors know best and unwillingness to consult when in need of information.

Looking at the barriers that existed across campuses, they can be categorized under management and organizational structure. They include; distance, improper use of technology and poor internet connectivity, inadequate communication and technology tools, limited opportunity to meet all staff from the various campuses and interact, poor knowledge sharing culture among staff, resources and it was time consuming since all workshops were at Nyankpala and required staff on the other campuses to travel.

Management’s perceived barriers to knowledge sharing among staff, from the interviews included lack of trust, inadequate communication, feeling of inadequacies, competition for recognition, lack of commitment, lack of motivation and unhealthy competitions among staff. Some had this to say;
Interviewee 4:

“We are individuals and we have our differences. Some are greedy and wouldn’t want to share. Even here it happened and I had to deal with it. I tasked one staff to organize training for the others and he didn’t want to do it. He wanted to be the only one to be contacted all the time.”

Interviewee 5:

“The distance, especially when writing papers with colleagues. And you don’t know what is going on in other campuses.”

Interviewee 4:

“When we go for trainings and return, during the meetings I task them to organize training for the others and that is captured in the minutes so then it becomes obligatory. So if you don’t share, next time there is another training, you won’t attend.”

Interviewee 6:

“There is nothing formal in place to ensure that knowledge is shared among staff.”

Interviewee 2:

“When we have to organize trainings that physically require hands-on exercises, it means people have to travel due to the multi-campus and that is at a cost to the University.”
Interviewee 3:

“Leadership style is a barrier. The leaders should be open to everyone and give equal encouragement. People shouldn’t feel that others are being favoured.”

The challenges that existed did not entirely deviate from what is faced by other academic libraries (Mayekiso, 2015) and as such, the UDS library can take a look at what pertains in other University libraries and modify it to fit this particular situation. Measures that have been implemented by other institutions to curb some of these challenges can be modified and applied to the UDS situation.

Notwithstanding this, the UDS Library staff and management are making efforts to build a culture of knowledge sharing though there is more room for improvement.
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the major findings of the research, the conclusion and the recommendations for the study.

6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The study focused on knowledge sharing among library staff in the University for Development Studies Library, which runs a multi-campus system. The objectives were to identify the perceptions of staff on knowledge sharing, the extent of participation, the strategies employed, the motivations as well as the challenges faced in knowledge sharing.

6.2.1 Perceptions, participation and strategies of knowledge sharing

The study showed that staff of the library as well as those in management positions, had a generally high perception about knowledge sharing with colleagues. This was evident in
the perceived benefits that could be derived from sharing one’s knowledge with colleagues as well as the high levels of trust, coordination and support that existed among staff of the library. The benefits that staff associated with knowledge sharing include, but were not limited to, the learning of new and updating of existing information, skills and expertise relevant to job performance, the ability to maintain best practices and improve service delivery, improving staff understanding of organizational goals, knowledge retention of long serving and highly skilled staff to ensure continuity and preventing corporate amnesia, fostering trust, unity and togetherness among staff and avoiding duplications of efforts and processes. A major benefit that the interviews uncovered was that it helped in building leadership and succession planning. It is very important that organizations identify and develop staff potential to take up major leadership roles when older staff leave, retire or die.

Higher levels of participation were recorded in knowledge sharing within the campus libraries but across libraries, low levels of participation were recorded. This was mostly attributed to the multi-campus nature of the University and the limited opportunities for staff from all campuses to meet, interact and develop relationships. Therefore, the management and staff of the library need to implement measures that would tone down the effects of geographical locations on staff participation in knowledge sharing.
The major communication channels used by staff to engage in knowledge sharing included face-to-face, emails, text messaging, formal meetings, workshops/trainings/seminars, social media platforms such as chat groups and by use of telephone conversations. The findings of the study revealed that the staff had a higher preference for face-to-face interactions by way of sharing knowledge with colleagues. This indicated that, for the management of the library to encourage greater participation in knowledge sharing among staff, there was the need to create avenues for staff to meet and interact regularly in the form of staff durbars, end of year socialization events, general meetings and so on.

Findings from the interviews, showed that, the UDS Library had instituted a seminar series which was a periodic seminar organized for staff to present findings from theses and other research papers to colleagues. This was done to enhance knowledge sharing and encourage staff to publish more. Also, a WhatsApp chat group existed to facilitate dissemination of information but that was not being effectively used.

6.2.2 Motivations for staff to engage in knowledge sharing

The motivations stated by staff that influenced their participation in knowledge sharing activities primarily, was that it improved upon their existing knowledge base and enhanced productivity. Other motivations included improved performance and service delivery, appreciation and respect for the giver, personal satisfaction, colleagues’
willingness to learn, cordial working environment, innovation, empowerment, encouraging learning and correcting mistakes, helps achieve the vision and mission of the library and it had the ability to boost the library's image.

The study findings also revealed that the institution made available the opportunity for staff to engage in knowledge sharing by streamlining job roles to include opportunities to share, availability of the necessary communication tools and channels to facilitate knowledge sharing and sufficient time to engage in knowledge sharing.

### 6.2.3 Knowledge sharing policy

Though there were conflicting positions as to whether the library possessed a policy on knowledge sharing or not, the conclusion drawn from the questionnaire and the interviews show that no such formal policy exist for knowledge sharing in the UDS library. However, some informal practices exist to facilitate knowledge sharing and they are the organization of in-services trainings and workshops, the library seminar series and encouraging those who attend external and international events to share what was learnt with colleagues.
6.2.4 Challenges of knowledge sharing

The challenges identified by the study that hindered the smooth participation in knowledge sharing activities by staff were more pronounced within the same campus libraries than across. Majority of the respondents pointed out that they faced challenges sharing knowledge with colleagues more on their campuses than at other campus libraries. These were usually barriers that can be categorized as emanating from the people involved in the knowledge sharing process such as apathy and lack of interest from colleagues, gossiping and tale bearing, lack of appreciation from colleagues and management. Personal behavioural attitudes of colleagues, poor knowledge sharing culture among staff, poor individual value of knowledge, political affiliations, unfounded notions senior officers were more knowledgeable than their juniors and staff unwillingness to consult when in need of information, all contributed to the challenges faced.

The challenges existing across campus libraries emanated from management and organizational structure such as distance, improper use of technology and poor internet connectivity, inadequate communication and technology tools, limited opportunity to meet all staff from the various campuses and interact, poor knowledge sharing culture among staff, resources and time.
6.3 CONCLUSION

Knowledge does not reside with one individual. Different people have different levels of knowledge and understanding on issues, processes and practices. In academic libraries, knowledge is continuously created and stored. Technological advances have also changed the roles that librarians and information professionals perform. It is therefore necessary, that libraries develop and maintain strategies that will enable them harness the knowledge of their knowledge workers in ways that can be effectively distributed and assimilated to ensure better and improved service delivery. Knowledge sharing practices are one of the major ways by which libraries can become more innovative, maintain best practices, build staff knowledge, skills and expertise as well as increase productivity and ultimately satisfy users information needs.

The UDS Library, though engaging in some level of knowledge sharing among staff, lacks the necessary formalized strategies, tools, organizational structures and processes that will motivate staff and ensure compliance to knowledge sharing activities. Knowledge sharing is practically important to the UDS library in that, it runs a multi-campus system and the clientele are from diverse backgrounds and geographical locations. In order to ensure identical services provision across all campus libraries, there is the need to disseminate information, knowledge and skills among staff to be able to reduce the gaps in terms of staffing and services provision that may exist between the
center and the peripheries. Formal policies should be put in place to direct knowledge sharing efforts to achieve the maximum desired impact.

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the research, the following recommendations are made.

6.4.1 Policy

A formal policy on knowledge sharing should be developed and implemented by the library management in consultation with the library board and the university management, to guide knowledge sharing activities among staff in the UDS libraries. This will stipulate the available communication channels, depict time frames, resource allocation, rewards and recognitions as well as sanctions when failure to comply emerges. This will serve as a highly motivating factor to enhance staff participation in knowledge sharing.

6.4.2 Knowledge sharing culture

A culture of knowledge sharing should be encouraged among staff to build trust, improve relationships and foster unity and innovation. Library leadership must endeavour to create an atmosphere that continuously encourages staff to be open to each other, enhance teamwork, innovation, support and fairness. When such
cordial enabling environments exist, it encourages people to engage in knowledge sharing behaviours.

6.4.3 Reward systems

Reward systems should be developed to serve as external motivation to engage in knowledge sharing. This could be financial and should consider those who facilitate trainings, those who initiate and organize workshops, as well as those who present their theses and research works.

6.4.4 Communication channels

Technology enhanced communication tools should be harnessed to reduce the obvious challenges associated with distance. The UDS Library could make use of Web 2.0 technologies such as blogs, library website, social networks, video and audio conferencing, emails among others. The library management should also make opportunities available for face-to-face interactions among staff of the various campuses.

6.4.5 Knowledge acquisition

The library management should support staff to acquire professional knowledge either through funding formal education, or funding participation in external and
international trainings/workshops/conferences/seminars. This would improve staff skills and expertise and therefore boost their drive to share with colleagues.

6.4.6 Knowledge capture

Procedures should be laid down to direct the conversion of staff specialized tacit knowledge into explicit forms in order to retain knowledge of long serving or highly skilled staff to ensure continuity and prevent corporate amnesia.

6.4.7 Monitoring

The library should implement measures to monitor the knowledge shared and its effectiveness in enhancing service delivery so as to inform policy reforms and decision-making.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF OF THE UNIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES LIBRARY.

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION STUDIES

QUESTIONNAIRE

My name is Deborah M. Bumbie-Chi, an MPhil Information Studies final year student in the Department of Information Studies, College of Education, University of Ghana. In partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of my MPhil Degree, I am conducting a study on ‘Knowledge Sharing among Library staff in a Multi-Campus University: The Case of University for Development Studies (UDS), Tamale, Ghana’. Thus, this questionnaire is basically meant to help me obtain and collect data on the topic being studied. The data obtained from you and your institution shall be confidentially handled and shall be used for academic purposes only. Thank you for accepting to answer this questionnaire.

SECTION A: Demographic Characteristics

Gender of respondent: Male ☐ Female ☐

Age: 21-29 ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60+ ☐

Campus: ......................................................

Designation (rank/position): ..........................................................

Unit/Section of Respondent: ..........................................................

Highest Certificate obtained: ......................................................

Number of years working in the Library ......................................

For the purpose of this questionnaire,
Knowledge is restricted to professional information, skills and expertise

Knowledge sharing (KS) is the mutual exchange of knowledge (among colleagues, friends etc)

SECTION B: Knowledge Acquisition

1. How do you acquire professional knowledge related to your job? (Tick all applicable to you)
   a. Formal education [  ]
   b. In-service training [  ]
   c. Workshops, conferences and seminars [  ]
   d. Personal development [  ]
   e. Colleagues [  ]
   f. Other (Specify) ……………………………………………

2. Have you had the opportunity to pursue formal education during the period you have been working at the library? If yes, list the programme and qualification.
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

3. If no, why ……………………………………………………………………………

4. Have you attended training/workshops/conferences organized by the library on your campus? Yes [  ] No [  ]

5. If no, why ……………………………………………………………………………

6. Have you attended training/workshops/conferences organized by the library on a different campus? Yes [  ] No [  ]

7. If yes, which campus………………………………………………………………

8. If no, why …………………………………………………………………

9. In what capacity do you participate in such workshops? (Please tick all applicable to you)
   a. Participant [  ]
   b. Facilitator [  ]
   c. Other (Specify) …………………………………..

10. Have you attended training/workshops/conferences organized by institutions other than yours? Yes [  ] No [  ]

11. If yes, how often do you participate in such trainings/conferences/workshops?
    a. Very often (at most 5 times per year) [  ]
    b. Often (4 times per year) [  ]
    c. Not often (twice a year) [  ]

12. If no to Question 10, why ……………………………………………………..
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13. Have you attended any international conferences/workshops/trainings? Yes [  ]
   No [  ]
14. If yes, how often do you participate in such trainings/conferences/workshops?
   d. Very often (at most 5 times per year)
   e. Often (4 times per year)
   f. Not often (twice a year)
   g. Not at all
15. If No to Question 13, why? .................................................................
16. Any suggestions on how to improve knowledge acquisition in the library
   ...........................................................................................................

SECTION C: Perception and Participation in Knowledge Sharing

17. Do you think it is important to share knowledge with colleagues? Yes [  ]
   No [  ]
18. If yes, what are some of the benefits of knowledge sharing? (tick all that apply)
   a. Learn new or update existing information, skills and expertise [  ]
   b. Improve understanding of organizational goals [  ]
   c. Avoid duplication of efforts and processes [  ]
   d. Knowledge retention of long serving and highly skilled staff [  ]
   e. Maintain best practices and improve service delivery [  ]
   f. Foster trust and unity [  ]
   g. Others
      (specify)...........................................................................................
19. If no to Question 17, why .................................................................

20. **To what extent have you** … (please tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>2-3 times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>2-3 times a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received knowledge from colleagues in your library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used knowledge from colleagues in your library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received knowledge from colleagues in other campus libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used knowledge from colleagues in other campus libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How many staff in your library do you regularly communicate with on a daily basis?
22. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am an important part of my institution and I do my job well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my colleagues to do their job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the information received from co-workers is trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the expertise of my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I face difficulties at work, I know that my colleagues will help me out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues do not try to deceive for their own profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. How many staff in other campus libraries do you regularly communicate with?
   a. 0-4 people
   b. 5-9 people
   c. 10-14 people
   d. 15 and above

24. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

   **I share knowledge because …**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it is important to share knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to share knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my superiors to think I am a good employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want my superiors to think I am competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I might get a reward (headship appointment, recognition, promotion etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be positively noticed in the Library and institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to improve the performance and reputation of the Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
When I share my knowledge …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find it personally satisfying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am snobbish/arrogant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel competent and respected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn from my mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superiors and colleagues praise me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. To what extent do you **agree or disagree** with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job role allows me to share knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to necessary communication tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is enough time to share knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D: Strategies and Motivations for Knowledge Sharing**

27. What channels are available for sharing knowledge in your Library
   a. Formal meetings
   b. Workshops/trainings/seminars
   c. Personal conversations/face-to-face interactions
   d. Emails
   e. SMS
   f. Telephone
   g. Chat groups (Facebook, WhatsApp etc)
   h. Others (specify) .................................................................

28. From the channels above, list in order of preference, the top 3 you use often
...................................................................................................................

29. Does the library have laid down procedures/policy on knowledge sharing among staff?
   Yes [  ] No [ ] No idea [ ]

30. If yes, what does it entail .................................................................

31. If no, what procedures are currently available ...........................................

32. To what extent do the following statements **affect your participation in** Knowledge sharing

195
I can comfortably share my knowledge with my subordinates

I can comfortably share my knowledge with my superiors

I can comfortably share my knowledge with colleagues younger than myself

I can comfortably share my knowledge with colleagues older than myself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can comfortably share my knowledge with my subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can comfortably share my knowledge with my superiors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can comfortably share my knowledge with colleagues younger than myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can comfortably share my knowledge with colleagues older than myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is internal competition in my library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other employees can threaten my position in the library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is strong rivalry among colleagues in my library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance is important in my library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unit’s performance is important in my library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is strong rivalry among the different campus libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. What motivates you to share knowledge with colleagues?

........................................................................................................................................

35. What deters you from sharing knowledge with colleagues?

........................................................................................................................................

36. Any suggestions on motivating staff to share their knowledge

........................................................................................................................................

**SECTION E: Challenges of Knowledge Sharing**

37. Are there any challenges that affect knowledge sharing with colleagues within your library?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

38. If yes, what are they? ........................................................................................................

39. Are there any challenges that affect knowledge sharing with colleagues on other campus libraries?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

40. If yes, what are they? ........................................................................................................
41. Are there measures that can be taken to improve knowledge sharing among staff in the UDS Library? If yes, state them……………………………………………………………. Thank you.

APPENDIX II

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What is your position/perception on KS in academic libraries?
2. What benefits do you think KS has?
3. What are the strategies in place to enhance knowledge acquisition among staff in the library?
4. How does the library retain knowledge of staff (long serving or highly skilled) who leave or resign or die?
5. Does the library have a knowledge sharing policy?
6. If yes, what does it entail?
7. If no, why and what is the current practice?
8. Are there any structures in place to facilitate KS among staff?
9. What do you think are the motivations for staff to engage in KS?
10. What are some of your perceived barriers to KS among your staff?
11. What measures have been put in place to curb these barriers?
12. What is the way forward or the future of KS in the library?
APPENDIX III

For the purposes of maintaining the anonymity of the interviewees, the researcher coded all responses as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 1:</td>
<td>University Librarian, Nyankpala Campus Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 2:</td>
<td>Head, Information Services Department (ISD), Nyankpala Campus Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 3:</td>
<td>Head, Collection Development Department (CDD), Nyankpala Campus Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 4:</td>
<td>Campus Librarian, Wa Campus Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 5:</td>
<td>Campus Librarian, Navrongo Campus Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 6:</td>
<td>Campus Librarian, Dungu Campus Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee 7:</td>
<td>Campus Librarian, Tamale Campus B Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>