International Journal of Library and Information Science Studies
Vol.6, No.2, pp.1-13, May 2020
Published by ECRTD- UK
Print ISSN: 2059-9056, Online ISSN: 2059-9064

KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND UTILISATION AS MEANS OF SERVICE DELIVERY AMONG LIBRARY PERSONNEL IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTHWEST, NIGERIA

Dr. Bamigboye, Olusola Bamidele, Ogunyinka, Babatunde Akeem, Dr. Aderibigbe Nurudeen Adeniyi
Federal University of Agriculture Library, P.M.B 2240, Abeokuta Ogun State Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This study examines knowledge sharing and utilization as means of service delivery among Library personnel in selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria. The population of the study was made up of Academic Librarians, Library Officers and Library Assistants. The study covered 12Nigerian University Libraries. Questionnaire was used for data collection. The instruments were grouped into four sections. Findings of the study revealed that both the tacit and explicit knowledge were being shared among the library personnel in which tacit knowledge was the most shared knowledge, library personnel shared knowledge with their colleagues most in the same department, seminars, workshops, mobile phones, conferences and staff meeting were the major modes of knowledge sharing and finally, the study revealed that acquisition, cataloguing and classification, selective dissemination of information and inter library loan were the major types of services rendered among library personnel in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria. Some of the recommendations were that Library management should encourage and promote knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization among library personnel and Library management should clearly state knowledge management strategy and create knowledge sharing initiatives in the library's goals.*

KEYWORDS: knowledge sharing, utilisation, service delivery, Nigerian university, libraries

INTRODUCTION

Quality service delivery is the goal of any library. The success or failure of any library depends largely on how its goal of quality service delivery is actualised. Librarians strive at all times to ensure that their goal of quality service delivery is achieved. Achieving this goal is a function of many factors, which include knowledge sharing and utilisation. Hence, the importance of knowledge sharing and utilisation among library personnel to the actualisation of quality service delivery cannot be over emphasised. Library is the centre of knowledge community; therefore, knowledge sharing among library personnel, users, or, between library personnel and patrons may help in enhancing library services.

Lee (2005) stated that knowledge and experiences of library personnel are resources of any library and should be valued, shared and exploited optimally. This shows that knowledge sharing is an important factor to improving service delivery in university libraries. Drawing from the foregoing, tacit knowledge includes employees' skills, experiences, and value judgments that reside in the

mind of an individual and often difficult to document, people often feel that sharing what they know will make them expendable or that their knowledge on any given subject is what makes them unique (Naikal and Paloti, 2015).
Knowledge sharing, therefore, can be described as the provision of task information and expertise to help and collaborate with others to develop new ideas, implement policies or procedures, or solve problems. Knowledge sharing can happen by means of eye-to-eye interchange or composed correspondence through systems administration with different specialists, or recording, arranging and gathering information for others (Pulakos, Dorsey and Borman 2003; Cummings, 2014).

However, sharing and acquiring knowledge is not enough or meaningful if not utilised. It is only through effective utilisation of knowledge that service delivery in academic libraries can be positively affected. Never before has the volume of knowledge and information continued to grow as rapidly as it does today. This abundance of information and the availability of various high-technology options for diffusing information indicate that the lack of quality service delivery, which is widely seen as retarding organisational growth (Popoola and Haliso, 2009), results from the ineffective functioning of the third basic information process: utilisation. The quality service delivery challenge can be viewed as a problem of adequate and proper knowledge utilisation, in that quality service delivery can be achieved if available knowledge is better utilised(MacDonald, 2018).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Knowledge is perceived to be a product of information. When information is analysed, processed and placed within context, it becomes knowledge. This fact is reflected in the definition of knowledge as defined by Alavi and Leidner (2001). They explained knowledge as information that resides in the heart of an individual. Besides, knowledge contrasts from information in that it is prescient and can be utilised to guide activity, while information simply means data in setting or documentation of any pieces of knowledge (Wiig, 2009).

Libraries act as a gateway for social and intellectual communications in communities and organisations (Robertson and Reese, 1999). Nonetheless, these gateways confront immense difficulties, as different knowledge resources are contained inside them. These knowledge resources include electronic journals, online databases, professional websites and other electronic resources, making it more difficult for library personnel to deal with the readers' issues. Library personnel need a variety of information and solutions in a timely manner. Information creation was embedded in knowledge sharing; knowledge sharing depends on information creation essentials (Robert, 2009).

In this circumstance, knowledge and experience sharing between library personnel turn out to be progressively imperative and essential. Specifically, with the advancement of the web condition, knowledge sharing in libraries is becoming increasingly crucial (Tait, Martzoukou and Reid, 2016). As library personnel face different circumstances or issues each day, they require different sorts of knowledge from particular domains. Productive knowledge sharing has been especially

powerful in contributing experiences into library institutions. In any case, knowledge sharing in libraries remains a disregarded research range (Liu, Chang, and Hu, 2010).

Anna and Puspitasari (2013) conducted a study on knowledge sharing strategy in Indonesian university libraries and revealed that knowledge sharing has not been formally adopted by many libraries. But in the process of implementation of knowledge sharing, it is visible from the strategy that only focuses on the implementation of knowledge sharing (face to face meeting) or just to share the results of the seminar and training without considering knowledge sharing as a complex process of knowledge creation. While the long haul and the most critical objective in knowledge sharing are the makings of new information and development has not been so obvious.

Shanhong (2000) depicted how libraries can manage the creation and sharing of information among their personnel. She suggested that libraries ought to make and build up their own archive information resources. She additionally stressed that, in sharing of knowledge, libraries should make exhaustive use of expert systems and all media. A few researchers from the library calling have endeavored to distinguish necessities by which libraries can advance knowledge sharing among library personnel, their patrons, and suppliers in their regular exercises. Nonetheless, this is a rising interest moderately new in this calling, and hence approaches that manage these issues are for the most general nature. As submitted by Parirokh, Daneshgar, and Fattahi (2007), they argued that knowledge sharing initiatives have not been mostly institutionalized in majority of the higher institution libraries. In support of this submission, Maponya (2014) argued that most of the knowledge sharing endeavors in academic libraries is largely uncoordinated; thus, the quest for sharing information and knowledge among library personnel has always been on an informal basis and usually based on verbal conversations rather than following official and coordinated structures. Consequently, knowledge and information are lost from time to time (Mittelstrass, 2010).

Fareed, Lucas and Ali (2004) pointed out that knowledge sharing activities are the most difficult aspect to achieve. In this point of views, library personnel are used to sharing knowledge with their respective communities. They are able to disseminate information, particularly regarding reprocessing materials and limiting information overload of their clients. Academic library personnel have to share knowledge with their students, teaching staffs and other stakeholders. However, a knowledge sharing culture is more conducive to knowledge creation and better overall performance and reduces duplication of efforts. A knowledge sharing culture involves both organisation and library personnel. Organisations need to put in place appropriate incentives and training plans in order to motivate library personnel for knowledge sharing and individual personnel needs a change of mindset to appreciate the benefits of knowledge sharing (Jain, 2012). Academic library personnel have to share knowledge with their students, teaching staffs and other stakeholders. However, a knowledge sharing culture is more conducive to knowledge creation and better overall performance and reduces duplication of efforts. A knowledge sharing culture involves both organisation and library personnel. Organisations need to put in place appropriate incentives and training plans in order to motivate library personnel for knowledge sharing and individual personnel needs a change of mindset to appreciate the benefits of knowledge sharing (Jain, 2012). Therefore, knowledge utilisation refers to the correct and appropriate application of experiences, insights, skills, innovative ideas/creative ideas of the librarians to enhance their

research productivity and quality service delivery (Janus, 2016). Knowledge utilization is a wonder which shows up wherever with regards to regular daily existence (Savolainen, 2009). Kulkarni, Ravindran, and Freeze (2006) define knowledge utilisation as how much an individual trust he or she has incorporated a knowledge object into work practices, including problem-solving and decision-making exercises.

Okonedo and Popoola (2012) stated that knowledge utilisation is a multifaceted experience, and covers the clients conduct, interfacing (to the source of the knowledge), searching for knowledge, knowledge skills, knowledge utilisation, knowledge need, reactions and impacts, as well as results of learning. The use of knowledge, as stated by Jarkko (2010), can be characterized as intellectual activity which is manifested through various thoughts and deeds. The concealed inspiration driving making knowledge open is to use the accessible knowledge to improve the groups' execution (Alavi and Leidner, 2001; Salisbury, 2003). In other words, individuals share what they have learned and transferred what they knew to those who have the collective interest and who have found the knowledge useful.

The ability to deliver superior service quality is an essential for progress to success (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry, 2012). Chia, Chin, and Chin, (2002) defined service quality as a comparison between customer expectation and their perception of the service they actually received. To measure service quality, the most well known model is SERVQUAL (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry,1988) which consist of five aspects: Reliability - the ability to provide the service promised accurately and as expected; Responsiveness - the willingness to render an appropriate service to help customers overcome their problem; Warranty - workers knowledge and politeness and courtesy and their ability to build trust and confidence; Empathy - service provider's attitude towards understanding each and every customer based on their problem; and Tangibles - physical evidence concerning the service provided or whatever appearance that can be seen, touched and tasted.

Abdullah, and Agus (2009) on library service quality in Malaysia indicated that library user's service improvement should be given high priority to achieve performance and to provide quality service to the users. Library user's satisfaction or Library user's priority does not mean disregarding laws and rules for the sake of satisfying them or to gain recognition. Furthermore, Ingraham (2005) said that library user's satisfaction actually means the ability to build a good and lasting relationship with them. Hence, in academic libraries, service delivery means to provide services which are fast, of good quality and satisfy the library users.

Objectives of the study

The following objectives guided the study

i. identify types of knowledge shared among library personnel as it affects service delivery in the selected universities in Southwest Nigeria;

ii. examine the frequency of sharing knowledge in the selected universities in Southwest Nigeria;

iii examine the modes adopted in the process of sharing knowledge in the selected universities in Southwest Nigeria;

v what is the frequency of utilisation of knowledge shared among library personnel in selected universities in Southwest Nigeria and
vi. What types of services are rendered in the selected university libraries in Southwest Nigeria?

METHODOLOGY

Survey research design of correlation type was adopted for this study. The population of the study was made up of Academic Librarians, Library Officers and Library Assistants. The study covered 12 Nigerian University Libraries. Questionnaire was used for data collection. The instruments were grouped into four sections. i. Identify types of knowledge shared among library personnel as it affects service delivery. ii. Examine the frequency of sharing knowledge. iii. Examine the modes adopted in the process of sharing knowledge. iv. What is the frequency of utilisation of knowledge shared among library personnel. v. What types of services are rendered in the selected university libraries? The data were analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation.

Data Presentation and Interpretation

Table 1: Types of knowledge being shared among library personnel in the selected universities libraries in Southwest, Nigeria

s/n	Variable	SD	D	A	SA	$\bar{x}$	S.D	Rank
A	**Tacit knowledge**	**f (%)**	**f (%)**	**f (%)**	**f (%)**			
1	People domicile knowledge	12 2.8	22 5.2	221 51.8	172 40.3	3.30	0.69	2nd
2	Experts	9 2.1	51 11.9	194 45.4	173 40.5	3.24	0.74	3rd
3	Professionals	6 1.4	6 1.4	231 54.1	184 43.1	3.39	0.59	1st
B	**Explicit knowledge**							
1	Printed papers	23 5.4	14 3.3	196 45.9	194 45.4	3.31	0.78	1st
2	Visual formats	11 2.6	43 10.1	216 50.6	157 36.8	3.22	0.73	2nd
3	Audio recordings	27 6.3	43 10.1	189 44.3	168 39.3	3.17	0.85	3rd
4	Digital formats	21 4.9	84 19.7	219 51.3	103 24.1	2.95	0.80	4th

Weighted Mean = 3.23

The findings of this study revealed that both the tacit and explicit knowledge were being shared among the library personnel in which Tacit knowledge was the most shared knowledge of which Professionals knowledge was ranked highest. This is because professional type of knowledge does

not provide only solution to a problem but also may help to see what type of problem needs to be solving.

Table 2: Frequency of knowledge sharing among library personnel in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria

s/n	Variable	Always f(%)	Occasionally f(%)	Seldom f(%)	Never f(%)	$\bar{x}$	Rank
1	I share knowledge with my colleagues in my own department	235 55.0	139 32.6	45 10.5	8 1.9	3.41	1st
2	I share knowledge about librarianship with colleagues	216 50.6	158 37.0	48 11.2	5 1.2	3.37	2nd
3	I share knowledge about scholarly communication and communication value with my colleagues	210 49.2	172 40.3	35 8.2	10 2.3	3.36	3rd
4	I share knowledge about classification and cataloguing of library materials with colleagues	208 48.7	169 39.6	44 10.3	6 1.4	3.36	3rd
5	I share knowledge about how information is delivered and accessed with my colleagues	193 45.2	187 43.8	41 9.6	6 1.4	3.33	5th
6	I share knowledge about staffing with my colleagues	195 45.7	174 40.7	47 11.0	11 2.6	3.30	6th
7	I share knowledge on technology use in libraries with colleagues	181 42.4	198 46.4	40 9.4	8 1.9	3.29	7th
8	I share knowledge about indexing and abstract with my colleagues	178 41.7	188 44.0	50 11.7	11 2.6	3.25	8th
9	I share knowledge about reference services issues with colleagues	162 37.9	183 42.9	75 17.6	7 1.6	3.17	9th
10	I share knowledge about data creation and digital preservation issues	147 34.4	209 48.9	63 14.8	8 1.9	3.16	10th
11	I share knowledge about readers services with colleagues	160 37.5	182 42.6	79 18.5	6 1.4	3.16	10th
12	I share knowledge about serials usage with colleagues	162 37.9	163 38.2	92 21.5	10 2.3	3.12	12th
13	I share knowledge with external professionals	139 32.6	202 47.3	64 15.0	22 5.2	3.07	13th
14	I share knowledge with co-workers from other department	153 35.8	186 43.6	46 10.8	42 9.8	3.05	14th

Weighted Mean = 3.24

Table 2 shows the frequency of knowledge sharing by library personnel in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria. "I share knowledge with my colleagues in my own department" was ranked highest by the mean scores ($\bar{x} = 3.41$) rating and was followed by "I share knowledge about

librarianship with colleagues" ($\bar{x} = 3.37$), and "I share knowledge about scholarly communication and communication value with my colleagues" ($\bar{x} = 3.36$).

Table3: Modes adopted in the process of sharing knowledge in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria.

s/n	Variable	SD f(%)	D f(%)	A f(%)	SA f(%)	$\bar{x}$	Rank
1	Seminars	5	23	176	223	3.44	1st
		1.2	5.4	41.2	52.2		
2	Workshops	6	29	202	190	3.35	2nd
		1.4	6.8	47.3	44.5		
3	Mobile phones	17	21	193	196	3.33	3rd
		4.0	4.9	45.2	45.9		
4	Conferences	5	33	232	157	3.27	4th
		1.2	7.7	54.3	36.8		
5	Staff meeting	14	18	245	150	3.24	5th
		3.3	4.2	57.4	35.1		
6	In-house training	11	69	187	160	3.16	6th
		2.6	16.2	43.8	37.5		
7	Mentoring	21	35	249	122	3.11	7th
		4.9	8.2	58.3	28.6		
8	Mailing lists	14	75	194	144	3.10	8th
		3.3	17.6	45.4	33.7		
9	Face book, twitter and yahoo messenger	19	69	208	131	3.06	9th
		4.4	16.2	48.7	30.7		
10	Memo	49	29	210	140	3.04	10th
		11.2	6.8	49.2	32.8		
11	Symposia	16	59	250	102	3.03	11th
		3.7	13.8	58.5	23.9		
12	e-mail and newsletter	47	47	183	150	3.02	12th
		11.0	11.0	42.9	35.1		
13	Library blog and library portal	47	40	207	133	3.00	13th
		11.0	9.4	48.5	31.1		
14	Intranet	15	87	223	102	2.96	14th
		3.5	20.4	52.2	23.9		

Weighted Mean = 3.15

Table 3 shows the modes of knowledge sharing among library personnel in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria. "Seminars" was ranked highest by the mean scores ($\bar{x} = 3.44$) rating as the major mode of knowledge sharing and was followed in succession by "Workshops" ($\bar{x} = 3.35$), "Mobile phones" ($\bar{x} = 3.33$), "Conferences" ($\bar{x} = 3.27$), "Staff meeting" ($\bar{x} = 3.24$),

"In-house training" ($\bar{x} = 3.16$), "Mentoring" ($\bar{x} = 3.11$), "Mailing lists" ($\bar{x} = 3.10$), and "Face book, twitter and yahoo messenger" ($\bar{x} = 3.06$).

Table 4: Frequency of utilisation of knowledge shared among library Personnel

s/n	Variable	Always f(%)	Occasionally f(%)	Seldom f(%)	Never f(%)	$\bar{x}$	Rank
1	Librarians in my library make use of knowledge gained	307 71.9	94 22.0	19 4.4	7 1.6	3.64	1st
2	Library policies in my library encourage librarians to use of knowledge shared	257 60.2	139 32.6	25 5.9	6 1.4	3.52	2nd
3	Knowledge utilisation in my library is very high	245 57.4	134 31.4	43 10.1	5 1.2	3.45	3rd
4	Knowledge gained is use for personal development	228 53.4	155 36.3	35 8.2	9 2.1	3.41	4th
5	Knowledge gained is used for research purposes	226 52.9	148 34.7	44 10.3	9 2.1	3.38	5th
6	Knowledge gained is used to solve daily activities	218 51.1	165 38.6	29 6.8	15 3.5	3.37	6th
7	Knowledge gained is used to solve any issues related to classification and cataloguing	214 50.1	161 37.7	43 10.1	9 2.1	3.36	7th
8	Knowledge gained is used to solve administrative issues	195 45.7	190 44.5	31 7.3	11 2.6	3.33	8th
9	Knowledge gained is used to solve technology and related problems	215 50.4	145 34.0	40 9.4	27 6.3	3.28	9th
10	Knowledge gained is used for teaching purposes	190 44.5	172 40.3	61 14.3	4 0.9	3.28	9th
11	I seek colleagues out for knowledge while working	170 39.8	212 49.6%	36 8.4%	9 2.1%	3.27	11th
12	Knowledge gained is use for professional development	207 48.5	149 34.9	44 10.3	27 6.3	3.26	12th
13	Knowledge gained is used for abstract and indexing skills development	186 43.6	172 40.3	51 11.9%	18 4.2	3.23	13th

Weighted Mean = 3.37

Table 4 shows Test of Norm for the frequency of utilisation of knowledge shared among library personnel in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria. 0.7% (n=3) never utilise knowledge gained, 0.7% (n=3) seldom seldom utilise knowledge gained, 30.9% (n=132) occasionally utilise knowledge gained and majority 67.7% (n=289) always utilise knowledge gained.

Table 5: Types of services rendered in the selected universities libraries in Southwest Nigeria.

s/n	Variable	SD	D	A	SA	$\bar{x}$	Rank
1	Acquisition	13 3.0%	14 3.3%	44 10.3%	356 83.4%	3.74	1st
2	Cataloguing and Classification	12 2.8%	22 5.2%	69 16.2%	324 75.9%	3.65	2nd
3	Selective dissemination of information	16 3.7%	22 5.2%	60 14.1%	329 77.0%	3.64	3rd
4	Inter library loan	20 4.7%	19 4.4%	71 16.6%	317 74.2%	3.60	4th
5	Information literacy skills training	13 3.0%	26 6.1%	84 17.9%	304 71.2%	3.59	5th
6	Internet/electronic service	16 3.7%	38 8.9%	74 17.3%	299 70.0%	3.54	6th
7	Current awareness Service	17 4.0%	33 7.7%	97 22.7%	280 65.6%	3.50	7th
8	Reprographic service	25 5.9%	33 7.7%	89 20.8%	280 65.6%	3.46	8th
9	Indexing and abstracting	28 6.6%	32 7.5%	99 23.2%	268 62.8%	3.42	9th
10	Circulation	38 8.9%	53 12.4 %	76 17.8%	76 17.8%	3.31	10th
11	Referencing	40 9.4%	51 11.9 %	84 19.7%	252 59.0%	3.28	11th
Weighted mean = 3.52							

Table 14 shows the types of services rendered in the selected university libraries in Southwest Nigeria. "Acquisition" was ranked highest by the mean score rating ($\bar{x} = 3.74$) and was followed in succession by "Cataloguing and Classification" ($\bar{x} = 3.65$), "Selective dissemination of information" ($\bar{x} = 3.64$), and "Inter library loan" ($\bar{x} = 3.60$). "Indexing and abstracting" ($\bar{x} = 3.42$), "Circulation" ($\bar{x} = 3.31$) and "Referencing" ($\bar{x} = 3.28$) were the least items indicated by the respondents.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of this study revealed that both the tacit and explicit knowledge were being shared among the library personnel in which tacit knowledge was the most shared knowledge of which professionals knowledge was ranked highest. This was followed by people domicile knowledge with mean ranking of ($\bar{x} = 3.30$) while experts knowledge was the least shared knowledge. This

agreed with the findings of (Choi. Kang., and Lee, 2008; Choo, 2010; Heng-Li, Lee, Pyong, and Wang, 2016) that the balanced combination of both tacit and explicit knowledge lead to higher efficiently and productively. Using the overall weighted mean of 3.23 as the benchmark for the types of knowledge being shared among library personnel in the selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria

The study found that library personnel shared knowledge with their colleagues most in the same department. The knowledge shared were on librarianship, scholarly communication and communication value, classification and cataloguing of library materials, how information is delivered and accessed, staffing, technology use in libraries, indexing and abstract, reference services, data creation and digital preservation issues, readers services and finally on serials usage. The findings established, using the weighted mean of 3.15 as benchmark, it could inferred that seminars, workshops, mobile phones, conferences and staff meeting were the major modes of knowledge sharing among library personnel in the selected university libraries in Southwest, Nigeria.

This study revealed that library personnel always utilise knowledge gained as follows; personal development, research purposes, solution to daily activities, solution to any issues related to classification and cataloguing, solution to administrative issues, solution to technology and related problems, teaching purposes, knowledge gained was also utilised for professional development, and finally for abstract and indexing skills development.

The study, therefore, revealed that acquisition, cataloguing and classification, selective dissemination of information and inter library loan were the major types of services rendered among library personnel in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Knowledge sharing and knowledge utilisation were significant and positively influenced service delivery among library personnel in the selected university libraries in Southwest Nigeria. Knowledge is the most shared which could be as a result of constant interaction of library personnel with others in the same or other department and this is done through many modes (media). Acquisition, cataloguing and classification, selective dissemination of information, inter library loan, information literacy skills training and internet/electronic service were the major types of services rendered among library personnel in the selected universities in Southwest, Nigeria.
The following recommendations were made:

1. Library management should encourage and promote knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization among library personnel.
2. Library management should clearly state knowledge management strategy and create knowledge sharing initiatives in the library's goals.
3. Library management should remove any form of fear that sharing may cause or jeopardise people's job security rather should encourage themselves in the knowledge sharing and utilisation culture.

4. Each academic library should create awareness on knowledge sharing and utilisation in order to realise the values and benefits of process knowledge to others. This can also be achieved through a clearly structured leadership and managerial direction.
5. Library personnel should be discouraged not to share their knowledge due to differences in experience levels rather be encouraged because no man knows it all.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Z.,and Agus, Z. Z. 2009. Assessing Knowledge Sharing Behaviour among Employees in SMEs: An Empirical Study. International Business Research, 2(2).

Alavi, M., and Leidner, D. E. 2001. Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues, MIS Quarterly 25(1): 107-136. Retrieved on 13th of October, 2019 from https://http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.629.858andrep=rep1and type=pdf

Anna, N. E., and Puspitasari, D. 2013. Knowledge Sharing In Libraries: A Case Study of Knowledge Sharing Strategies in Indonesian University Libraries. Proceedings of IFLA WLIC 2013 (1-11). Singapore: IFLA. Retrieved on 10th of August, 2019 from http://library.ifla.org/200/1/207-anna-en.pdf

Chia, M. C., Chin, T.C., and Chin, H.H. 2002. 'A Review of Service Quality in Corporate and Recreational Sport/Fitness Programs', *the Sport Journal*, 5(3): 1-9.

Choi, S. Y., Kang, Y. S. and Lee, H. 2008. The Effects of Socio-technical Enablers on Knowledge Sharing: An Exploratory Examination. *Journal of Information Science*, 34(5): 742-754. DOI: 10.1177/0165551507087710

Choo, H. M. 2010. Knowledge Management and Its Potential Applicability for Libraries. Library Management, 31(3): 198-212.

Cummings, J. N. 2014. Work Groups, Structural Diversity, and Knowledge Sharing In a Global Organisation. Management Science, 50: 352-364.

Fareed, H., Lucas, C. and Ali, M.2004. Managing Knowledge Effectively. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, Retrieved on 13th of February, 2019 from http://www.tlainc.com/articl66.htm

Heng-Li-Li Y., Lee, S., Pyong, M. and Wang, L. 2016. Why special libraries are the right places to host a Knowledge Management Center, In Proceedings of IFLA KM Satellite Meeting. Helsinki, Finland

Ingraham, P. W. 2005. Performance: Promises to keep and miles to go. Public Administration Review, 65(4):390–5. Retrieved on 20th November, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00466.x

Jain, P. 2012. An Empirical Study of Knowledge Management in University Libraries in SADC Countries. In H. T. Hou (Ed.), New Research on Knowledge Management Applications and Lesson Learned. Shanghai: Intec.

Janus, S. S. 2016. Becoming a Knowledge-Sharing Organization: A handbook for scaling up solutions through knowledge capturing and sharing. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / the World Bank. Retrieved on 10th of January, 2019 from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/25320/9781464809439.pdf?sequence=2

Jarkko, B.(2010). Ambiguities in knowledge production: Multimodal Analysis of Discourse and Dramaturgy in Public Participation GIS Experiments. Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 37(5):895-910. Retrieved on 21st May, 2019 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227472698_Ambiguities_in_knowledge_production_Multimodal_analysis_of_discourse_and_dramaturgy_in_public_participation_GIS_experiments

Kulkarni, U. R., Ravindran, S., and Freeze, R. 2006. A knowledge Management Success Model: Theoretical Development and Empirical Validation. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 23(3): 309-347. Retrieved on 19th of December, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222230311

Lee, H. 2005. The role of libraries in knowledge management. Retrieved on 23rd of December, 2019 from http://szlibszptt.net.cn/download/km_n_lib.ppt.

Liu, K. L., Chang, C. C., and Hu, I. L. 2010. Exploring the effects of task characteristics on knowledge sharing in libraries. Library Review, 59(6): 455-468.

MacDonald, S. 2018. How to Build a Powerful Customer Service Knowledge Base Retrieved on 27th January, 2019 from https://www.superoffice.com/blog/customer-service-knowledge-base/

Maponya, P.M. 2014 Knowledge Management Practices in Academic Libraries: A Case Study of the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg Libraries. Retrieved on 6th April, 2019 from http://www.ukzn.ac.za/depertment/data/leap_scec.salpaper.pdf

Mittelstrass, J.2010.The loss of knowledge in the information age. Department of Philosophy, University of Konstanz, Germany.19-23. Retrieved on 25th of February, 2018 from http://www.portlandpress.com/pp/books/online/wg85/085/0019/0850019.pdf

Naikal, G. and Paloti, F. 2015. Performance Indicators for Measuring Performance of Activities in Knowledge Management Projects, M.S. Thesis, Department of Informatics, University of Gothenburg

Okonedo, S. and Popoola, S. O. 2012. Effect of Self-Concept, Knowledge Sharing and Utilisation on Research Productivity among Librarians in Public Universities in South-West, Nigeria. Library Philosophy & Practice (e-journal); 1-22. Retrieved on April 23rd, 2019 from https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2040&context=libphilprac

Parirokh, M., Daneshgar, F., and Fattahi, R. 2007. Identifying knowledge-sharing requirements in academic libraries. Library Review, 57(2): 107-122.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L. 2012. SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perception of service quality,

Popoola, S. O and Haliso, Y. 2009. Use of Library Information Resources and Services as Predictor of the Teaching Effectiveness of Social Scientists in Nigerian Universities. African *Journal of Library, Archival and Information Science* 19(1):65–77. Retrieved on 16th June, 2019 from http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0andsid=0c6b036b-076e-4b53-9f4b-5257833f1d41%40sessionmgr4007 (17 April, 2018)

Pulakos, E. D., Dorsey, D. W., and Borman, W. C. 2003. Hiring for knowledge-based competition. In S. E. Jackson, M. A. Hitt, and A. S. DeNisi (Eds.), Managing knowledge for sustained competitive advantage: Designing strategies for effective human resource management. pp155-177. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Robert, C. A. 2009. Annotation for knowledge sharing in a collaborative environment. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 13(1): 111-119.

Robertson, S., and Reese, K. 1999. A virtual library for building community and sharing knowledge. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 51: 663-685.

Salisbury, M. W. 2003 Putting theory into practice to build knowledge management systems, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(2): 128-141, Retrieved on 16th June, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270310477333

Savolainen, R. 2009. The information needs of prospective homebuyers: an exploratory study of apartment purchases in Finland. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33(5):566 - 571. Retrieved on 21st July, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2009.00804.x

Shanhong, T. 2000. Knowledge management in libraries in the 21st century. Proceedings of the 66th IFLA Council and General Conference, Jerusalem. 1-6.

Tait, E., Martzoukou, K. and Reid, P. 2016. Libraries for the future: the role of IT utilities in the transformation of academic libraries. Palgrave Communications, UK. 1-9. DOI: 10.1057/palcomms.2016.70

Wiig, K. 2009. Knowledge Management Handbook. (E. Liebowitz, Ed.) New York: CRC Press.