The factors determining knowledge sharing intention among information professionals in Nigeria: a path model analysis

Tella Adeyinka
Department of Library and Information Science,
University of Ilorin,
Nigeria

Email: tellayinkaedu@yahoo.com; tella.a@unilorin.edu.ng

Abstract

Rationale of study **-** Several studies have considered the factors determining the knowledge sharing intention among employees. However, studies focusing on information professionals and factors determining their knowledge sharing intention through a path model are either limited or been ignored.

Methodology - In this study, the researcher developed and tested a path model that explains the factors that determine the intention of information professionals in Nigeria to share knowledge with their colleagues through a survey design.

Findings - The results revealed that a correlation exists between the overall knowledge sharing intention score and the other knowledge sharing intention factors. The results demonstrate that citizenship behaviour had the highest correlation with knowledge sharing intention ($r = 0.852$). This is followed by creativity and innovation ($r = 0.704$), and interaction frequency ($r = 0.558$). The results of the regression of knowledge sharing intention on the ten related factors show an adjusted R-square value of 0.661, and an F-ratio of 105.37; the latter of which is significant at 0.05 level ($0.000 < 0.05$). These indicate that the ten independent variables jointly (as indicated by the R-square value) explained 76.5% of the variations in the knowledge sharing intention by the information professionals.

Implications - The research findings have a big bearing on policy formulation and decision making in information and knowledge organisations, the public and private information sector players, professional associations and information and knowledge training institutions.

Originality - This research has a great value in the sense that it is one of the pioneer studies on information sharing in the context of information research in Nigeria.

Keywords

Knowledge management, knowledge sharing, knowledge sharing intention, Nigeria

1 Introduction

Knowledge is very important to all organisations and should be properly managed. Knowledge is a critical and strategic resource to create new ideas and innovation. It is an asset which calls for organisations to manage it intensively. There are activities involved in knowledge management including acquiring, sharing, and storing the knowledge. However, the most crucial activity of all is knowledge sharing (Bartol, 2002; Gumus, 2007). Since most knowledge is held in the heads of the people, sharing it will help to disseminate the knowledge to the others and by so doing new ideas are generated (Hsiu-Fen, 2007; Samieh & Wahba, 2007). However, there are so many barriers to knowledge sharing in organisations. Therefore, focusing on improving knowledge sharing has a great potential to enable organisations to enhance their competitive advantage.

Knowledge sharing is denoted as the edge to create knowledge which contributes to the increase in employees' performance and harnesses innovation (Scully & Khosrowshahi, 2011). Knowledge sharing is defined as a deliberate subjective act that makes knowledge reusable by other people through knowledge transfer (ILO, 2007). It is the act of exchanging ideas and experiences through deliberations to create new knowledge (Bartol & Srivastava,

2002). Holste and Fields (2005) considered knowledge sharing as the process of giving and receiving knowledge. Susanty and Wood (2011:159) explain that it entails "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". 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).

Intention simply refers to a thing intended; an aim or a plan. An intention is an idea that one plans to carry out. This implies that something in one's mind is an intention. It is a mental state that represents a commitment to carrying out an action or actions in the future and involves mental activities such as planning and forethought. In other words, intention is the starting point of every dream. It is the creative power that fulfills all of human needs, whether for money, relationships, spiritual awakening, or love. In the context of this study therefore, intention to share knowledge is defined as the mental state of an information professional that represents his/her commitment to carrying out an action or actions of sharing knowledge/information with colleagues in the future.

Most employees including information professionals find it difficult to share their knowledge. This might be because they are worried of losing the knowledge that differentiates them from the others (Husted *et al.*, 2005). Similarly, employees do not share their knowledge because they are afraid they may lose some of their power, reduce the opportunities of personal success such as promotion or compensation, and acquire additional workload requiring more time, energy and thought accomplish (So & Bolloju, 2005; Husted *et al.*, 2005; Lee & Ahn, 2005). A study by Lee and Ahn (2005) identified various barriers to knowledge sharing. Since knowledge sharing activities engage employees' high efforts, they tend to reduce their willingness to share. Irrespective of whether or not employees have the intention for sharing knowledge, knowledge must be shared and employees must participate actively in it. Managing knowledge sharing in organisations is considered a big challenge. In the light of this, employees have to be encouraged to increase their involvement in knowledge sharing. According to Susanty and Wood (2011), it is unrealistic to assume that all employees are willing easily to offer knowledge without considering what may be gained or lost.

Having unveiled the factors that prevent the employees from the intention of sharing knowledge, research has been so silent on the factors that promote or determine knowledge sharing intention particularly among the information professionals in Nigeria. Since it has been suggested that knowledge hoarding is an inherently human characteristic (Davenport & Prusak, 1998), knowledge-sharing behaviour can only be encouraged rather than mandated. Therefore, much research has focused on how to encourage employees to share knowledge within and across organisations (Tezuka & Niwa, 2004; Voelpel & Han, 2005). The preoccupation of information professionals is to enrich the lives of others with information which then translates to knowledge for them.

Sharing of knowledge typically occurs in the informal networks in the organisation by means of social interaction. Several authors have proposed to use quantitative analysis to study the knowledge sharing relations in organisations to identify potential barriers to knowledge sharing. Similarly, some others have applied social network analysis to explore knowledge sharing. In addition, several studies have considered the factors determining the knowledge sharing intention among employees. However, studies focusing on knowledge sharing among information professionals through a path model are limited. In this article, the researcher developed and tested a path model that explained the factors that

determine the intention of information professionals in Nigeria to share knowledge with their colleagues. This study is one of the pioneer studies on which other future related studies could be anchored.

2 Determinants of knowledge sharing in organisations

Extant literature has revealed several factors as determinants of knowledge sharing in organisations. By synthesising most of these previous researches, the theoretical foundations for the development of a number of hypotheses based on a path model analysis is hereby provided to show the relationship between a number of factors and knowledge-sharing among information professionals in Nigeria. In this study, information professionals are defined as the specialists, usually professionally trained and certified, who rely on information to design new products or create new business processes (Griffin 2008). In the context of this study, they include librarians, records managers, information technology officers, archivists, information centre managers, database managers, web designers, and publishers, among others.

2.1 Citizenship behaviour

Some researchers have induced the concept of organisational citizenship behaviour into knowledge management so as to explain knowledge-sharing willingness (Bock & Kim,

2002; Koh & Kim, 2004). Smith and McKeen (2002) demonstrated that knowledge sharing culture goes deeper than superficial individual behaviours and captures the hearts and minds of the people in an organisation. This shows that employees in organisations with a knowledge-sharing culture should endeavour to share their knowledge imitatively. Citizenship behaviour is an important factor which could encourage people to perform their work, or share their knowledge or experiences. The relationship between citizenship behaviour and interaction frequency has not been the focus of much research to date. Therefore, it is hypothesised that:

H1. Citizenship behaviour will not significantly determine knowledge sharing intention.

2.2 Peer reliable role performance

Reliable role performance is related to how a person implements his/her assigned work. Griffin (2008) emphasised that, in the work place, it is natural for people to consider how well their co-workers have performed their tasks when assessing whether or not their co-workers were trustworthy. Past performance is one of the aspects of a person's competence. Since competence-based trust will let the person be more willing to communicate with the person he trusts (Abrams *et al*., 2003), so reliable role performance can be considered to

have a positive relationship with knowledge sharing intention. Thus it is proposed that:

H2: Peer reliable role performance will not significantly determine knowledge sharing.

2.3 Interaction frequency

Lai, Liu and Shaffer (2004) have proposed that network members who frequently contact one another may develop stronger citizenship behaviour, because frequency of interaction will make them more supportive towards each other. Also, it has been found that positive affectivity could constitute an antecedent of citizenship behaviour (Organ, 1988) and could facilitate the development of positive affectivity. Besides, citizenship behaviour could be regarded as a critical factor supporting the development of a knowledge-sharing atmosphere that could be established by leaders' endeavour. Thus, it is proposed that:

H3: The frequency of interaction among information professionals will not significantly determine their knowledge sharing intention.

2.4 Trust

Many researchers believe that trust is an important precursor of knowledge sharing because people are more inclined to share and accept knowledge when they are in trusting relationships with others. Trust involves a willingness to make one vulnerable to others in various dimensions including (1) trust in their competence; (2) trust in their openness and honesty; (3) trust in their intensions and concerns; and (4) trust in their reliability (Mishra, 1996). Therefore, trust is an important facilitator in communication. According to Mitzal (1996:10), "trust is keeping our minds open to all evidence and secures communication and dialogue". Trust facilitates transactions and collaboration (Fukuyama, 1995). This suggests that where relationships are high in trust, people are more willing to engage in cooperative interaction (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Indeed empirical research has linked trust with levels of inter-unit resource exchange which could produce cooperation, resource exchange, and help employees to ignore competitive messages (Kotlarsky & Oshri 2008). Unless there is a high degree of trust within organisations, people will be sceptical about the intentions and behaviour of others and thus, they may withhold their knowledge. Building a relationship of trust within an organisation will help to facilitate a more proactive and open knowledge sharing process (Wong, 2005). Ardichvili *et al*. (2003) concurred that no matter how motivated staff are, they do not share knowledge with those they do not trust. Levin and Cross (2004) found that the level of trust affects not only the sharers but the seekers of knowledge too. Similarly, Holste and Fields (2005) argued that when there is trust between individuals, they are more likely

to take note of and receive knowledge in addition to providing worthwhile knowledge in return. Hence, it is hypothesised that:

H4: Trust will not significantly determine knowledge sharing intention.

2.5 Self-efficacy

Hsu *et al.* (2007) defined knowledge sharing self-efficacy as a form of self-evaluation that influences decisions about what behaviours to undertake, the amount of effort and persistence to put forth when faced with obstacles, and finally, the mastery of the behaviour. The social cognitive theory argues that the mind of an individual is an active tool which guides one's steps towards formulating expectations, abilities and outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Okyere-Kwakye and Nor (2011) explained that in the context of knowledge management this theory could mean that if individuals are not sure of their capabilities and the outcome of the knowledge they are supposed to share, they may not share it. This shows that individuals build confidence before sharing their knowledge. If they feel incapacitated they will not share. However, individuals may still share knowledge when their expectation of the outcome is high. According to Bandura (1997) self-efficacy is the judgment of one's capability to organise certain behaviour. Individuals formulate their self-efficacy based on their environment, personal

goals, and the social networks they find themselves in. Hence one may formulate a degree of self-efficacy depending on the expectation of the outcomes. Self-efficacy can help motivate employees to share knowledge with colleagues (Wasko & Faraj, 2005). Researchers have also found that employees with high confidence in their ability to provide valuable knowledge are more likely to accomplish specific tasks (Constant *et al.*, 1994). Knowledge 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 that they can contribute to organisational performance by sharing knowledge will develop greater positive willingness to both contribute and receive knowledge. People may develop higher self-efficacy to exchange their knowledge when there is cooperation within the environment and the social network in which they found themselves. Hence, it is hypothesised that:

H5: Self-efficacy will not significantly determine the knowledge sharing intention.

2.6 Employee creativity and innovation

Creativity and innovation concern the process of creating and applying new knowledge. Creativity is the process of generating ideas whilst innovation is the sifting, refining and, more critically, the implementation of those

ideas. Creativity is about divergent thinking. Innovation is about convergent thinking. Creativity is about the generation of ideas and innovation is about putting them into action. But coming up with new ideas is not enough. People need innovation – the taking of new or existing ideas and putting them into action. This requires the application of existing knowledge and the development of appropriate new knowledge. Coming up with new ideas is the "food" of innovation. Innovation is a far tougher proposition than creativity (Gurteen, 1998). It is expected that professionals who are creative and innovative will be willing and eager to share their innovation and creativity with others. In the light of this, it is hypothesised that:

H6: Creativity and innovation will not significantly determine knowledge sharing intention.

2.7 Organisation or management policies

Management literature has emphasised the importance of top management in implementing and supporting an environment that fosters effective knowledge sharing and innovation within business units (Vera & Crossan, 2004). Southon *et al.* (2002) have proposed that management policy has a direct influence on the communication culture within the company as leadership style affects the employees' behaviour. Thus, if managers are more inclined to consideration or initiating structure, then the subordinates of these managers will be correspondingly affected to behave in a manner that is oriented towards their managers' style. In addition, strategic leadership is a key driving force for organisational learning (Vera & Crossan, 2004) and for knowledge management (Nonaka *et al.*, 2000). Nonaka *et al.* (2000) assert that leaders promote and develop knowledge sharing, create and energise the space in which knowledge is created and trigger knowledge creation and use. The way in which knowledge management practices are designed and implemented is a reflection of corporate and business unit support, which in turn, is a reflection of the leadership (Figallo & Rhine, 2002). Taking the above into consideration, the following hypothesis related to management support or policies was formulated:

H7. Organisation/Management policies will not significantly determine knowledge sharing.

2.8 Interest concern

Wang (2004) proposed that ethical concerns have a positive relationship on the intention to share knowledge while self-interest concerns have a negative relationship. In the light of this, it is proposed that:

H8. Interest concern will not significantly determine knowledge sharing intention.

2.9 Sense of belonging

Sense of belonging can be equated to sense of community (SoC) which has been defined within a group by Wasko and Faraj (2000) as a feeling that members have of belonging to one another and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together. SoC leads to a common perspective of knowledge as a public good, owned and maintained by the community (Wasko & Faraj 2000). Thus, knowledge-sharing is likely to be motivated by moral obligation that results in a deeper sense of satisfaction than when motivated by extrinsic factors. A strong SoC will also lead to a greater degree of importance being placed on recognition of knowledge-sharing. This brings with it feelings of intrinsic satisfaction. Hence, it is hypothesised that:

H9: The stronger the sense of belonging, the stronger the intention to participate in knowledge-sharing.

2.10 Organisation motivation

Knowledge resides within individuals. Therefore, in order to effectively share knowledge, individuals must be motivated to do so. It has been argued that the provision of appropriate incentives will most likely influence the behaviour of employees in knowledge sharing. Hall (2001b) views knowledge-sharing as a social exchange and argues that to entice people to share their knowledge, actors need to

be persuaded it is worth entering into a transaction in exchange for some kind of resource. These arguments raise the question of what constitutes an appropriate incentive. Indeed, there is much debate as to the most effective and appropriate incentive in motivating knowledge-sharing activities (Hall, 2001a). Personal motivation to share the knowledge one possesses must be understood so that an organisation can develop structures to encourage knowledge sharing amongst staff. In order to build a knowledge-based enterprise, incentive systems should be focused on criteria such as knowledge sharing and contribution, teamwork, creativity and innovative solutions (Holste & Fields 2005). Knowledge-sharing could be motivated by a sense of moral obligation. Extrinsic rewards such as financial incentives are another method of motivating knowledge sharing (Hall 2001b). Herzberg (2003) found that financial rewards and other external factors are important in avoiding demotivation, but have little effect on sustaining the motivation of employees. Instead Herzberg (2003) discovered that factors that are intrinsically rewarding, such as the work itself, recognition and reputation, had a far greater influence on an employee's motivation. Therefore, it is assumed that good positive motivation of members may or may not gear organisation workers to share their knowledge. Hence, it is hypothesised that:

H10: Organisational motivation will not significantly determine knowledge sharing intention

3 Methodology

This study adopted a pure quantitative method using a survey approach. This approach was chosen to allow the researcher to draw on large sample which is representative of the total population (Babbie 2004). Moreover, a survey approach was chosen because it is the most prominent approach used in previous related studies such as that of Huang *et al*. (2008). The study concentrated on Nigerian information professionals selected from seven states including Kwara, Oyo, Osun, Ogun, Lagos, Ondo, and Ekiti states as the target population of the study. These states were chosen because of their accessibility. A sample was drawn from among librarians, records managers, IT officers, archivists, information centre managers, database managers, web designers, and publishers who are regarded as information professionals in this study. A total of five hundred (500) information professionals were drawn through a total enumeration sampling technique.

A self-completion questionnaire with items adapted from various scales used in previous related studies such as Huang *et al*. (2008) was used. The various constructs in the questionnaire were measured to examine the determinant factors of knowledge sharing intention. Previous related studies from extant literature were used to derive the constructs for the study. A five-point rating format ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree was adopted for the instrument. The questionnaire consisted of 11 sections, each containing four items that measured the factors in the model and captured demographic data.

The criterion related validity was assessed by the correlation between the total scores on the instrument (sum of the 44 items) and the measures of the dependent factor or variable, that is, knowledge sharing intention (criterion). Usually, a positive relationship between the total score and the valid criterion of the instrument implies the capability of the instrument to measure the knowledge sharing intention. A higher correlation represents an acceptable criterion-related validity of the questionnaire (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Hussein *et al*., 2007). In other words, a higher correlation suggests a strong correspondence between the constructs and the knowledge sharing intention dimension of the questionnaire (Kerlinger, 1988). In this study, the 37 items on the questionnaire had a criterion-related validity of 0.91 at significant level of 0.05, which represents acceptable criterion validity.

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to examine the factor structure of the 44-item questionnaire. Prior to identifying the factor structure of the knowledge sharing intention questionnaire using factor analysis, a chi-square value of 627.53 at significant level of 0.05 were obtained. This suggests that the inter-correlation matrix contains sufficient common variance to make factor analysis worthwhile. The responses were examined using the principal component factor analysis as the extraction technique. An iterative sequence of factor analysis was also conducted. At this stage none of the items were deleted. At the end of the factor analysis procedure, 10 factors with 44 items on the questionnaire were obtained. The factor loading for the 44-item questionnaire shows significant loading of all the items on the single factor indicate uni-dimensionality. It was observed that no cross-loading was found. This supports the discriminant validity of the questionnaire. To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire used in this study, *a* test re-tests reliability method of two weeks interval using CronbachApha was adopted to determine both internal consistency reliability, overall reliability and reliability of each of the factors or variables identified in the study.

The author administered the questionnaire through his students that went on six (6) months industrial work experience scheme (SIWES) during the 2011/12 session. Through total enumeration, 700 respondents were identified and as result a total of 700 copies of questionnaire were shared among the students to be administered in their respective SIWES places. The copies of the questionnaire were administered and returned to the author at the end of the sixth month when the students completed the SIWES. Out of the total of 700 copies administered by the students, 500 copies were completely filled and useful for the analysis. This represents 71.4% return rate.

4 Findings of the study

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to examine the relationships between the constructs while multiple regression analysis was used to find out the determinant of knowledge sharing intention among the factors. The results of the analyses are presented as indicated in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Response rate

Name of State	Total Questionnaire Administered	Total Questionnaire Returned Completely Filled
Kwara	100	65
Oyo	100	90
Ogun	100	80
Lagos	100	95
Ondo	100	60
Osun	100	60
Ekiti	100	50
Total	700	500

The demographic information of respondents who took part in the study are summarised in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Demographic Information (N = 500)

Demographics	Frequency	Percentage %
Gender		
Male	325	65.0
Female	175	35.0
Total	**500**	**100**
Age		
25- 30 years	210	42.0
31- 35 years	120	24.0
36- 40 years	80	16.0
41 -45 years	60	12.0
46 years +	30	6.0
Total	**500**	**100.0**
Experience		
0- 10 years	300	60.0
11-20 years	105	21.0
21-30 years	56	11.2
31 years +	39	7.8
Total	**500**	**100.0**
Information Professionals		
Librarians	**256**	51.2
Information Centres Managers	**89**	17.8
Records Manager	**53**	10.6
IT/Officer Database Managers	**70**	14.0
Archivist/Publishers & Booksellers	**32**	6.4
Total	**500**	**100.0**

Table 3 reveals that correlation exists between the overall knowledge sharing intention score and the other knowledge sharing intention related factors. The results show that citizenship behaviour had the highest correlation with knowledge sharing intention

(r = 0.852). This is followed by creativity and innovation (r =0.704), interaction frequency (r = 0.558). A correlation of other factors reveals peer reliable role performance (r = 0.540), affective based trust (r = 0.523), cognitive based trust (r = 0.507), org/mgt. policy (r = 0.406), interest concern (r = 0.402) which had the lowest correlation with knowledge sharing intention. This suggests that all these factors correlate with knowledge sharing intention of information professionals. Nevertheless, the results reveal that some correlations are higher than others. Among the inter-correlations that are higher than 0.5 are creativity and innovation (r = 0.704), interaction frequency (r = 0.558),

peer reliable role performance (r = 0.540), affective based trust (r = 0.523), cognitive based trust (r = 0.507). These high correlations are not surprising considering the fact that respondents are likely to link citizenship behaviour with knowledge sharing intention. This is to say that the citizenship behaviour influence creativity and innovation which affect the interaction frequency. The benefits respondents derived from knowledge sharing will influence their peer reliable performance. A few other inter-correlations are close to 0.5. Among these are perceived org/mgt. policy (r = 0.406), and interest concern (r = 0.402).

Table 3: Inter-correlation matrix of the factors (N = 500)

(N=500)													
			Factors (Variables)										
Factors (Variables)	Mean	Std. Dev.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
(1) Knowledge Sharing Int.	22.131	13.932	1.000										
(2) Citizenship beh.	10.732	3.733	.852	1.000									
(3)Peer reliable role performance	9.144	2.414	.540	**.563**	1.000								
(4) Interaction frequency	6.556	2.656	.558	.323	.420	1.000							
(5)Trust	6.907	2.222	.507	**.501**	**.535**	.394	1.000						
(6) Self-efficacy	8.336	2.321	**.523**	.351	.429	.360	.476	1.000					
(7)Creativity &innovatn.	7.321	3.451	**.704**	.286	.300	.332	.390	**.521**	1.000				
(8) Org/Mgt. polices	7.003	3.100	.406	.211	.227	.220	.132	.228	.348	1.000			
(9)Interest concern	5.232	3.366	.402	.224	.427	.342	.241	.429	.318	.219	1.000		
(10) Sense of belonging	4.992	3.226	.398	.219	.412	.324	.232	.412	.302	.209	.205	1.000	
(11) Org. motivation	4.897	2.991	.388	.211	.404	.311	.228	.409	.299	.203	.201	.199	1.000

Table 3a presents the results of the regression of knowledge sharing intention on the ten

related factors. The regression results show an adjusted R-square value of 0.661 (Table 3(a)),

and an F-ratio of 105.37 (Table 3(b), the latter of which is significant at 0.05 level (0.000 < 0.05). These results indicate that the eight independent variables jointly (as indicated by the R-square value) explained or determined 76.5% of the variations in the knowledge sharing intention by the information professionals. This is also significant, as indicated by the F-ratio thereby confirming that all the ten factors significantly determine knowledge sharing intention of the information professionals.

Table 3(b) provides information on the individual contributions of each of the ten factors in determining information professionals' knowledge sharing intention (KSI). The results show that each of the factors makes a significant contribution to knowledge sharing intention (as indicated by the significance of the t values, which are greater than 0.05, as shown in the rightmost column of the table.

Table 3a and 3b: Summary of simple regression analysis on determinant of Knowledge Sharing Intention (dependent variable) by other KSI factors (Independent variables) (N = 500)

(a) Model Summary					
Model	R	R. Square	Adjusted Square	Standard Error of the Estimate	
1	.865(a)	765	.661	3.54788	
(b) ANOVA					
Model		Sums of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7575.444	8	946.931	105.367	.05(a)
	Residual	4421.606	492	8.987		
	Total	11997.050	500			

The results in table 4 above reveal that all the ten factors returned correlations greater than 0.5 significant level. This leads to the rejection of hypotheses 1- 10 where it was stated that citizenship behaviour, peer reliable role performance, interaction frequency, cognitive based trust, and affective based trust, creativity and innovation, organization management policy, and interest concern will not significantly determine knowledge sharing intention of the information professionals. Alternatively, the results reveal that the ten factors significantly determine knowledge sharing intention of the information professionals in the seven selected Nigeria states.

Table 4: Results on Hypotheses 1- 8 (N = 500)

Variables	No	Pearson Correlation Co-efficient	Alpha	Remark
Citizenship behaviour vs KSI	500	r = .78	0.5	S*
Peer reliable role performance vs KSI	500	r = .68	0.5	S*
Interaction frequency vs KSI	500	r = .71	0.5	S*
Trust vs KSI	500	r = .68	0.5	S*
Self-efficacy vs KSI	500	r = .67	0.5	S*
Creativity & innovation vs KSI	500	r = .70	0.5	S*
Org/mgt. policy vs KSI	500	r = .59	0.5	S*
Interest concern vs KSI	500	r = .56	0.5	S*
Sense of belonging	500	r = .49	0.5	S*
Organisational motivation	500	r = .47	0.5	S*

VS = versus,   KSI = Knowledge Sharing Intention

5 Discussion of findings

Evidently, the study has demonstrated that citizenship behaviour had the highest correlation with knowledge sharing intention followed by creativity and innovation, interaction frequency, peer reliable role performance, affective based trust, cognitive based trust, organisation management policy, and interest concern. When an individual is treated positively in terms of meeting his/her needs especially in a place work, that individual will no doubt give the best of self to such an organisation. No doubt, citizenship behaviour is an important factor which could encourage people to perform their work. This might also make them to be enthusiastic in sharing knowledge and information with colleagues. The current result is therefore not surprising since knowledge sharing culture goes deeper than superficial individual behaviours and captures the hearts and minds of the people in an organisation (Smith & McKeen, 2002).

The correlation of creativity and innovation with knowledge sharing intention is also a good one. Creativity is about the generation of ideas while innovation is about putting them into action. An individual who generates new ideas will always be willing to communicate and share it with his colleagues because the idea will be credited to his/her name thereby serving as motivation for him to do more. Similarly, the antecedent of giving support to one another particularly in organizations might therefore be in form of sharing knowledge with one another. Meeting and interacting with one another will also no doubt promote the sharing of knowledge. This is in agreement with earlier proposition by Lai, Liu and Shaffer (2004) that network members who frequently contact one another may develop stronger citizenship behaviour, because frequency of interaction will make them more supportive towards each other.

The results in this study also confirm that all the ten factors significantly determine knowledge sharing intention of the information professionals and similarly; each of the factors make significant contributions to knowledge sharing intention. The determination and contribution of citizenship behaviour to knowledge sharing intention is not a coincidence. This is because the literature has it that knowledge sharing culture goes deeper than superficial individual behaviours and captures the hearts and minds of the people in an organization (Smith & McKeen, 2002). Employees having the knowledge-sharing culture therefore will no doubt endeavour to share their knowledge imitatively. Similarly, the contribution of the peer reliable role performance is a very interesting one. Past performance is one of the aspects of a person's competence. Again, the personality of an individual employee can adjudge him or her of being reliable. No doubt, therefore, that a reliable person will always be willing to relate well with the peers. Doing so can lead to sharing of their knowledge with them. This might be the reason for the contribution of this factor to knowledge sharing demonstrated in this study.

On the contribution of interaction frequency to knowledge sharing, it has been previously asserted that positive affectivity could constitute an antecedent of citizenship behaviour (Organ 1988), and frequency of interaction could facilitate the development of positive affectivity (Cummings, 2004). If there is high frequency of interaction among employees in an organization, it is a welcome development. This is because that high interaction will no doubt result to sharing of knowledge. In fact employees will just be doing it even without notice. All they will think they are doing is that they are interacting with their peers but yet in reality, they are transferring knowledge to one another. This is because the feeling of that security will be there. Going by Mitzal's (1996) position, trust is keeping our mind open to all evidence and secures communication and dialogue. There is no doubt again that an atmosphere where there is trust people will be free to share with one another even on issues that are confidential. This also might be responsible the contribution of this factor cognitive and even affective based trust to knowledge sharing reported in this study.

This study also reported that creativity and innovation determine and contribute to knowledge sharing. A creative person will always want colleagues to notice his or her existence in the organization. This is done mostly through the sharing of their innovative and creative ideas with them. Consequently, they'll always have the belief that they are asset to the organization. To do this successfully is by sharing knowledge and ideas which are

uncommon and novel and which can be credited to their name at any point in time even when they leave the organization. This is particular to information organization. Creativity is about the generation of ideas and innovation is about putting them into action. By the time an idea is put into action, it is as good as being communicated and shared.

The contribution of other factors such as Self-efficacy, organization management policy, and interest concern to knowledge sharing intention reported in this study is also a welcome development. Self-efficacy is the ability and capability of an individual to handle or perform something better than the other. In other words, it is not an overstatement to state that some information professionals are self-efficacious in sharing information than others. Without mincing words, such individuals will not rest until they share ideas and knowledge. Therefore, this result is also not surprising. Again, if it is part of the organizational policy that employees should share their knowledge with one another, they will always have the intention of doing so particularly if there is a reward attached to it. Similarly, interest goes a long way in knowledge sharing intention. Having a sense of belonging to an organization also will encourage an employee to always have the willingness to share knowledge especially when the organization is meeting all their demands. Similarly, employees who have the intention of sharing knowledge will always do so without stress than those who do not.

6 Limitations of the study

Research from such a small sample size (500 participants) in one profession in a single country (Nigeria) is considered insufficient. Therefore, future research should consider expanding the scope of the study so that more participants can be included. Again, the study covered only two geo-political zones with inclusion of only seven states in isolation of four other geo-political zones comprising of thirty states in Nigeria. In the light of this, future research should consider extending the study to cover more geo-political zones and more states.

7 Conclusion

In conclusion, the study has revealed that correlation exists between the overall knowledge sharing intention score and the other knowledge sharing intention related factors and that citizenship behaviour had the highest correlation with knowledge sharing intention, followed by creativity and innovation, and interaction frequency. Similarly, the ten independent variables jointly (as indicated by the R-square value) explained 76.5% of the variations in the knowledge sharing intention by the information professionals.

7 Recommendation

It is recommended that knowledge workers and information professionals should develop good citizenship behaviour as it has been shown to be a very strong factors stimulating knowledge sharing intention. Organisation motivation had the lowest correlation with knowledge sharing intention. Therefore, it is recommended that information organisations in Nigeria need to do more in this area. Increasing the motivation for knowledge sharing by the management will go a long way to improve the intention to share knowledge by the information professionals.

8 References

Abrams, L.C.,Cross, R., Lesser E., & Levin D. Z. (2003). Nurturing interpersonal trust in knowledge sharing networks. *Academy of Management Executive* , 17(4):64-76.

Ardichvili A., Maurer M., Li, W. Wentling, T. & Stuedemann, R. (2006). Cultural influences on knowledge sharing through online communities of practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management* , 10(1):94-107.

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.

Bock, G.W.& Kim, Y. (2002). Breaking the myth of rewards: an exploratory study of attitude about knowledge sharing. *Information Resources Management Journal* , 15(2):15-22.

Campbell, D.R. & Fiske, D.W. . (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by multi-trait-multi-method matrix. *Psychological Bulletin* , 56(9):81-105.

Constant, D., Kiesler, S. & Sproull, L. (1994). What's mine is ours or is it? A study of attitudes about information sharing. *Information Systems Research* , 5(4):400-21.

Cross, R., & Sproull, L. (2004). More than an answer: information relationships for actionable knowledge. *Organization Science* , 15(4):446-462.

Cummings, J. (2004). Work groups, structural diversity and knowledge sharing in a global organization. *Management Science* , 50(3):352-364.

Davenport, T.H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: how organizations manage what they know.* Harvard Business School Press.

Figallo, C. & Rhine, N. (2002). *Building the knowledge management network.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: the social virtues and the creation of prosperity.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Griffin, R. (2008). *Management.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Gumus, M. (2007). The effect of communication on knowledge sharing in organizations. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice* , 8(2):15-26.

Gurteen, D. (1999). *Creating a knowledge-sharing culture.* Retrieved March 17, 2013, from Knowledge Management Magazine: 2 (5) : www.gurteen.com/gurteen/gurteen.nsf/id/X004E2852

Hall, H. (2001a). Input-friendliness: motivating knowledge sharing across intranets. *Journal of Information Science* , 27(3):139-146.

Hall, H. (2001b). *Social exchange for knowledge exchange, Managing knowledge:conversations and critiques.* University of Leicester.

Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: how do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review* , 87-96.

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 ConferencePaper(MED: B1).*

Hsiu-Fen, L. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower* , 28(3&4):315-332.

Hsu, M., Ju, T., Yen, C. & Chang, C. (2007). Knowledge sharing behaviour in virtual communities: the relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectation. *Journal of Human-Computer Studies* , 65(2):153-169.

Huang, Q., Davidson, R.M., Liu, H., & Gu, J. (2008). The impact of leadership style on knowledge sharing intentions in China. *Journal of Global Information Management* , 16(4):67-91.

Hussein, R., Abdu-Karim, N.S., Mohamed, N., & Ahlan, A.R. (2007). The influence of organizational factors on information system success in e-government agencies in Malaysia. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries* , 29(1):1-17.

Husted, K., Michailova, S., & Minbaeva, D. (2005). Knowledge sharing and organizational performance: the role of extrinsic and intrinsic motives. *International Human Resources Management Conference.* Cairns Australia.

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

Kerlinger, F. (1998). *Foundation of behaviour research.* New York: Harper and Row.

Koh, J., & Kim Y.G. (2004). Knowledge sharing in virtual communities: An e-business perspective. *Expert Systems with Applications* , 26:155-166.

Kotlarsky, J., & Oshri, L. (2008). Social ties, knowledge sharing and successful collaboration in globally distributed system development projects. *European Journal of Information Systems* , 14:37-48.

Lai, C.T., Liu, X. & Shaffer M.A. (2004). *Interpersonal citizenship behavior of employees in greater China:a social capital perspective.* Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http://net2.hkbu.edu.hk/~brc/CCMP200402.PDF

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

Levin, D. &. Cross (2004). The strength of weak ties you can trust: the mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science* , 50(11):1477-1490.

Luthans, F. (2003). Positive organizational behavior: developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive* , 16(1);57-75.

Mishra, A. (1996). The Centrality of Trust', in Trust in Organisations. In R. Tyler, *Organisational Responses to Crisis* (pp. 261-287). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Mitzal, B. (1996). *Trust in modern societies.* Cambridge : Polity Press.

Nahapiet, J. (1996). Creating organisational capital through intellectual and social capital. *Organisation Science Winter Conference.*

Nonaka, I., Toyama, R. & Konno, N. (2000). SECI, Ba and Leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long Range Planning* , 33:5-34.

Okyere-Kwakye, E. & Nor, K. (2011). Individual factors and knowledge sharing. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration* , 3(1):66-72.

Organ, D. (1998). *Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Samieh, H.M. & Wahba, K. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior from Game theory and Socio-Psychology perspective. *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.*

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.

Smith, H.A., & McKeen, J.D. (2002). Instilling a knowledge-sharing culture (Vol. Learning and Capabilities),. *Proceedings of the Third European Conference on Organizational Knowledge(ALBA).* Athens, Greece. River, NJ.: Prentice Hall.

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.

Southon, G. & Todd, R.J. (2001). Educating for a knowledge management future: perceptions of library and information professionals. *The Australian Library Journal* , 50(1):313-326.

Susanty, A.I. & Wood, P.C. . (2011). The motivation to share knowledge of the employees in the telecommunication service providers in Indonesia. *International Conference on Social Science and Humanity IACSIT Press*, (pp. 2:159-162). Singapore.

Tezuka, S.,& Niwa, K. (2004). Knowledge sharing in inter-organizational intelligence: R&D-based venture alliance community cases in Japan. *International Journal of Technology Management* , 28(7&8):714-728.

Vera, D. & Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and organization learning. *Academy of Management Review* , 29(2):222-240.

Voelpel, S.C. & Han, Z. (2005). Managing knowledge sharing in China: The case of Siemens sharenet. *Journal of Knowledge Management* , 9(3):51-63.

Wang, C. (2004). The influence of ethical and self-interest concerns on knowledge sharing intentions among managers: An empirical study. *International Journal of Management* , 21(3):370-381.

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.