International Journal of Library Science;
Volume 22; Issue No. 1; Year 2024;
ISSN 0975-7546; Int. j. lib. sci.

Self-efficacy as correlate of knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria

Solomon Olusegun Oyetola[1], Thomas Ayinla Ogunmodede[2], and **Adeola Adesoji Arinola[3]**

[1]Olusegun Oke Library,
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State Nigeria.
Email: sooyetola@lautech.edu.ng;

[2]Department of Library and Information Science,
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.
Email: taogunmodede@lautech.edu.ng;

[3]Department of Library and Information Science,
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.
Email: aaarinola@lautech.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

This research investigated the relationship between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing among information professionals in selected university libraries in the South-West region of Nigeria. The study aimed to achieve three main objectives. Employing a descriptive survey design rooted in the positivism paradigm, the population consisted of 95 academic librarians from six universities: Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (FUNAAB); University of Ibadan (UI); Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ife; Federal University of Technology, Akure (FUTA); Federal University, Oye (FUOYE); and University of Lagos (UNILAG).

The study adopted a total enumerative sampling technique, and the data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics (such as frequency, percentages, mean, and standard deviation) as well as inferential statistics (specifically Pearson Product Moment Correlation, with a significance level set at 0.05). The findings revealed that information professionals in the selected university libraries perceive knowledge sharing as a valuable process that fosters innovation, creativity, problem-solving, and skill enhancement. Various channels were identified through which knowledge is shared, including face-to-face interaction, email, mobile phones, WhatsApp, memos, and Facebook.

Additionally, the study highlighted the significance of self-efficacy in enabling information professionals to effectively perform their duties, acquire knowledge efficiently, and apply what they have learned. Moreover, a positive and significant correlation was found between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing. Based on these results, it is recommended that universities and libraries actively encourage and facilitate knowledge sharing among information professionals by providing appropriate channels and platforms. Furthermore, organizations and managers should prioritize the enhancement of employees' self-efficacy through training and development programs, mentoring, and coaching initiatives.

Keywords: Self efficacy, knowledge sharing, information professionals, university libraries, Nigeria.

Library of Congress Classification No: ZA3038-5190

1. Introduction

Knowledge is critical to all organisations and should be managed appropriately. Knowledge is an important and crucial resource for developing new ideas and innovations. It is an asset that necessitates intensive management by organisations. Acquiring, sharing, and storing knowledge are all activities involved in knowledge management. The most important activity, however, is knowledge sharing (Gumus, 2007). Because most knowledge is held in people's heads, sharing it will assist to disperse the knowledge to others in generating new ideas. However, there are numerous impediments to information exchange in organisations. As a result, concentrating on enhancing information exchange has a high potential to help organisations gain a competitive advantage.

Knowledge sharing is defined as the ability to create knowledge that improves employee performance and fosters innovation (Scully & Khosrowshahi, 2011). ILO (2007) defines knowledge sharing as an intentional subjective act that makes knowledge reusable by other people through knowledge transfer. It is the process of exchanging ideas and experiences in order to generate new knowledge (Bartorl & Srivastava, 2002). According to Holste and Fields (2005), knowledge sharing is the process of giving and receiving knowledge. It comprises the activities of how to help groups of people working together, facilitating the exchange of their knowledge, enhancing organisational learning capacity, and increasing their ability to achieve individual and organisational goals (Susanty and Wood, 2011). Similarly, the term knowledge sharing implies the giving and receiving of information framed within a context by the knowledge of the source (Sharrat & Usoro, 2003).

The majority of employees, especially information specialists, find it difficult to communicate their expertise. This could be because they are concerned about losing the information that distinguishes them from others (Husted et al., 2005). Employees, similarly, do not share their knowledge because they are afraid of losing some of their power, reducing their chances of personal success such as promotion or compensation, and acquiring additional workload requiring more time, energy, and thought to complete (So & Bolloju, 2005; Husted et al., 2005; Lee & Ahn, 2005). Lee and Ahn (2005) identified several hurdles to information exchange in their study. Employees' desire to contribute decreases as a result of the significant effort required for knowledge sharing activities. Whether or whether not employees intend to share knowledge, knowledge must be shared, and employees must actively participate in it. Managing knowledge sharing in enterprises is regarded as a significant task. In light of this, staff must be encouraged to become more involved in knowledge exchange. In this study, information professionals are defined as specialists that rely on information to produce new products or create new business processes (Gryphon 2008). They include, among others, librarians, records managers, information technology officers, archivists, information centre managers, database managers, web designers, and publishers in the context of this study.

2. Statement of the Problem

The goal of knowledge sharing (KS) is to help and facilitate others. Another reason for sharing knowledge is to learn from one another (Wei et al., 2012). People also share knowledge to feel good and help their organisations achieve their goals (Chong et al., 2019). Individuals value KS, and

organisations focus on their needs to improve knowledge sharing among their staff (Parirokh et al., 2008). This is because it is critical in successfully executing knowledge management programmes within organisations and can also assist to improving organisational and individual performance. Given the significance of KS, researchers have investigated its numerous characteristics, and it is gaining attention (Boateng et al., 2017). Several research studies have been conducted to know the factors affecting the sharing of knowledge, but still there is a need to explore this area of research (Supar, 2012).

Self-efficacy (SE) has been defined as individuals' belief in their ability to carry out a goal that will benefit others (Chen and Hung, 2010). It is concerned with the personal belief in one's ability to generate the desired end by one's own efforts, as well as persons who are inclined to engage in a task because they believe they can complete it (Maddux, 2016). SE has also been regarded a crucial factor in knowledge sharing, as there is a wealth of literature indicating that it influences KS (Kaewchur and Phusavat, 2016), and researchers are interested in exploring SE's involvement in predicting KS (Lai and Hsieh, 2013). SE influences sharing of knowledge positively and significantly. Research highlights that there is vital role of SE in improving sharing of knowledge within organisations (Chen and Hung, 2010).

There is a positive as well as significant relationship between SE and KS (Bilginoglu and Yozgat, 2018). SE impacts behaviour towards KS which highlights that it predicts KS of individuals (Jung, 2014). However, another research study confirmed that significant relationship between SE and students' behaviour towards sharing of knowledge did not exist. Researchers argued that new environment and interactions with new people make it difficult for new comers to engage themselves in KS behaviour-related activities (Chung et al., 2008). Research highlights that people having higher SE are found to be more inclined towards sharing of knowledge than the individuals with lower SE (Carmeli et al., 2013).

Previous research indicates that various studies conducted in the past analysed and discovered that the significance of SE in predicting behaviour towards information sharing is critical (Shuang and Keyi, 2008). Several researches studied the interaction between the two factors and found that SE influenced people's KS. It emphasizes the significance of SE as a critical predictor of better KS potential (Boonmee, 2011). However, there is a scarcity of literature that provides acceptable evidence of the existence of a relationship between these two variables and their effect on one another. As a result, the purpose of this research was to investigate the link and influence of both variables (SE and KS).

3. Objectives

The specific objectives of the study are to:

1. examine importance of knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West Universities, Nigeria;
2. identify channels of knowledge sharing among information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West Universities, Nigeria; and

3. know the self-efficacy of information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West Universities, Nigeria.

4. Research Questions

1. What is the importance of knowledge sharing by information professional in selected university libraries in South-West Nigeria?
2. What are the channels of knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?
3. What is the self-efficacy of information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West Universities, Nigeria?

5. Research Hypothesis

This hypothesis is tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Ho: There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West Universities, Nigeria.

6. Literature Review

Self-efficacy is defined as belief in one's ability to manage and execute the actions necessary to achieve one's goals (Jashapara & Tai, 2006). Based on the data, self-efficacy was modest. The majority of respondents were polled based on their level of confidence and belief in themselves. This finding is reinforced by Lin, Hung, and Chen (2009), who define individuals who share knowledge as a competent, superior, and cooperative manner of accomplishing personal goals, indicating an extreme readiness to share their expertise. Hsu et al. (2007) described knowledge sharing self-efficacy as a type of self-evaluation that influences decisions about what behaviours to engage in, how much effort and tenacity to put forth when confronted with barriers, and, finally, mastery of the conduct. According to the social cognitive theory, an individual's mind is an active tool that leads one's movements towards forming expectations, skills, and outcomes (Bandura, 1997). According to Okyere-Kwakye and Nor (2011), in the context of knowledge management, this idea could suggest that if individuals are unsure of their capabilities and the outcome of the knowledge they are expected to offer, they may not share it. This demonstrates that people gain confidence before sharing their information. They will not share if they are incapacitated. Individuals may still share knowledge if they have a high expectation of a positive outcome.

Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as one's assessment of one's competence to organise certain conduct. Individuals develop their self-efficacy in response to their surroundings, personal aspirations, and the social networks in which they find themselves. As a result, depending on the expected consequences, one can develop a degree of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy can help motivate employees to share knowledge with colleagues (Wasko & Faraj, 2005). Studies have also indicated that employees with high confidence in their ability to provide valuable knowledge are more likely to accomplish specific tasks (Constant et al., 1994). Self-efficacy typically manifests in people believing that their knowledge can help to solve job-related problems and improve work efficacy (Luthans,

2003). Employees who believe they can improve organisational performance by sharing knowledge will be more likely to both contribute and receive knowledge. When there is cooperation within the context and social network in which they find themselves, people may acquire a better self-efficacy to exchange their expertise.

Self-efficacy is a type of self-evaluation that can influence decisions about what behaviours to execute as well as the amount of effort and drive to push forward in the face of problems and behavioural mastery. Furthermore, Jashapara and Tai (2006) defined self-efficacy as belief in one's own ability to plan and carry out the actions necessary to achieve specific goals. Kankanhalli et al. (2005) discovered that self-efficacy may be an element with inherent advantages, which may be paired with other variables to explore their effect on the behaviour of knowledge contributions. The study's findings revealed that self-efficacy is associated to knowledge contribution when using electronic knowledge repositories. Furthermore, Hilmi et al. (2009) demonstrated that self-efficacy might be projected, where the higher an individual's favourable attitude towards sharing knowledge, the higher its intention to share knowledge.

However, Mafabi et al. (2017) stated that information sharing is the primary enabler of knowledge management. In general, knowledge sharing entails disseminating acquired knowledge within a group of people. Knowledge exchange can take place in both formal and informal settings. Furthermore, Shaik and Othman (2015) argued that in order to ensure success, achieve goals, and increase performance in academic institutions, universities must encourage information sharing activities among their professors, staff, and students. According to Yogeesha and Gopala Krishna (2013), three groups of elements can be associated with knowledge sharing: self-efficacy, organisational, and technological aspects.

7. Methodology

The study employed a descriptive survey design which is anchored on the positivism paradigm. The justification for the positivism paradigm is based on the fact that the paradigm promotes precision and at the same time empirical method in collecting data for academic research. Owolabi (2016) argues that the positivism paradigm permits academic research to be conducted based on empirical facts. The population of the study comprised 95 academic librarians in six (6) universities libraries including Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta; University of Ibadan; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ife; Federal University of Technology, Akure; Federal University, Oye, Ekiti and University of Lagos. Total enumerative sampling was used. The justification for using this technique was because the population size seemed manageable and relatively small. The psychometric properties of the instrument were obtained using Cronbach Alpha method. 15 copies of the questionnaire were administered to academic librarians in Ladoke Akintola University, Ogbomoso. In all, 0.75 reliability coefficient was obtained for the instrument. Out of 95 copies of the questionnaire administered, 65 were properly filled and returned representing 68.4% return rate and were found worthy for the analysis of data collected. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentages, mean and

standard deviation) and inferential statistics (Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used at 0.05 level of significance).

8. Data Analysis and Result

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 1: Distribution of the Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	37	56.9
Female	28	43.1
Total	**65**	**100.0**

Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents by gender. Majority of the respondents, 37 (56.9% were males while 28 (43.1%) were females.

Table 2: Distribution of the Respondents by Age

Age range in years	Frequency	Percentage
20 – 25	7	10.8
26 – 30	1	1.5
31 – 35	10	15.4
36 – 40	5	7.7
41 – 45	8	12.3
46 – 50	19	29.2
51 – 55	13	20.0
56 – 60	2	3.1
61 and above		
Total	65	100.0

Table 2 shows the distribution of the respondents by age. A total of 19 (29.2%) respondents were between the ages of 46 and 50 years. This was followed by 13 (20.0%) respondents between the ages of 51 and 55 years.

Table 3: Distribution of the Respondents by Marital Status

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	11	16.9
Married	54	83.1
Divorced	-	-
Separated	-	-
Widowed	-	-
Total	**65**	**100.0**

Table 3 shows the distribution of the respondents by marital status. Majority of the respondents, 54 (83.1%) were married and 11 (16.9%) respondents were singles.

Table 4: Distribution of the Respondents by Academic Status

Academic Status	Frequency	Percentage
Assistant Librarian	12	18.5
Librarian II	11	16.9
Librarian I	12	18.5
Senior Librarian	15	23.1
Principal Librarian	10	15.4
Deputy Librarian	5	7.7
University Librarian	-	-
Total	**65**	**100.0**

Table 4 shows the distribution of the respondents by academic status. A total of 15 (23.1%) respondents were Senior Librarians while 12 (18.5%) respondents were Assistant Librarian and Librarian I respectively.

Table 5: Distribution of the Respondents by Academic Qualification

Academic Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Ph.D	23	35.4
M.Phil	1	1.5
Master	36	55.4
First Degree	5	7.7
Total	**65**	**100.0**

Table 5 shows the distribution of the respondents by academic qualification. Majority of the respondents, 36 (55.4%) were Master's holders.

Table 6: Distribution of the Respondents by Section/Unit in the University Libraries

Section/Unit	Frequency	Percentage
Management	6	9.2
Cataloguing/Classification	25	38.5
Reference	4	6.2
Circulation	15	23.1
Virtual	3	4.6
Reprographic/Conservation/Preservation	2	3.1
IT and Computer	3	4.6
Serials	7	10.8
Audio Visual	-	-
Total	65	100.0

Table 6 shows the distribution of the respondents by section/unit in the libraries. A total of 25 (38.5%) respondents were in the Cataloguing/Classification section/unit in the library.

Table 7: Distribution of the Respondents by Years of Working Experience

Years of Working Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 5	19	29.2
6 – 10	15	23.1
11 – 15	16	24.6
16 – 20	6	9.2
21 and above	9	13.8
Total	**65**	**100.0**

Table 7 shows the distribution of respondents by years of working experience. A total of 19 (29.2%) respondents had between 1 and 5 years of working experience while 16 (24.6%) respondent had between 11 and 15 years of working experience.

9. Research questions

Research Question One: What is the importance of knowledge sharing by information professional in selected university libraries in South-West Nigeria?

Table 8: Knowledge Sharing by Information Professionals in Selected University Libraries in South-West, Nigeria

S/N	ITEM	SA	A	D	SD	X	SD
1	I think knowledge sharing is a process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual is shared with another individual	51 (78.5%)	14 (21.5%)	-	-	3.78	0.414
2	I think knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity including research productivity to Librarians	43 (66.2%)	22 (33.8%)	-	-	3.66	0.477
3	I am aware of the importance of sharing my knowledge with my colleagues	40 (61.5%)	23 (35.4%)	2 (3.1%)	-	3.58	0.556
4	By sharing knowledge, I can use the experience of others in finding solution to problems I encounter on the job	40 (61.5%)	22 (33.8%)	3 (4.6%)	-	3.57	0.585
6	I feel Knowledge sharing will enhance my skills in research activities in this library	34 (52.3%)	27 (41.5%)	4 (6.2%)	-	3.46	0.614
7	I feel Librarians should have access to knowledge of one another in this library	30 (46.2%)	33 (50.8%)	2 (3.1%)	-	3.43	0.558
8	I don't think I will be fulfilled if I don't share my knowledge with my colleagues	15 (23.1%)	39 (60.0%)	6 (9.2%)	5 (7.7%)	2.98	0.800
9	I am willing to share knowledge, if I will be acknowledged and appreciated	16 (24.6%)	28 (43.1%)	18 (27.7%)	3 (4.6%)	2.88	0.839
10	I am willing to share knowledge, if I can obtain a sense of achievement	14 (21.5%)	30 (46.2%)	20 (30.8%)	1 (1.5%)	2.88	0.761
11	I am willing to share knowledge, if it will be used for promotion	13 (20.0%)	21 (32.3%)	27 (41.5%)	4 (6.2%)	2.66	0.871

12	I feel that my position would be eroded, if I share my knowledge with my colleagues in the profession	12 (18.5%)	15 (23.1%)	29 (44.6%)	9 (13.8%)	2.46	0.953
13	I don't share knowledge because it is difficult to convince colleagues of the value of knowledge sharing	7 (10.8%)	16 (24.6%)	29(44.6%)	13 (20%)	2.26	0.906
14	I don't think I have to share my knowledge with my hard earn money	5 (7.7%)	8 (12.3%)	31 (47.7%)	21 (32.3%)	1.95	0.874
15	I don't think I have time to share my knowledge with colleagues	6 (9.2%)	3 (4.6%)	37 (56.9%)	19 (29.2%)	1.94	0.846

Table 8 shows the knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria. Majority of the respondents, 65 (100.0%) agreed that they thought that knowledge sharing is a process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual is shared with another individual. Similarly, 65 (100.0%) agreed that they thought that knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity including research productivity to information professional, 63 (96.9%) respondents indicated that they were aware of the importance of sharing my knowledge with my colleagues, 62 (95.4%) agreed that by sharing knowledge they can use the experience of others in finding solution to problems they encountered on the job and 61 (93.8%) agreed that they felt knowledge sharing will enhance their skills in search activities in this library.

Research Question Two: What are the channels of knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 9: Channel of Knowledge Sharing by Information Professionals

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	SD
1	I share knowledge through face-to-face interaction	35 (58.8%)	30 (46.2%)	-	-	3.54	0.502
2	I share knowledge through E-mail	32 (49.2%)	30 (46.2%)	3 (4.6%)	-	3.45	0.587
11	I share knowledge through mobile phone	32 (49.2%)	31 (47.7%)	-	2 (3.1%)	3.43	0.661
13	I share knowledge through WhatsApp	28 (43.0%)	33 (50.8%)	2 (3.1%)	2 (3.1%)	3.34	0.691
12	I share knowledge through Memo	19 (29.2%)	42 (64.6%)	4 (6.2%)	-	3.23	0.553
3	I share knowledge through Facebook	25 (38.5%)	29 (44.6%)	11 (16.9%)	-	3.22	0.718
4	I share knowledge through Library Portal	20 (30.8%)	22 (33.8%)	21 (32.3%)	2 (3.1%)	3.09	0.765
10	I share knowledge through notice board	20 (30.8%)	34 (52.3%)	8 (12.3%)	3 (4.6%)	3.09	0.785
25	I share knowledge through Digital Camera / Photos	19 (29.2%)	35 (53.8%)	9 13.8%)	2 (3.1%)	3.09	0.744
14	I share knowledge through Google scholar	18 (27.7%)	35 (53.8%)	7 (10.8%)	5 (7.7%)	3.02	0.838
8	I share knowledge through Library news bulleting	18 (27.7%)	31 (47.7%)	14 (21.5%)	2 (3.1%)	3.00	0.791
15	I share knowledge through	17	3 (49.2%)	13	3 (4.6%)	2.97	0.809

	Research gate	(26.2%)		(20.0%)			
5	I share knowledge through Twitter	13 (20.0%)	26 (40.0%)	25 (38.5%)	1 (1.5%)	2.92	0.872
22	I share knowledge through Teleconferencing	14 (21.5%)	33 (50.8%)	16 (24.6%)	2 (3.1%)	2.91	0.765
19	I share knowledge through You Tube	17 (26.2%)	30 (46.2%)	12 (18.5%)	6 (9.2%)	2.89	0.904
9	I share knowledge through Yahoo messenger	13 (20.0%)	33 (50.8%)	16 (24.6%)	3 (4.6%)	2.86	0.788
16	I share knowledge through Instagram	19 (29.2%)	21 (32.3%)	21 (32.3%)	4 (6.2%)	2.85	0.922
7	I share knowledge through blog	18 (27.7%)	31 (47.7%)	14 (21.5%)	2 (3.1%)	2.83	0.802
24	I share Knowledge through Television	16 (24.6%)	25 (38.5%)	20 (30.8%)	4 (6.2%)	2.82	0.882
21	I share knowledge through Skype	12 (18.5%)	30 (46.2%)	21 (32.3%)	2 (3.1%)	2.80	0.775
23	I share knowledge through Radio	14 (21.5%)	28 (43.1%)	19 (29.2%)	4 (6.2%)	2.80	0.851
6	I share knowledge through LinkedIn	14 (21.5%)	28 (43.1%)	21 (32.3%)	2 (3.1%)	2.78	0.780
18	I share knowledge through 2go	15 (23.1%)	24 (36.9%)	18 (27.7%)	8(12.3%)	2.71	0.964
20	I share knowledge through Pinterest	13 (20.0%)	22 (33.8%)	24 (36.9%)	6 (9.2%)	2.65	0.909
17	I share knowledge through Twoo	9 (13.8%)	23 (35.4%)	25 (38.5%)	8 (12.3%)	2.51	0.886

Table 9 shows the channel of knowledge sharing by information professionals in the selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria. Majority of the respondents, 65 (100.0%) agreed that they shared knowledge through face-to-face interaction. Also, 62 (95.4%) respondents agreed that they shared knowledge through e-mail, 63 (96.9%) respondents agreed that they shared knowledge through mobile phone, 61 (93.8%) indicated that they shared knowledge through WhatsApp, 61 (93.8%) respondents agreed that thy share knowledge through Memo and 54 (83.1%) respondents indicated that they shared knowledge through Facebook.

Research Question Three: What is self-efficacy of information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West Universities, Nigeria?

Table 10: Self-Efficacy of Information Professionals

S/N	SELF-EFFICACY	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	SD
1	I am always sure that I will do my work	48 (73.8%)	17 (26.2%)	-	-	3.74	0.443
2	I do learn things rapidly	37 (56.9%)	27 (41.5%)	1 (1.5%)	-	3.55	0.531
3	I am fond of applying what I have learnt always	31 (47.7%)	36 (55.4%)	-	-	3.48	0.503
4	I love providing new ideas	29 (44.6%)	36 (55.4%)	-	-	3.45	0.501
5	I believe I can lead group successfully	29 (44.6%)	35 (53.8%)	1 (1.5%)	-	3.43	0.529
6	I love solving problem myself	26 (40.0%)	39 (60.0%)	-	-	3.40	0.494

7	I do not commit the same mistake twice	16 (24.6%)	39 (60.0%)	10(15.4%)		3.09	0.631
8	I love to do assignment independently	14 (21.5%)	46 (70.8%)	5 (7.7%)	-	3.14	0.527
9	I am always successful in my activities	19 (29.2%)	43 (66.2%)	3 (4.6%)	-	3.25	0.531
10	I like to reason rapidly	22 (33.8%)	40 (61.5%)	3 (4.6%)	-	3.29	0.551
11	I am seriously addicted to my career in the library	21 (32.3%)	44 (67.7%)	-	-	3.32	0.471
12	I never experience stress whenever I work in the library	6 (9.2%)	25 (38.5%)	28(43.1%)	6(9.2%)	2.48	0.793
13	My ability continues to increase with my experience	24 (36.9%)	41 (63.1%)	-	-	3.37	0.486
14	I am confident to handle all professional work assigned to me	25 (38.5%)	40 (61.5%)	-	-	3.38	0.490
15	My emotion does not affect my job	15 (23.1%)	38 (58.5%)	12(18.5%)	-	3.05	0.648
16	I feel satisfy anytime I go to office	11 (16.9%)	45 (69.2%)	9 (13.8%)	-	3.03	0.558
17	If I can't do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can	15 (23.1%)	49 (75.4%)	1 (1.5%)	-	3.22	0.450
18	When I make plans, I am certain I can make them work	15 (23.1%)	46 (70.8%)	4 (6.2%)	-	3.17	0.517
19	Failure make me loose courage	3 (4.6%)	14 (21.5%)	32(49.2%)	16 (24.6%)	2.06	0.808
20	I give up easily	11 (16.9%)	32 (49.2%)	22(33.8%)	-	1.83	0.698

Table 10 shows the effect of self-efficacy on information professionals in the selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria. Majority of the respondents, 48 (73.8%) agreed that self-efficacy helps them to do their work. Also, 37(56.9%) respondents agreed that self-efficacy helps to learn things rapidly, 31 (47.7%) respondents agreed that self-efficacy makes them to apply what they have always learnt, 29 (44.6%) indicated that self-efficacy makes them to provide new ideas and lead group of people successfully.

10. Research Hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West Universities, Nigeria.

Correlations			
		KNOWLEDGESHARING	SELFEFFICACY
KNOWLEDGE_SHARING	Pearson Correlation	1	.286*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.021
	N	65	65
SELFEFFICACY	Pearson Correlation	.286*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	
	N	65	65
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Table 11 shows the significant relationship between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria. The mean score of

self-efficacy is Mean = 3.12, SD = 0.25 while the mean score of knowledge sharing (Mean = 2.95, SD = 0.31) of information professional in the selected university libraries is found to be significant at $p < 0.05$. Thus, the means of self-efficacy ($r = 0.286^{**}$, $N = 65$, $p < 0.05$) has significant relationship on

knowledge sharing. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

11. Discussion of the Findings

Findings regarding knowledge sharing by information professionals in selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria indicated that majority of the respondents agreed that they thought that knowledge sharing is a process whereby knowledge possessed by an individual is shared with another individual. Similarly, more than half of the librarians agreed that knowledge sharing can bring innovation and creativity including research productivity to information professional, find solution to problems they encountered on the job and enhance their skills in search activities in their library. The result of the study is in line with the findings of Tella (2015) who found that knowledge sharing enhances productivity among library professionals in Nigeria.

Concerning the channel of knowledge sharing by information professionals in the selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria, findings revealed that information professionals in the university libraries under study agreed that they shared knowledge through face-to-face interaction, e-mail, mobile phone, through WhatsApp, through Memo and through Facebook. This finding is in consonance with the study of Tella (2015) who found that knowledge sharing platforms by librarians include physical interaction, WhatsApp and email. Supporting this, Chong et al. (2019) revealed that knowledge is shared among library professionals through email and other social media platforms.

Furthermore, findings relating to the effect of self-efficacy on information professionals in the selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria indicated that majority of information professionals agreed that self-efficacy helps them to do their work, helps to learn things rapidly and makes them to apply what they have always learnt. This study agrees with the study of Tella (2015) who found that self-efficacy facilitates productivity among library professionals in Nigeria. Furthermore, Hilima et al. (2019) support the findings of this study. They found that self-efficacy is a determinant factor for achieving productivity among professionals, especially librarians.

Overall, this study revealed that self-efficacy ($r = 0.286^{**}$, $N = 65$, $p < 0.05$) has significant relationship on knowledge sharing. This implied that self-efficacy influences knowledge sharing. This validates the finding of Bilginoglu and Yozgat (2018) who found that there is a positive as well as significant relationship between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing. The result of this study validates the study of Jung (2014).

12. Conclusion and recommendations

The study has shown that knowledge sharing is perceived by information professionals in the selected university libraries in South-West, Nigeria as a valuable process that can bring about innovation,

creativity, problem-solving and skill enhancement. The study also revealed that information professionals share knowledge through various channels, such as face-to-face interaction, email, mobile phone, WhatsApp, Memo and Facebook. In addition, self-efficacy was identified as an important factor that helps information professionals to perform their duties effectively, learn quickly, and apply what they have learned. Furthermore, this study has revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing. This suggests that information professionals who have a high level of self-efficacy are more likely to engage in knowledge sharing activities.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that universities and libraries should encourage and facilitate knowledge sharing among information professionals through the provision of appropriate channels and platforms. They should also promote self-efficacy among information professionals through training and development programmes, mentoring, and coaching, as this can enhance their productivity and performance. Moreover, it is important to conduct further research on the barriers to effective knowledge sharing and how to overcome them, as this can help to improve the effectiveness of knowledge sharing practices among information professionals in university libraries. Furthermore, organisations and managers should focus on enhancing the self-efficacy of their employees through training and development programmes, mentoring, and coaching. This can help to encourage knowledge sharing among employees, leading to increased innovation, problem-solving, and productivity. Additionally, organisations should create a supportive culture that encourages knowledge sharing and recognizes the contributions of employees who engage in knowledge sharing activities. This can help to create a positive environment where employees feel comfortable sharing their knowledge and expertise with others.

13. References

Babbie. E. (2004). The practice of social research (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

Bartol, A. & Srivastava, B. (2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: The role of organizational reward systems. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies,* 9(1):64-76.

Bilginoglu, E. & Yozgat, U. (2018). Perceived training intensity and knowledge sharing among banking sector employees in Turkey: Examining the moderating role of Intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy, *Life Skills Journal of Psychology,* 2(4):361-371

Boateng, H., Agyemang, F.G., Okoe, A.F. & Mensah, T.D. (2017). Examining the relationship between trustworthiness and students' attitudes toward knowledge sharing, *Library Review,* 66(1/2):16-27.

Carmeli, A., Gelbard, R. & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2013). Leadership, creative problem-solving capacity, and creative performance: the importance of knowledge sharing, *Human Resource Management,* 52(1):95-121.

Chen, C.J. & Hung, S.W. (2010). To give or to receive? Factors influencing members' knowledge sharing and community promotion in professional virtual communities,
Information and Management, 47(4):226-236.

Chong, C.W., Yuen, Y.Y. & Chong, S.C. (2019), Exploring KM practices in Malaysian R&D firms, *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication,* 68(4/5):356-376.

Chung, W., Change, W. & Chiu, Y. (2008). Impacts of altruism and self-efficacy on knowledge sharing behavior and the moderating effect of mentor-intern interaction: An empirical study from business internship students, *Journal of Cooperative Education,* 42(1):50-57.

Hilmi, A., Iman, S., Kadarsah, S., & Govindaraju, R. (2009). Knowledgesharing behavior, antecedent and their impact on the individual innovation capability. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research,*5(12).

Holste, J.S., & Fields, D. (2005). The relationship of affect and cognition-based trust with sharing and use of tacit knowledge. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper* (MED: B1).

Hsu, M. H., Ju, T. L., Yen, C. H., & Chang, C. M. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in Virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. *International Journal of Human–Computer Studies,* 65, 153–169.

ILO. (2007). Results-based management: knowledge strategy. 300th Geneva Session, 9(2):1-2. Geneva.

Jashapara, A., & Tai, W. C. (2006). Understanding the complexity of human characteristics on e-learning systems: An integrated study of dynamic individual differences on user perceptions of ease of use. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice,* 4:227–239.

Jung (2014). The interactive role of motivation and ability for knowledge sharing in employee networks, Doctoral dissertation, Seoul National University, South Korea.

Kaewchur, O. & Phusavat, K. (2016). Key factors influencing knowledge sharing, *International Journal of Humanities and Management Sciences (IJHMS),* 4(3):236-237.

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.

Lee D. D., & Ahn, J.H. (2005). Rewarding knowledge sharing under measurement inaccuracy. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice,* 3:229-243.

Mafabi, S., Nasiima, S., Muhimbise, E. M., Kasekende, F., & Nakiyonga, C. (2017). The mediation role of intention in knowledge sharing behavior. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 47*(2):172–193. https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-02-2016-0008

Okyere-Kwakye, E., Nor, K.M., & Ziaei, S. (2011). The influence of altruism, self efficacy and trust on knowledge sharing, *Bilgi Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi Dergisi,* 6(1):31-39.

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

Scully, R.1 & Khosrowshahi, F. (2001). Implementing the process of knowledge sharing for small construction consultant practices in Ireland. *The Built & Human Environment Review,* 4(1):45-58.

Sharrat, M. & Usoro, A. (2003). Understanding knowledge sharing in online communities of practice. *Electronic Journal on Knowledge Management, 1*(2):187-196.

Shuang, Z. & Keyi, W. (2008). The effect of attitude and self-efficacy on knowledge sharing, in 5th International Conference on Innovation and Management, Maastricht, 2008, Dalian Univ Technol, Sch Management, Dalian China, Maastricht,1551-1556.

Skaik, H. A., & Othman, R. (2015). Investigating academics' knowledge sharing behaviour in United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 6(1):161–178. https://doi.org/10.15341/jbe (2155-7950)/01.06.2015/016

So, J.C.F. & Bolloju, N. (2005). Explaining the intentions to share and reuse knowledge in the context of IT service operations. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 9(6):30- 41.

Wasko, M.M. & Faraj, S. (2005). Why should I share? Examining social capital and knowledge contribution in electronic networks of practices. *MIS Quarterly,* 29(9):35-57.

Wei, C.C., Choy, C.S., Chew, G.G. & Yen, Y.Y. (2012). Knowledge sharing patterns of undergraduate students, *Library Review,* 61(5):327-344.