African Journal of Emerging Issues
Peer reviewed | Double blind | Interdisciplinary

African Journal of Emerging Issues
(AJOEI)
Online ISSN: 2663 - 9335
Available at: https://ajoeijournals.org

INFORMATION SCIENCE

KNOWLEDGE SHARING METHODS AMONG LIBRARY INFORMATION SCIENCE PROFESSIONALS IN IMPROVING SERVICE DELIVERY IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES LIBRARIES IN KIAMBU COUNTY, KENYA

[1*]Joseph Lamech Ondieki, [2]Dr. Jane Maina, [3]Dr. Samuel Macharia

[1]Department of Communication Media and Library Information Science,

Kisii University, Kenya

ljondieki@email.com

[2]Department of Communication Media and Library Information Science,

Kisii University, Kenya

janermaina@email.com

[3]Department of Communication Media and Library Information Science

Kisii University, Kenya

author3@email.com

Publication Date: April 2023

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: Increased organizational information and change have created a great need to manage knowledge to ensure effectiveness. The aim of the study was to investigate the influence of knowledge sharing practices among library information science professionals in improving service delivery in Public University libraries in Kiambu County, Kenya.

Problem statement: Information has been repackaged in a variety of ways, and new demands calls for re-engineering service delivery to meet changing user needs. This pattern requires that library information science professionals to be able to share knowledge in order to keep abreast with a changing information management terrain. Library information science professionals are struggling in integrating knowledge management methods in their work processes due to lack of a sharing culture, collaboration and limited skills for knowledge sharing leading to largely inaccessible knowledge due to limited knowledge sharing avenues.

Methodology: Cross-sectional survey research design was used to carry out research. With a population of 165 members of staff. This design is used in an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to investigate knowledge sharing between the two public Universities. Data was collected using questionnaires and interview.

Results of the study: The knowledge sharing strategies factors that had a statistically significant influence on library knowledge sharing at 95% confidence interval were; library knowledge sharing among working groups, library knowledge sharing among project teams, library knowledge sharing among learning community, library knowledge sharing among informal network and library knowledge sharing among community of practice that have P-value less 0.05. Work groups, project teams, learning community, informal network and community of practice (CoPs) were strategies available influencing the knowledge-sharing model.

Conclusion and policy recommendation: The 21st Century economy recognizes knowledge as the primary resource for wealth generation for competitive advantage, survival of the economy depends on knowledge creation, transfer and its maximum exploitation. Knowledge remains the greatest asset owned by LISP in universities, most universities have not recognized that knowledge sharing enhances institutional performance. The study therefore creates an environment where knowledge is shared to enhance performance and growth in public universities libraries. It is recommended that university libraries should consider putting in place knowledge management policies that encourage knowledge sharing. The absence of KM policies encourages knowledge loss, especially of retiring staff or those departing for other reasons. Policies aimed at preserving organisational intellectual assets are widely considered to enhance knowledge sharing in university libraries.

Keywords: *Knowledge management, knowledge sharing, service delivery, Public universities***.**

INTRODUCTION

Universities and their libraries are social organizations where workers transform resources for use by consumers through the functions of teaching, research, and service. The growing amount of transactional information in databases, knowledge embedded in processes and documentation, and explicit and implicit knowledge in the heads of the workers. As the pace of change increases and people change jobs more frequently, information and knowledge that used to be concentrated in one person or process increasingly being held by multifunctional teams with limited life spans, operating with rapidly changing systems and environments. Increased organizational information and change have created a great need to manage knowledge to ensure effectiveness. In higher education, librarians can play a vital role in knowledge-sharing (Townley, 2001).

Knowledge sharing refers to making personal and organizational knowledge accessible by others within the firm (Sandhu & Suppiah, 2011). Knowledge sharing has had significant attention in both the academic and business world making it one of the critical driving forces for business and organizations for more knowledge-intensive areas, as are hiring “minds” more than “hands” and the needs of leveraging the value of knowledge are increasing (Wong, 2005). The way management handles their staff may contribute to staff willing to share their insights based on their expectations and informed by their beliefs and experiences in their years of service. Cummings, (2003) argues that an environment that is characterized by trust, openness, tolerance, fairness, and a reward system avers that it would encourage knowledge sharing.

White (2004), in an examination which researched impression of library staff towards knowledge sharing at Oxford University Library Services, uncovered that the library had created Knowledge sharing apparatuses through which library staff shared tacit-knowledge and traded skills and expertise. Non-profit organizations that have implemented knowledge sharing is still rare,

especially library that implements knowledge sharing. Despite of this, many organizations are pioneering initiatives for making knowledge sharing for some reasons, for example to boost innovation both products and services (Irdiani, 2012). However, along with the global economic and information age urges libraries to adopt knowledge sharing in order to enhance knowledge creation. Library is the same as other organizations, through knowledge Sharing, it can accelerate the process of knowledge creation and reuse of knowledge, because the library services and products are constantly evolving.

The success, of any section in organizations depends on knowledge sharing which covers a wide range of organizational ideas including strategic, economic, behavioral, and managerial strategies (Biranvand, 2015). Knowledge sharing among staff and inside groups provides the organization with the opportunity to discover knowledge resources and then make investment in them (Wang & Noe, 2010). The most important reason behind the knowledge sharing system's lack of success in sharing knowledge is managers' lack of information on the factors affecting knowledge sharing (Jen & Wen, 2009). Libraries and information centers are amongst the organizations, which need knowledge sharing in their daily affairs. Libraries deliver high quality information for their patrons in a reasonable time, therefore, they are considered to be amongst organizations, which need to establish knowledge sharing elements, because librarians promote their specialized information level. Libraries play their role as knowledge disseminators, by providing a suitable context for knowledge sharing among their own staff and offer services to the other users and organizations (Biranvand, 2015).

Rotich and Munge (2007) observe that resource sharing, in the context of librarianship, as an omnibus expression to cover co-operation, coordination, inter-library loans, co-operative acquisitions, co-operative storage and processing. Information resources sharing is a wide phrase embracing information services cooperation, systems, and networking. Rotich and Muge (2007) citing Odini's (1991) assert that resource sharing may be seen as a term for working out inter-institutional relationships for the benefit of users in a profession which is frequently described as changing from materials-oriented to client-oriented.

Information professionals in Kenya realized that they cannot manage to acquire all the information resources their institutions require, and because of the information explosion, the amount of information generated is so enormous as to render its complete collection by one institution impossible. Hence the need to share and transfer information among themselves (Rotich & Muge, 2007). A study by Kabita (2021), on how coffee farmers in Kiambu County, Kenya share knowledge with the Coffee Research Institute who require specialised knowledge. The success of the venture in terms of quantity and quality of yields depends on the availability and access of relevant knowledge. The findings have demonstrated that the farmers and the institute currently share knowledge through a mixed array of methods. However, several challenges hinder the effective use of these knowledge-sharing strategies. The current symmetry of knowledge flow is lopsided since the Coffee Research Institute shares much more than it receives from the farmers creating challenges to famers to benefit optimally from the knowledge generated by the Coffee Research Institute.

Knowledge sharing helps workers solve problems, learn new things and increase understanding. Staff can learn from each other and benefit from new knowledge and development by one another. Staff who are able to share knowledge are more productive and more likely to survive on their jobs than staff who do not (Yang, 2004). Librarians by way of sharing their knowledge, experience, thoughts and beliefs mutually establish their common understanding. The most effective result of

using knowledge sharing practices is to improve workers' skills and knowledge, which in turn increased workers efficiency and productivity (Pearlasamy, 2009). Those with limited knowledge benefit from the advantage of knowledge sharing in organizations. Knowledge sharing has helped each librarian learn from the experiences and practices of others and increased workers efficiency in the library.

Knowledge sharing during collaborative learning benefits all participants in terms of positive learning outcomes and achieves more in cooperative interaction than in individualistic exchange. To acquire knowledge effectively as personal knowledge needs to be shared. Unless personal knowledge is shared with others, the knowledge is likely to have a limited impact on effectiveness. To ensure a good flow of information, librarians must share their knowledge. In the absence of this, there will be no free flow of knowledge, and this will lead to information hoarding (Yang, 2004). Therefore, a lot of emphasis on educating librarians who are well prepared to play an influential role in the knowledge society is required because librarians are the main driving force for educational development and the advancement of information. Effective sharing of this resource is consequently one of the most critical challenges facing librarians in university libraries (Aranda & Fernandez, 2002).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Library practices has evolved greatly resulting to technological growth. Information has been repackaged in a variety of ways, and new demands calls for re-engineering service delivery to meet changing user needs. This pattern requires that library information science professionals [LISP] to be able to share knowledge in order to keep abreast with a changing information management terrain. However, library professionals are still struggling in integrating KM strategies in their work processes due to lack of a sharing culture, collaboration and limited skills for knowledge sharing leading to largely inaccessible knowledge due to limited knowledge sharing avenues (Roknuzzaman & Umemoto, 2009).

Knowledge created and accumulated by library information science professionals in their duties towards fulfilling their service delivery mandates, engineered by the amount of training that occurs through the library operations (Mosala-Bryant, & Hoskins, 2017). The high turnover of library information science professionals by resignation, retirements, promotions, sickness and death, greatly affects how staff can share the knowledge which they have acquired through organizations spending on their training and other capacitating initiatives and also reduces the availability of potential mentors for new staff. The outcome of this knowledge loss in the library leads to inability to learn from experts, leading to unlearned lessons and repeated mistakes. This study therefore intends to evaluate the influence of knowledge sharing practices among library information science professionals in Public Universities in Kiambu County, Kenya.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

i. To establish the types of knowledge shared among LISP in improving service delivery in public university libraries in Kiambu County Kenya.
ii. To establish the methods available for knowledge sharing among LISP in improving service delivery in Public Universities in Kiambu County, Kenya.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

i. What types of knowledge are shared among LISP in improving service delivery in public university libraries in Kiambu County Kenya?

ii. Which methods are available for knowledge sharing practices among LISP in improving service delivery in Public Universities in Kiambu County, Kenya?

TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE SHARED

Knowledge exist in different forms to be able to distinguish them is an essential ingredient for knowledge management, as categorized by a leading authority (Nonaka, I994) who categorized knowledge as either tacit or explicit.

Tacit Knowledge

Tacit knowledge is subjective experience based knowledge that can't be expressed in words, sentences, numbers or formulas, because it is context specific and personal in nature (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Cognitive skills such as beliefs, images, intuition and mental models are included as well as technical skills such as craft and know-how (Brown & Duguid 1998). It is deeply rooted in action, commitment and involvement making it hard to communicate. Tacit knowledge is most likely to lead to breakthroughs because it is the most valuable source of knowledge (Wellman, 2009). Tacit knowledge is characterized by experience, expertise and skills of an individual, which are difficult to describe with language (Haldin-Herrgard, 2000), to document and store. Tacit knowledge is unobservable, difficult to teach, encode, and hard to separate from the context where it exists (McLever et al., 2013). Ali and Khan (2016). Observes tacit knowledge as information exchanged on any given job training, by communities of practices, mentoring and knowledge sharing forums like seminars, conferences, workshops, and knowledge fairs. Tacit Knowledge shared from one LISP to another or a group. These are members engaged in a formal institution, for instance colleagues in a workplace.

Explicit Knowledge

Explicit knowledge is objective and rational knowledge that can be expressed in words, sentences, numbers or formulas. It includes theoretical approaches, problem solving, manuals and databases that can be transferred more easily than tacit knowledge. It is also sometimes referred to as know-what (Brown & Duguid 1998). How to access to the knowledge and Guidance, LISP are considered to be the key in the building-up of a knowledge sharing system (Gamble & Blackwell, 2001).

Explicit knowledge is expressed formally using a system of symbols, making it to be easily communicated either in rule-based or object-based. When explicit knowledge shared in object-based, it is found as software codes, computer databases, technical drawings, tools, photographs, voice recordings and films (Dentakos, 2020) represented using strings of symbols (words, numbers and formulas). Explicit knowledge when codified into rules, or operating procedures, it is said to be rule-based. Knowledge sharing on operational procedures in libraries ensures that LISP adequately observe proper procedures when handling work in their sections. If explicit knowledge is well documented in the booklet's on information science services it can provide guidance in case of any necessary action that needs to be administered to the users.

Embedded Knowledge Sharing

This type of knowledge is normally found in structures, routines, processes, products, and artefacts (Hlatshwayo, 2017), through management initiative to formalize a certain beneficial routine used in the organization applying tacit and explicit knowledge. Embedded knowledge needs to be followed strictly in order to be effective in terms of rules and regulations, which provide guidance

and can help promote the standardization of operational procedures. Embedded knowledge is found in rules, processes, manuals, organizational culture, and products. Embedded knowledge refers to the knowledge that is locked in processes, products, culture, routines, artifacts, or structures (Gamble & Blackwell 2001). Knowledge is embedded formally through a management initiative to formalize a certain beneficial routine, or informally as the organization uses and applies the other two knowledge types.

METHODS OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING PRACTICES AMONG LISP

Organizations are realizing that they need people-focused methods in which organization members are able to interact virtually to facilitate the sharing of tacit knowledge (Rambur & Saenz, 2007). Knowledge sharing necessitates understanding on how a variety of social structures in organizations provides a context for knowledge-sharing processes to take place (Blankenship & Ruona, 2007).

Work Groups

These are groups of LISP working together on a regular basis to attain common goals (Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 1994). They are like business units or departments/Sections' which are typically found in functional organizational structures where activities are grouped according to logic of similarity in work functions (Hatch, 1997). They consist of members who have similar roles, job assignments and report to the same manager. Cummings (2004) observes that work groups may be more structurally diverse, in situations where members of the group are dispersed across different geographic locations, representing different functions, report to different managers and working in different business units. They are formed on grounds of a formalized organizational structure, working together until when re-organization occurs.

Project Team

Project teams are made up of members with complementary skills working together to achieve a common purpose for which they are accountable (Schermerhorn *et al.*, 1994). These are cross functional and organized to complete a specific project and their members are selected by management (Wenger & Snyder, 2000). They stay together until when the project is completed and then disbands. The popularity of the team-based concept, project teams are found in several types of organizational structures, but are most commonly found in organizations with a matrix structure that combines the efficiency and flexibility found in functional and multidivisional structures (Hatch, 1997). Fong (2003) examines knowledge sharing as working with other knowledge processes in knowledge creation and integration, for the success of the project team. Falling of project teams in knowledge sharing is because they are temporary in nature and new knowledge gained may be lost when the team disbands, if there are no systems in place to capture and disperse the knowledge that reside within the project team (Ruuska & Vartiainen, 2005).

Strategic Community

Strategic communities have a limited number of experts within the organization who share a common and work-related interest. These communities are formed by the organization to achieve certain business goals. They are expected to perform for the company or organization through development of innovative solutions and best practices, which differentiates a strategic community from Communities of Practice (CoPs) (Ruuska & Vartiainen, 2003).

Learning Community

Learning communities are methods that provide space for learning and sharing knowledge, within the education literature and the structure is called professional learning community (PLC). Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, and Thomas (2006) observes that there is no universal definition for PLCs, in International consensus PLC is a "group of people sharing and critically interrogating their practice in an ongoing, reflective, collaborative, inclusive, learning-oriented and growth-promoting way." Their focus is on professional learning within a community context. Blankenship and Ruona's (2007) examines PLCs, as communities which develop around a shared vision, specific goal or professional learning need. They vary in size, membership and activities that are sanctioned and supported by the organizational leaders like reflective dialogue, peer coaching and study records which are the ways knowledge is shared.

Community of Practice (CoPs)

Communities of practice (Cops), as a communication channel of knowledge sharing are formal and informal groupings of people who voluntarily share similar interests and goals. Cops are another way of organizing work interactions between employees and they are very effective in leveraging knowledge flows (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005). Most Cops use internet or computer mediated communications facilities, such as blogs, to interchange ideas and knowledge. Ramirez, (2007) agrees that weblogs used in communities of practice could help in sharing knowledge of a particular area of interest, by posing questions, sharing ideas, comments and experiences. However, Atwood (2009) warns that caution therefore be exercised to avoid positing of unprofessional and inappropriate issues to be shared.

In this case, participants preferred the presence of multiple sharing channels like video conferencing and face-to-face meetings. LISP were interested in using Cops as a knowledge sharing strategy, because it gave them an opportunity select a list of Staff they were interested in, setting up their own communities because of the nature of the information they needed was very sensitive.

Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) CoPs share a concern, a set of problems, a passion about a topic and deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting regularly. Their basic notion is to share a common passion and they interact with the intent to share knowledge. Wenger (1999) highlights how CoPs combine three elements of joint enterprise, mutuality, and shared repertoire to allow members to have the potential to learn and improve practice. This concept is Key to understanding how members interact within the community to continually learn from each other and create their shared repertoire.

Informal Network

Krackhardt and Kilduff (2002) observes how human behavior is embedded in social networks that facilitate the flow of knowledge and other resources between individuals and groups. A network is a set of actors who are connected by ties (Borgatti & Foster, 2003). Actors may be individuals, teams, organizations, etc. The ties that connect the actors are characterized in a multitude of ways, as being directed or undirected, valued or dichotomous. Directed or undirected ties describe whether knowledge is flowing in either one direction (directed) or both directions (undirected). Valued refers to how strong or weak the ties may be. Networks exist in all types of organizations, from highly formalized hierarchical structures to matrix and network structures, like advice

networks, trust networks, and communication networks span the boundaries of formal functions and divisions.

Informal networks exist in various forms in organizations for various purposes and this is where work is done in organizations (Krackhardt & Hanson, 1993). They provide space through which acquisition, sharing, and creation can take place. Networks emerge based on the relationships that individuals form with others. They are the basis from which other social structures may emerge; however, networks based on both personal and professional relationships can exist independent of other social structures, both within and across organizations (Ruuska & Vartiainen, 2003).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Kothari (2011) argues that a research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose. A research design is the structure, or the blueprint, of research that guides the process of research from the formulation of the Questionnaire up to the point of reporting the research findings.

Cross-sectional survey research design was used to carry out research. This design is used in an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to investigate knowledge sharing between the two public Universities. The study requires collection of quantifiable information from the study sample (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Types of Knowledge

The study was to establish the types of knowledge shared among librarians and the findings are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Types of knowledge sharing encounters

Rank	Types of knowledge sharing encounters	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Embedded Knowledge	130	89
2	Explicit Knowledge	102	69.9
3	Tacit Knowledge	91	62.3

From Table 1 above the results indicates that a majority of the librarian's ranked embedded knowledge 89% (130) as the preferred types of knowledge used by LISP in the work place as reflected in the sharing encounters. Explicit knowledge was ranked second at 69.9% (102) and tacit knowledge was ranked third at 62% (91). This implies that most LISP shared embedded knowledge while executing their duties, because knowledge from one process incorporated into another. Knowledge locked within the sources should be transferred to relevant users. Gamble and Blackwell (2001) use planning Scenario, as the practice of creating a set of scenarios and hypothesizing how these scenarios might unfold by drawing upon the perspectives of experts and the firm's knowledge asserts. Explicit knowledge is expressed using a system of symbols, making it to be easily communicated either in rule-based or object-based. Jackson *et al.* (2003) acknowledges that explicit knowledge management systems are quite transparent and therefore easy to replicate thus cannot be the source of sustained long-term competitive advantage.

Knowledge sharing forums

The study sort to find out in what forums are used to share knowledge by LISP. The findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Knowledge sharing forums

Rank	Knowledge sharing forums	Frequency	Percentage
1	Forum (public place for meeting)	142	97
2	Workshops	113	77
3	Seminars	79	54
4	Orientation	57	39
5	Induction	33	23

From the Table 2 on knowledge sharing forums, forum was ranked first with 97% (142) respondents. Workshops were ranked second with 77% (113) respondents, followed by seminars with 54% (79) respondents. Orientation and induction were ranked fourth and fifth with 39% (57) and 23% (33) respondents respectively. From the Table 2 above it implies that most LISP prefer to share embedded knowledge in forum and workshops, because of diverse expertise for one to prove that he/she is an authority in a particular area. This deny staff opportunities to learn from experienced staff this concurs with Kankanhalli *et al.* (2005) who posit that LISP are afraid that they will lose power position in the organization if they contribute unique knowledge to others which may make them better than the originators of knowledge.

Knowledge Sharing Methods

Respondents were asked to show how far they agreed with the knowledge sharing strategies. Results are as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Knowledge sharing methods among LISP in Public Universities

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std. Deviation
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Work groups	2(1.4)	6(4.1)	9(6.2)	26(17.8)	103(70.5)	4.69	.670
Library database	5(3.4)	9(6.2)	13(8.9)	46(31.5)	73(50.0)	4.59	.519
Project teams	5(3.4)	9(6.2)	11(7.5)	27(18.5)	94(64.4)	4.43	.873
Community of Practice (CoPs)	4(2.7)	7(4.8)	18(12.3)	36(24.7)	81(55.5)	4.37	.821
Learning community	2(1.4)	21(14.4)	33(22.6)	47(32.2)	43(29.5)	3.69	1.082
Strategic community	2(1.4)	29(19.9)	35(24.0)	46(31.5)	34(23.3)	3.53	1.104
Informal Network	7(4.8)	28(19.2)	47(32.2)	49(33.6)	15(10.3)	3.38	.940

The results in Table 3 indicates that the staff strongly agreed with a mean of 4.69 that knowledge can be shared through work groups and with a mean of 4.59, knowledge can also be shared through library database. With a mean of 4.43 respondents agreed that knowledge can be shared through

project teams and through communities of practice with a mean of 4.37. Respondents were neutral on informal network with a mean of 3.38.

This implies that respondent agreed that some of the methods such as work group, project teams and communities of practice were available but were neutral on informal networks may be because of lack of knowledge. The results confirm Fong (2003) observation that knowledge sharing is working with other knowledge processes, for the success of the organizational objectives. The DULI, DULII and DULIII from both universities agreed that: -

> *"Knowledge sharing methods were available in both libraries, they were almost similar in that staff were organized in sections and each section performs its rightful duties. For example, circulation staff share all activities in the section and when handing over to shift workers. There is one senior staff in charge, (empties) who oversees coordination of services at circulation, matched with staff with similar interests."*
>
> *"Confirmed that staff were scheduled individually on how they will be attending training to enhance their knowledge. Each section has a list of activities and procedure of doing work which is shared in case of transfer or resignation. Exit minutes are also filled in the librarian's office and the soft copy of procedures are kept in the library database." (DULII; DULIII)*

Data capturing methods

The study sought to find out how the library ensured that it retained and shared knowledge of staff leaving the library for new employment or retirement. The results are as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Data capturing methods

	Frequency	Percent
Creating a library staff database where staff share information	12	8%
Exit plans to ensure knowledge is captured and orientation of new users and induction of new staff	126	89%
Inform library clients on everyday activities	4	3%
Total	142	100

The results in Table 4 indicates the different ways libraries used to retained and shared knowledge retention with 126 (89%) who were the majority indicated that there exit plans to ensure knowledge is captured and orientation of new users and induction of new staff. 12 (8%) indicated said creating a library staff database where staff share information with the least 4 (3%) indicating that need to inform library clients on everyday activities.

Methods of capturing and acquiring knowledge

Respondents were asked to indicate how they capture and acquire knowledge from external and internal clients. Results are as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Methods of capturing and acquiring knowledge

Capturing/ Acquiring	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std. Deviation
Networking with other libraries and with institutions of all kind			3(2.1)	34(23.3)	109(74.7)	4.73	.492
Attending conferences, seminars, and workshops			5(3.4)	48(32.9)	93(63.7)	4.60	.557
Online databases Searching			6(4.1)	53(36.3)	87(59.6)	4.55	.576
Standardized routine information-update reports	0	2(1.4)	14(9.7)	78(54.2)	50(34.7)	4.22	.674
Discussion forums		4(2.7)	18(12.5)	77(53.5)	45(31.3)	4.13	.731
Collating internal profiles of academic librarians	4(2.7)	27(18.5)	24(16.4)	47(32.2)	44(30.4)	3.68	1.167
Buying knowledge products or resources in the form of manuals, blueprints, research reports and other reports	8(5.5)	44(30.1)	16(11.0)	37(25.3)	41(28.1)	3.40	1.321
Customer based client system that capture reference and responses	20(13.7)	26(17.8)	19(13.0)	46(31.5)	35(24.0)	3.34	1.377
Subscribing to listservs and online or virtual Communities of Practice	4(2.7)	54(37.0)	19(13.0)	33(22.6)	36(24.7)	3.29	1.271
Existence of a folder of FAQs	20(13.7)	28(19.4)	30(20.8)	24(16.8)	42(29.3)	3.28	1.421

The results in Table 5 respondents strongly agreed that they networked with other libraries and with institutions of all kind with a mean of 4.73. Respondents also strongly agreed that they attended conferences, seminars, and workshops, hand acquired knowledge through searching online databases with a mean of 4.60 and 4.55 respectively.

From the results it implies that majority of the staff were aware of the methods used in capturing and acquisition of knowledge from their internal and external clients. Respondents said that

> *"the attitude of library staff towards knowledge sharing is positive however some are not ready to share their knowledge mainly for position held by them" (UL, DULI, DULII, DULIII).*

Knowledge Retention methods

The study sought to find out how the library ensured that they retained and shared knowledge of staff leaving the library for green pasture or retirement. The results are as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: How Library retains and shares knowledge from staff

Knowledge Retention methods	Frequency	Percent
Achieving working conditions and staff induction	70	80
No formal process	10	11
Through all campus's librarian meetings done every year where experiences and reports are shared and quarterly reports	2	2
Recruiting some staff to replace the departing ones	3	3
capturing information and disseminate them to the user, online database	2	2
Total	87	100

Results in Table 6 revealed that libraries used different ways to ensure retention and knowledge sharing among staff due to attrition by staff leaving the library for greener pastures or through retirement/death. The majority of the staff at 70 (80%) felt that achieving working conditions and staff induction formed a strategy for retention and sharing of knowledge by LISPs. This implies that LISPs were aware of the need for retaining and sharing knowledge. The study therefore contradicts Kankanhalli *et al.* (2005) who posited that LISP were afraid to share knowledge for fear of losing power position in the organization if they contribute unique knowledge. The study concludes that majority of LISP supported knowledge retention and sharing, by preparing work procedures, induction, regular meetings, exit minutes and databases for work procedures.

Knowledge Skills and Expertise

The study sought to find out the skilled and expertise shared among LISP. The results are as tabulated in Table 7.

Table 7: Knowledge skills and expertise shared by Library Information science professionals.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std. Deviation
Orientation skills	0	0	2(1)	37(25)	107(73)	4.78	.415
Marketing skills	0	27(18)	39(27)	31(21)	49(34)	4.71	.487
Acquisitions of new materials skills	0	7(5)	5(3)	58(40)	76(52)	4.69	.545
Online databases search skills	0	1(1)	4(3)	49(34)	92(63)	4.63	.563
Management skills	0	26(18)	45(31)	32(22)	43(29)	4.60	.492
Classification and cataloguing skills	0	1(1)	5(3)	57(39)	83(57)	4.58	.573
Data entry skills	0	1(1)	3(2)	29(20)	113(77)	4.48	.528
Information literacy skills	2(1)	45(31)	16(11)	27(18)	56(38)	3.66	1.097

The results in Table 7 shows the staff knowledge skills and expertise shared among LISP. The results indicated that staff strongly agreed that orientation skills with a mean of 4.78, marketing skills with a mean of 4.71, and acquisitions of new materials skills with mean of 4.69 was shared among LISP. Respondents also strongly agreed that they shared online databases search skills with a mean of 4.63, management skills with a mean of 4.60, classification and cataloguing skills of library materials with a mean of 4.58, and Data entry skills with a mean of 4.48. Respondents

agreed that Information literacy skills with a mean of 3.66. Implications of the study is that LISPs share a variety of skill and expertise in handling knowledge. The study concludes therefore that there exists professionalism in Library work.

Knowledge Sharing improve/Promote service delivery

Further, respondents were asked to show how the KS techniques supported service delivery. The results are as computed in Table 8.

Table 8: Knowledge Sharing Support on service delivery

	Frequency	Percent
Build capacity across different carders	44	35.2
Formulation of work procedures and staff orientation	23	18.4
Marketing library products and services	15	12.0
Transfer of knowledge and experience to upcoming librarians	10	8.0
Create uniformity in working relations	10	8.0
Easy information access	10	8.0
Consistency in service delivery	6	4.8
promoting professionalism and reaches many people in less time	3	2.4
Bringing information closer to the user, easy access to information and retrieval	2	1.6
Contribute to database collection	2	1.6
	125	**100**

The results in Table 8 shows that 125 responded to the question with 21 respondents declining. The results indicated that knowledge sharing can improve and promote service delivery by building capacity across different carders with a mean of out of which 44(35.2%). formulation of work procedures and staff with a mean 23(18.4%) and orientation with a mean 15(12%) with 10(8%) marketing library products and services. Respondents also disagreed that transfer of knowledge and experience to upcoming librarians, creates uniformity in working relations and easy information access respectively in equal proportion. With a mean of 10(8%). This study confirms that KS has a positive impact on service delivery. It confirms the contribution of Alavi and Leidner (2001) that knowledge sharing systems encompass technological initiatives useful in the creation of databases of experts, the development of decision aids and expert system

Knowledge sharing Techniques

Respondents were asked to indicate what knowledge sharing techniques used in their library. The results are as shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Knowledge Sharing Techniques used in the library

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std. Deviation
E-mail	0	2(1)	3(2)	34(23)	107(73)	4.72	.508
Face to face meetings	0	0	6(4)	59(40.4)	81(55.5)	4.54	.589
Libraries web page	2(1)	1(1)	9(6)	49(34)	85(58)	4.47	.754
Seminars	2(1)	5(3)	11(8)	55(38)	73(50)	4.22	.921
Intranet	2(1)	3(2)	37(25)	53(36)	51(35)	4.05	.916
Telecommunication	5(3)	59(40)	24(16)	27(18)	31(21)	3.14	1.274
Blogs	8(5)	54(37)	53(36)	12(8)	19(13)	2.92	1.108
Forum	33(23)	39(27)	28(19)	16(11)	30(21)	2.88	1.423
Wikis	37(25)	41 (28)	28(19)	13(9)	27(18)	2.75	1.423
Skype	13(9)	76(52)	22(15)	14(10)	21(14)	2.69	1.229

The results in 9 shows that staff strongly agreed that knowledge was shared among librarians using email with a mean of 4.72 and face-to-face meetings with a mean of 4.54. Respondents agreed that they used of libraries web page with a mean of 4.47, seminars with a mean of 4.22 and intranet with a mean of 4.05. Some respondent were neutral on the use of telecommunication with a mean of 3.14, blogs with a mean of 2.92; forum with a mean of 2.88; wikis with a mean of 2.75 and Skype with a mean of 2.69. These patterns may be due to lack of the equipment and knowledge to interact with various modern communication platforms.

This implies that LISP had slow adoption of new technologies as information delivery tools. The results reveal a point of departure in technology adoption in knowledge sharing. With the use of email and web pages taking prominence, however face-to-face meetings still hold importance in traditional knowledge sharing practices the respondents DULI, DULII DULIII and ULII from two public universities affirmed that

> *"there is full time Internet for all its electronic transactions like emails, intranet, blogs wikis, skype and telecommunication. Above all because of location and accessibility WhatsApp has taken root in terms of Knowledge sharing."*

CONCLUSIONS

The 21st Century economy recognizes knowledge as the primary resource for wealth generation for competitive advantage, survival of the economy depends on knowledge creation, transfer and its maximum exploitation. Knowledge remains the greatest asset owned by LISP in universities, most universities have not recognized that knowledge sharing enhances institutional performance. The study therefore creates an environment where knowledge is shared to enhance performance and growth in public universities libraries.

Knowledge sharing methods among Library Information Science professionals in Public Universities in Kiambu County, Kenya implies that respondent agreed that some of the methods such as work group, project teams and communities of practice were available at work places. Informal networks were neutral because of lack of knowledge that knowledge sharing is working with other knowledge processes, for the success of the organization. The study concluded that lack

of knowledge sharing culture motivated individual factors such as personal values, beliefs and norms. The integration of different cultures through merging of library operations has brought about different expectations and uncertainties among library staff that has further limited knowledge sharing among staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The library management should create a knowledge sharing culture by putting in place a good working environment where staff can develop a culture of knowledge sharing across all LISP bearing in mind the wide academic programs offered in public universities. Organizational culture promotes values and encourages sharing of important knowledge. Exciting LISP are more likely to pass on their knowledge through personal interactions rather than depositing it in technological databases, therefore recommend that senior management implement long-term initiatives to develop a knowledge sharing culture with regular team briefings and team building events.

The respondents also agreed on putting in place mentorship programs to promote knowledge sharing. This will help in implementing enabling knowledge sharing strategies such as ICT infrastructure, mentorship programs, job rotation policy and performance evaluation systems in developing new skills and ideas that will affect the library's long-term performance and competitiveness. It is recommended that university libraries should consider putting in place knowledge management policies that encourage knowledge sharing.

REFERENCES

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge sharing and Knowledge sharing Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues. *MIS Quarterly*, *25*(1), 107-136. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961

Aranda, D. & Fernandez, L. (2002). Determinant of innovation through a knowledge-based theory. *Journal for Knowledge sharing*, *102*(5), 289-296. https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570210428320

Atwood, C.G. 2009. *Knowledge management basics*. The American Society for training and development, Alexandra: ASTD Press.

Biranvand, A., Seif, M., & Khasseh, A. A. (2015). Knowledge sharing among librarians in public libraries of Fars Province, Iran. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, *1*, 1259.

Blankenship, S. S., & Ruona, W. E. A. (2007). Professional learning communities and communities of practice: A comparison of models. In F. Nafukho (Ed.), *AHRD 2007 International Conference Proceedings* (pp. 888-895). Indianapolis, IN: Academy of Human Resource Development.

Cabrera, E. F. & Cabrera, A. (2005). Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(5), 720-735. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500083020

Cummings, J. (2003). *Knowledge sharing: a review of the literature.* Operation Evaluation Department Working Paper. World Bank.

Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work groups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organization. *Management Science, 50*(3), 352-364. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1030.0134

Earney, S. & Martins, A. (2009). Job rotation at Cardiff University Library Service: a pilot study. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 41*(4), 213-226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000609345089

Fong, P. S. W. (2003). Knowledge creation in multidisciplinary project teams: Anb empirical study of the processes and their dynamic relationships. *International Journal of Project Management, 21*(7), 479-486. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(03)00047-4

Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Irdiani, A. (2012). Peran knowledge sharing di kalangan karyawan. *Librinet,l, 1*(1).

Jen, C.C. & Wen, .J. (2009). Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance the mediating role of knowledge management capacity. *Journal of business research, 62*,108 - 112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.11.016

Kabita, E., Kwanya, T., & Mbenge-Ndiku, T. (2021). Knowledge Sharing Strategies between Coffee Farmers and Coffee Research Institute: A Case Study of Gitwe Farmers' Co-Operative Society. https://doi.org/10.53615/2232-5697.10.157-175

Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., & Wei, K. K. (2005). Contributing knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories: An empirical investigation. *Mis Quarterly, 29*(1), 113-143. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148670

Kothari, C.R. (2011). *Research Methodology-Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: New age publications.

Krackhardt, D., & Hanson, J. R. (1993). Informal networks: The company behind the charts. *Harvard Business Review, 71*(4), 104-111. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733(02)00008-4

Krackhardt, D., & Kilduff, M. (2002). Structure, culture and Simolean ties in entrepreneurial firms. *Social Networks, 24*(3), 279-290.

Liu, N. C & Liu, M. S. (2011). Human resource practices and individual knowledge sharing behaviour: an empirical study for Taiwanese R&D professionals. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(4), 981-987. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.555138

Mosala-Bryant, N.N. & Hoskins, R.G., (2017). Motivational theory and knowledge sharing in the public service, *South African Journal of Information Management 19*(1), a772. https://doi.org/10.4102/ sajim.v19i1.772. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v19i1.772

Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research Methods:* Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Nairobi: Acts Press.

Mutula, S.M. & Jacobs, M.E. (2010). Challenges of information illiterate first-year entrants for the University of Botswana, Botswana: Sage. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666909358304

Peariasamy, T. (2009). A study on the influence of performance reward on knowledge sharing, factors, barriers and recommendations. Retrieved from http://www.fppsm.utm.my/files/journal/JK 07/706.pdf.

Rambur, N., & Sáenz, J. (2007). Promoting people-focused knowledge sharing: The case of IDOM. *Journal of Knowledge sharing*, *11*(4), 72-81. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270710762729

Rambur, N., & Sáenz, J. (2007). Promoting people-focused knowledge sharing: The case of IDOM. *Journal of Knowledge sharing*, *11*(4), 72-81. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270710762729

Ramirez, A. (2007). To blog or not to blog: understanding and overcoming the challenge of knowledge sharing, Journal *of Knowledge Management Practice*, *8*(1), 1-12.

Roknuzzaman, M., & Umemoto, K. (2009). How library practitioners view knowledge sharing in libraries: A qualitative study. *Library Management*, *30*(8/9), 643-656. https://doi.org/10.1108/01435120911006593

Rotich, D. C., & Munge, E. M. (2007). An overview of electronic information resources sharing initiatives in Kenyan universities. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, *73*(1), 64-74. https://doi.org/10.7553/73-1-1335

Ruuska, I., & Vartiainen, M. (2003). Communities and other social structures for knowledge sharing—A case study in an Internet consultancy company. In M. Huysman, E. Wenger, & V. Wulf (Eds.), *Communities and technologies* (pp. 163-184). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-0115-0_9

Ruuska, I., & Vartiainen, M. (2005). Characteristics of knowledge sharing communities in project organizations. *International Journal of Project Management*, *23*(5), 374-379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2005.01.003

Sandhu, M., Jain, K., & Ahmad, I. (2011). Knowledge sharing among public sector employees: evidence from Malaysia, International Journal of Public Sector Management, 24(3), 206-226. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513551111121347

Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (1994). *Managing organizational behavior*. New York: Wiley.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, *7*(4), 221-258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8

Townley, C.T. (2001). Knowledge management and academic libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, *62*(1), 44-55. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.62.1.44

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. Human resource management review, 20(2), 115-131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.10.001

Wenger, E. (1999). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, *7*(2), 225-246. https://doi.org/10.1177/135050840072002

Wenger, E. C., & Snyder, W. M. (2000). Communities of practice: The organizational frontier. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(1), 139-145.

White, T. (2004), Knowledge sharing in an academic library, paper presented at IFLA 70, Buenos Aires.

Wong, K. Y. (2005). Critical success factors for implementing KM in small and medium enterprises, *Industrial management and Data systems, 105*(3), 261 – 279. Retrieved from: (www. Emeraldinsight.com /0263.5577. html). https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570510590101

Yang, J. (2004). Job related knowledge sharing, comparative case study. *Journals of Knowledge sharing, 8*(3), 118-126. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270410541088