FEDERAL UNIVERSITY GUSAU (FUGUS), ZAMFARA STATE, NIGERIA
FUGUS INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE
(FIJLIS)VOL.2., NO.2, (DECEMBER)2025 DOI: https://doi.org/10.57233/fijlis.v2i2.10
ISSN PRINT:1595-3432
A Publication of the University Library.

FACTORS FACILITATING KNOWLEDGE SHARING AMONG LECTURERS IN THE FACULTIES OF ENGINEERING IN UNIVERSITIES IN KANO STATE

by

Izdihar Abdulwakil Saleh
Maryam Abacha American University of Nigeria
izdihar.saleh@maaun.edu.ng

Aishatu Hassan Muhammad
Federal Polytechnic Bauchi
amhassa@fptb.edu.ng

Dalhatu Usman Mairiga
Department of Library and Information Sciences
Bayero University, Kano
dalmansarkee@gmail.com

Received on: 13th Jan., 2025 **Revised and Accepted on:** 16th Sept., 2025 **Published on:** 1st Dec., 2025

Abstract

It has been observed that lecturers in engineering faculties possess diverse skill sets that, if effectively harnessed, could enhance university academic activities. This study investigates knowledge sharing practices among engineering lecturers at the Bayero University Kano and Aliko Dangote University of Science and Technology, Wudil. The study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design; data were collected from 192 lecturers through a structured questionnaire administered via a total enumeration approach. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) and inferential statistics to identify trends and relationships. Findings reveal that various forms of knowledge, tacit, explicit, and specific, are actively shared within the engineering faculties. Key factors facilitating knowledge sharing include personal interaction, trust, motivation, reward systems, organisational culture, and institutional structure. However, the overall extent of knowledge sharing remains moderate, highlighting opportunities for improving faculty engagement and strategy implementation. The study concludes that enhancing knowledge sharing requires targeted interventions, such as incentive and recognition programmes and greater integration of ICT tools. These strategies are essential to strengthening collaboration, fostering innovation, and improving academic performance in engineering faculties. The findings underscore the need for a supportive institutional environment that promotes continuous and effective knowledge exchange among academic staff.

Keywords: Knowledge sharing, Lecturers, Engineering faculties, Tacit knowledge, Explicit knowledge, Facilitating factors

Introduction

In the present knowledge-driven environment, knowledge sharing is widely recognized as a cornerstone of organizational growth, innovation, and effective decision-making (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Drucker, 1993). Within higher education, it enhances academic practices by enabling timely access to information, fostering collaboration, and improving research productivity. The value of knowledge sharing, however, depends not only on institutional strategies but also on individual willingness, attitudes, and perceptions of relevance (Al-Kurdi et al., 2023). To support this process, universities adopt practices such as peer mentoring, workshops, and communities of practice, while also utilizing digital repositories and collaborative platforms to capture and disseminate critical knowledge (Huang et al., 2020).

In faculties such as engineering, where innovation and practical expertise are central, effective knowledge sharing among lecturers is vital for promoting intellectual exchange, improving teaching methods, and advancing collaborative research. Knowledge sharing is not merely the transfer of information but also a dynamic process of co-creation that strengthens institutional learning and competitiveness (Meihami & Meihami, 2024; Santoro et al., 2024). Lecturers thus act both as disseminators of disciplinary knowledge and facilitators of organizational advancement, underscoring the strategic importance of fostering a knowledge-sharing culture in academia.

Statement of the problem

Knowledge sharing plays a vital role in higher education institutions, which are traditionally regarded as hubs for knowledge creation and dissemination. It fosters collaboration, enhances innovation, and improves institutional performance. Yet, despite its potential, knowledge sharing is often underutilized. Barriers such as lack of trust, workload pressures, and limited digital competence frequently hinder its practice, leading to knowledge hoarding and reduced innovation within faculties (Razmerita et al., 2021; Huang et al., 2020).

In the faculties of engineering within Kano State universities, these challenges are compounded by weak mentoring structures and limited engagement with global advancements in engineering research and pedagogy. Many lecturers face difficulties in accessing and sharing both tacit and explicit knowledge, which undermines professional development and institutional competitiveness. While international studies have identified leadership, organizational culture, technology, and individual motivation as central drivers of knowledge sharing (Al-Kurdi et al., 2023; Meihami & Meihami, 2024; Santoro et al., 2024), empirical research focusing on Nigerian universities—and specifically engineering faculties in Kano State—remains limited.

This gap restricts the development of context-sensitive strategies to strengthen knowledge-sharing practices. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate the enablers and barriers influencing knowledge sharing among engineering lecturers in Kano State universities, to inform institutional policies that foster collaboration, innovation, and global competitiveness.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to examine the nature of knowledge shared among lecturers in the Faculties of Engineering at Bayero University Kano and Aliko Dangote University of Science and Technology, with a focus on understanding the factors that facilitate or inhibit effective knowledge sharing practices. The specific objectives are to:

1. Identify the types of knowledge shared among lecturers in the Faculties of Engineering in universities located in Kano State.

2. Examine the key factors that facilitate knowledge sharing among engineering lecturers in the universities under study;
3. Determine the barriers inhibiting effective knowledge sharing practices among lecturers in the Faculties of Engineering at the selected universities.

Review of Related Literature

Defining knowledge is a complex task, as it represents a multidimensional and socially embedded construct that integrates experience, intuition, judgment, skills, and lessons learned. Far from being static, knowledge is a dynamic process involving creating, interpreting, integrating, and applying information, all shaped by personal beliefs, professional practices, and organizational contexts. Unlike data, which are raw and unstructured, or information, which is organized for specific purposes, knowledge evolves continuously through interaction with new inputs and lived experiences. This evolution encompasses a range of cognitive and social activities, including the pursuit of new information, its interpretation, and its dissemination through interaction and collaboration, ultimately enabling the generation of insights and innovative solutions (Kurniawati et al., 2023; Meihami & Meihami, 2024).

Within this perspective, knowledge management (KM) has emerged as a systematic process of capturing, integrating, and applying knowledge to create organizational value and foster innovation (Meihami & Meihami, 2024). Central to KM is knowledge sharing, defined as the reciprocal exchange of ideas and expertise among individuals or groups, which enhances collective understanding and informs sound decision-making (Razmerita et al., 2021). Effective KM requires the integration of people, processes, and technology, a synergy that not only facilitates the efficient dissemination of knowledge but also supports its strategic application to stimulate growth and competitiveness (Abbas & Sağsan, 2023; Meihami & Meihami, 2024). In the context of higher education, knowledge sharing has been shown to increase absorptive capacity and strengthen institutional innovation, underscoring its role as a critical driver of organizational performance (Al-Kurdi et al., 2023).

The importance of knowledge sharing is particularly pronounced in higher education institutions. Universities, as argued by Lawal, Oriogu, and Ogbuiyi (2017), must leverage intellectual capital by fostering knowledge exchange among academic staff to remain competitive in a globalized educational landscape. Steyn (2004) further emphasizes that management must balance attention across people, technology, and organizational structures if institutions are to harness the full potential of knowledge resources. Importantly, this process extends beyond the mere transfer of explicit knowledge; it requires the careful communication and absorption of tacit knowledge, which is deeply embedded in individual experience and interpersonal interactions.

Despite the recognition of knowledge sharing as a vital organizational function, significant gaps persist in understanding how tacit knowledge—the experiential, unwritten form of knowledge—circulates within universities, particularly in developing contexts. Foundational contributions, such as those of Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) and Wagner-Dobler (2004), distinguished tacit from explicit knowledge, but these studies largely focus on corporate environments. Moreover, while Omotayo (2019) underscores the importance of integrating people, processes, and technology in KM, relatively few empirical studies have examined how these elements interact in academic institutions. Although research into technological and leadership enablers of knowledge sharing exists (Arazy & Haas, 2012; Sari et al., 2021), integrated models that capture the cultural, behavioral, and relational complexities unique to universities remain underdeveloped. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates the

factors influencing tacit knowledge sharing among university lecturers to strengthen KM practices and foster innovation in higher education.

Types of Knowledge Shared in Institutions of Higher Learning

Recent studies continue to emphasize that explicit and tacit knowledge are the twin pillars of intellectual capital, shaping how organizations generate and sustain innovation. Explicit knowledge remains codified and systematic, easily documented and disseminated through formal channels such as repositories and databases (*Meihami & Meihami, 2024; Del Giudice et al., 2021*). Tacit knowledge, on the other hand, is deeply personal, rooted in intuition, skills, and lived experiences, making it harder to codify but indispensable for creativity and adaptability (*Kurniawati et al., 2023; Santoro et al., 2024*). As *Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995)* originally argued, and as reaffirmed in more recent scholarship, organizational learning and innovation emerge most powerfully when explicit and tacit knowledge interact dynamically within social and institutional contexts.

Organisational knowledge, which encompasses both tacit and explicit forms, represents a strategic asset that reflects the collective expertise, culture, and memory of an institution (Cabrera, 2002; Secundo et al., 2023). As organisations increasingly compete based on knowledge, developing effective knowledge management strategies has become critical to sustaining core competencies and ensuring long-term institutional resilience (Meihami & Meihami, 2024; Abbas & Sağsan, 2023). This is particularly significant in academic settings, where knowledge creation and dissemination are central to institutional mission and performance. At the individual level, employee-held knowledge is equally vital, and the collective knowledge base of an institution depends largely on the ability and willingness of individuals to share what they know (Al-Kurdi et al., 2023; Kianto et al., 2018). Yet, knowledge sharing often faces barriers such as limited trust, lack of motivation, weak communication infrastructure, and ineffective knowledge-sharing cultures (Huang et al., 2020; Santoro et al., 2024). Motivational drivers—including a desire to learn, contribute, or support collective goals—remain critical in overcoming these challenges (Kurniawati et al., 2023).

Within universities, leadership, organisational culture, and technology serve as pivotal enablers of knowledge sharing. Leaders who model and reward sharing behaviours foster cultures of openness and trust that strengthen collaboration (Al-Kurdi et al., 2023; Arazy & Haas, 2012). Technological platforms such as cloud-based systems, social media, and AI-enhanced knowledge tools provide further support, although they cannot replace the value of human interaction (Chua et al., 2019; Sari et al., 2021). Moreover, individual attributes such as learning orientation and cognitive style have been linked to greater willingness to share knowledge, highlighting the role of both personal and organisational factors in shaping behaviour (Liao & Wu, 2021; Abbas & Sağsan, 2023). In higher education, attitudes toward knowledge sharing differ across institutional and cultural settings, reinforcing the need for context-sensitive inquiry (Fullwood, 2013; Zhang et al., 2020). Ultimately, fostering a strong knowledge-sharing culture not only supports institutional goals but also enhances innovation and competitiveness in a rapidly evolving educational landscape (Meihami & Meihami, 2024).

Factors Facilitating Knowledge Sharing among Lecturers in Higher Institutions

Recent research underscores the pivotal role of leadership in fostering knowledge sharing (KS) within organizations. Leaders who model and reward KS behaviors are particularly effective in cultivating cultures of openness, collaboration, and trust (*Al-Kurdi et al., 2023; Arazy & Haas,*

2012). In parallel, technology has become a critical enabler, with platforms such as cloud-based knowledge management systems, artificial intelligence, and social media increasingly leveraged to facilitate KS practices (*Chua et al., 2019; Sari et al., 2021; Abbas & Sağsan, 2023*). Yet, while digital tools enhance access, storage, and dissemination, they cannot substitute the relational and interactive aspects of human knowledge exchange (*Santoro et al., 2024*).

At the individual level, motivational and cognitive factors strongly shape KS behaviors. Individuals with high learning orientation, collaborative attitudes, or prosocial motivations are more inclined to share knowledge, whereas lack of trust or weak incentives often inhibit such behavior (*Kurniawati et al., 2023; Liao & Wu, 2021; Zhang et al., 2020*). Building on earlier reviews of KS determinants (*Wang & Noe, 2010*), recent studies call for examining these variables in higher education, where leadership, organizational structure, and institutional culture intersect with academic norms to influence sharing (*Secundo et al., 2023*).

Within universities, attitudes toward KS are context-dependent. While classic research highlighted the role of organizational culture in enabling contribution (*Fullwood, 2013; Chang & Lin, 2015*), newer evidence suggests that variability in individual contributions remains a source of institutional advantage and innovation (*Meihami & Meihami, 2024*). Collectively, these findings highlight that leadership, technology, organizational culture, and individual motivation intersect to shape effective KS, underscoring the need for continuous exploration in diverse higher education environments.

Methodology

This study adopted a quantitative research design, which involves the systematic collection and analysis of numerical data to test relationships among variables and assess patterns in behavior. Specifically, a cross-sectional survey design was employed to gather data at a single point in time from a defined population. This approach was suitable for examining the factors influencing knowledge sharing among engineering lecturers. The study population comprised engineering lecturers from two public universities in Kano State, Nigeria, Bayero University Kano and Aliko Dangote University of Science and Technology, Wudil. A total enumeration (census) sampling technique was used, involving all 192 lecturers in the faculties of engineering across the two institutions. Data were collected using a structured, self-administered questionnaire consisting of closed-ended questions designed to measure respondents' attitudes, perceptions, and practices related to knowledge sharing.

The data collected were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were used to summarize demographic characteristics and knowledge sharing patterns. Inferential statistics were applied to examine relationships between variables and assess the impact of various factors on knowledge sharing practices. The methodological approach was deemed appropriate for achieving the study's objectives, particularly in identifying both facilitators and barriers to knowledge sharing among engineering faculty members.

Data Analysis and Results

Respondents were asked about the types of knowledge shared in the faculties of engineering, and their responses are presented below:

Types of knowledge shared among the Respondents

Table 1: *Distribution of Tacit and Explicit Knowledge Based on Respondents' Responses*

Item	Knowledge Type	Description	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
1	Tacit	Discoveries in the world of science	77 (52.7)	69 (47.3)
2	Tacit	Experience in seminars/conferences	79 (54.1)	67 (45.9)
3	Tacit	Knowledge of how to use application software to compile results	99 (67.8)	47 (32.2)
4	Tacit	New trends in teaching methodologies and class management	94 (64.4)	52 (35.6)
5	Tacit	Know-how on professional publications (journals, books, materials)	95 (65.1)	51 (34.9)
6	Tacit	Experience in laboratory work	50 (34.2)	96 (65.8)
7	Tacit	Knowledge of fieldwork	65 (44.5)	81 (55.5)
8	Explicit	Manual for operating machines/equipment in the lab	58 (39.7)	88 (60.3)
9	Explicit	Innovations in sharing strategies	106 (72.6)	40 (27.4)
10	Explicit	Technical report	61 (41.8)	85 (58.2)
11	Explicit	Circular letters	47 (32.2)	99 (67.8)
12	Explicit	Books and bulletins	73 (50.0)	73 (50.0)
13	Explicit	Others (please specify)	18 (12.3)	128 (87.7)

Note. N = 146 respondents. Percentages are based on the total sample.

The data in Table 1 indicates that majority of the respondents, 77(52.7%), 79(54.1%), 99(67.8%), 94(64.4%), and 95(65.1%) represent tacit knowledge available in their faculties, however, the lecturers believe that knowledge is shared through the above statements, while 58(39.7%), 106 (72.6%), 61(41.8%), 47 (32.2%,)73(50.0%), and 18(12.3%) represent explicit knowledge available in the faculties of engineering, Therefore, the finding shows that majority of the lecturers in the faculties of engineering, were found sharing knowledge through the above statements. The findings of the study also revealed that both tacit and explicit knowledge are shared extensively by the lecturers in the faculties of engineering in Kano state universities.

Table 2: Specific Knowledge Shared among the Respondents

Distribution of Specific Knowledge Based on Respondents' Responses

Specific Knowledge	**Yes, n (%)**	**No, n (%)**
Civil Engineering	18 (12.3)	128 (87.7)
Petrochemical Engineering	37 (25.3)	109 (74.7)
Electrical Engineering	50 (34.2)	96 (65.8)
Mechanical Engineering	41 (28.1)	105 (71.9)
Mechatronics Engineering	30 (20.5)	116 (79.5)
Agricultural & Environmental Engineering	31 (21.1)	115 (78.8)
Laboratory Practices	47 (32.2)	99 (67.8)
Social Media Application & Utilisation	29 (19.9)	117 (80.1)
Fieldwork	59 (40.4)	87 (59.6)

Note. N = 146 respondents. Percentages are based on the total sample.

Respondents were asked about specific types of knowledge shared in the faculties of Engineering according to their respective departments in Kano State universities. Their responses are presented below:

The data in Table 2 indicates that the majority of the respondents, 59(40.4%) strongly agreed to the fact that knowledge on field work is shared, followed by 50(34.2%) of the respondents agreed that knowledge on Electrical engineering is shared, followed by 47(32.2%) of the respondents agreed that knowledge on Laboratory practices is shared, followed by 41(%) of the respondents agreed that knowledge on Mechanical engineering is also shared. Another set of 37(25.3%), 31(21.1%), 30(20.5%), 29(19.9%), 27(18,5%), 26(17.8%) and 18(12.3%) respondents who also agreed that knowledge on Petro-chemical engineering, Agricultural and Environmental Engineering, Mechatronics engineering, social media application and utilisation, as well as knowledge on Civil engineering was shared in their respective faculties for academic activities. This finding indicates that the majority of lecturers in the faculties of engineering in Kano state universities share knowledge in their various departments. This shows that lecturers share knowledge with their colleagues effectively for proper academic activity.

Categories of People with whom Lecturers Shared Knowledge

Respondents were asked about categories of people's shared knowledge within the faculties of engineering in universities in Kano state. Their responses are presented below:

Table 3: *Categories of People with Which Respondents Shared Knowledge*

Category	***Yes, n (%)***	***No, n (%)***
Lecturers within my department	31 (21.1)	115 (78.8)
Lecturers within my institution	47 (32.2)	99 (67.8)
Lecturers from other institutions	29 (19.9)	117 (80.1)
Both within my institution and others	59 (40.4)	87 (59.6)

Note. N = 146 respondents. Percentages are based on the total sample.

The data in Table 3 indicates that almost half 59(40.4%) of the respondents shared knowledge with both lecturers in their institution and others, followed by 47(32.2%) shared with lecturers within the institution, 31(21.1%) reveals that lecturers within the department, and 29(19.9%) indicated that they shared knowledge with lecturers from other institutions. This finding indicates that lecturers in the faculties of engineering in Kano state universities share knowledge with other colleagues within the departments, within the institution, and also within other institutions.

Factors Facilitating Knowledge Sharing among Lecturers in the Faculties of Engineering

Respondents were asked to indicate the following factors facilitating knowledge sharing among lecturers in the faculties. Their responses are presented in Table 4.

Table4: *Factors Facilitating Knowledge Sharing Among the Respondents*

Statement	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
Personal interactions with colleagues	122 (83.6)	24 (16.4)
Management support	137 (93.8)	9 (6.2)
Motivation and reward systems (recognition, financial rewards)	134 (91.8)	12 (8.2)
Organisational culture and structure	105 (71.9)	41 (28.1)
ICT infrastructure	93 (63.7)	53 (36.3)
University policy on knowledge sharing	102 (69.9)	44 (30.1)
Trust among lecturers	104 (71.2)	42 (28.8)
Individual attitude towards knowledge sharing	130 (89.0)	16 (11.0)
Individual willingness to share knowledge	125 (85.6)	21 (14.4)
Personal development	83 (56.8)	63 (43.2)

Note. N = 146 respondents. Percentages are based on the total sample.

Table 4 depicts the factors facilitating knowledge sharing among lecturers in the faculties under study. The responses were as follows: Management support 137 (93.8%), followed by motivation and reward system, such as recognition, financial rewards 134(91.8%), individual attitude on knowledge sharing 130(89.0%), individual willingness to share knowledge 125(85.6%), personal interactions with colleagues 122(83.6%), organisational culture and organisational structure 105(71.9%), trust among lectures 104(71.2%), university policy on knowledge sharing 102(69.9.7%), information and communication technological infrastructure 93(63.7%), and personal development 83(56.8%) of the respondents said the above statement.

An overall assessment revealed that the majority of the lectures believed that management support, motivation and reward system, such as recognition, financial rewards, individual attitude on knowledge sharing, individual willingness to share knowledge, personal interactions with colleagues, organisational culture and organisational structure, trust among lectures, university policy on knowledge sharing, information and communication technological infrastructure, and Personal development were the most important factor that facilitates knowledge sharing among lecturers in the faculties of engineering in Kano State universities.

Discussion of the Findings

The findings of this study indicate that lecturers in the faculties of engineering within Kano State universities actively share both tacit and explicit knowledge to support teaching, research, and professional growth. Specifically, knowledge shared includes teaching techniques and conference experiences (tacit), as well as research writing and publication strategies that combine tacit and explicit components. These exchanges occur not only within departments but also across faculties and institutions, underscoring the dynamic and boundary-spanning nature of knowledge flows. This aligns with Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) theory of organizational knowledge creation, which emphasizes that knowledge is amplified and crystallized through dialogue, experience sharing, and collaborative learning. More recent studies (Kurniawati et al., 2023; Santoro et al., 2024) similarly highlight that tacit knowledge emerges and evolves

through interaction, reinforcing the relevance of social and relational processes in academic contexts.

The findings also reveal that several factors facilitate knowledge sharing among lecturers, including management support, recognition and reward systems, individual willingness to share, trust-based relationships, organizational culture, supportive policies, technological infrastructure, and opportunities for personal development. These results resonate with Wang and Noe's (2010) framework, which identifies leadership, culture, incentives, and technology as universal drivers of knowledge sharing, while also aligning with contemporary research that underscores the interplay between people, processes, and technology in higher education (Abbas & Sağsan, 2023; Meihami & Meihami, 2024). In particular, the emphasis on leadership and organizational culture in this study echoes findings by Al-Kurdi et al. (2023), who argue that leaders who model and reward knowledge sharing foster stronger collaborative environments in universities.

Consistent with previous scholarship, the study also highlights significant inhibitors of knowledge sharing. Barriers include lack of trust, hierarchical and status-related concerns, and insufficient recognition or reward systems. These findings support earlier observations that cultural and interpersonal dynamics strongly shape knowledge sharing behaviors (Al-Alawi, Al-Marzooqi & Mohammed, 2007; Stewart, 2007). Recent studies also affirm that despite advances in technology, cultural and motivational factors remain decisive in determining whether knowledge exchange occurs (Huang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). The lack of trust observed in this study reflects challenges identified by Santoro et al. (2024), who noted that weak relational ties and competitive environments often limit tacit knowledge sharing, particularly in academic institutions where prestige and recognition strongly influence behavior.

Overall, these findings suggest that while lecturers in Kano State universities recognize the value of knowledge sharing, the extent and quality of exchange depend on the interaction of organizational enablers, cultural dynamics, and individual motivations. Importantly, this study extends prior research by situating these dynamics within engineering faculties in Nigerian universities — a context often overlooked in global KS literature. By highlighting both the enablers (leadership, culture, technology, motivation) and inhibitors (trust deficits, hierarchical barriers, lack of recognition), the study contributes context-specific insights that reinforce and expand upon contemporary knowledge management scholarship.

Conclusion

The study reveals that lecturers in the faculties of engineering at universities in Kano State hold generally positive perceptions and attitudes toward knowledge sharing. However, while explicit knowledge such as teaching methods, classroom management, and publication strategies is frequently exchanged, the sharing of tacit knowledge — rooted in personal experience, mentoring practices, and research collaboration — remains comparatively limited. This imbalance suggests that while the academic environment supports routine knowledge exchange, deeper, experience-based knowledge flows are constrained by cultural, motivational, and institutional barriers. The findings confirm that leadership, organizational culture, technological infrastructure, and individual motivation are central to shaping knowledge-sharing practices, underscoring the need for targeted institutional interventions to foster stronger collaborative academic environments.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Enhance Motivation and Recognition**: Institutional management at Bayero University Kano and Aliko Dangote University of Science and Technology, Wudil, should adopt structured motivational strategies — including recognition awards, promotion criteria linked to collaborative research, and modest financial incentives — to encourage both explicit and tacit knowledge sharing among lecturers.
2. **Strengthen ICT Infrastructure**: The Research Incentive Committees, in collaboration with university leadership, should prioritize the provision and upgrading of ICT infrastructure. Reliable internet access, digital repositories, and collaborative platforms will enhance both local and international knowledge exchange, making tacit knowledge transfer more feasible through virtual mentoring and research communities.
3. **Cultivate Trust and Collaborative Culture**: University leadership should implement policies and workshops that promote trust, collegiality, and openness among lecturers. Team-based projects, cross-faculty seminars, and informal academic forums can help break hierarchical barriers and strengthen tacit knowledge exchange.
4. **Leadership and Policy Support**: Departmental and faculty leaders should model knowledge-sharing behaviors and integrate knowledge management practices into institutional policy. Embedding KS in workload planning, staff appraisal, and professional development programs will ensure it becomes an institutional norm rather than an individual choice.

References

Abbas, J., & Sağsan, M. (2023). Impact of knowledge management practices on organizational performance: The mediating role of innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 27*(4), 889–908.

Al-Alawi, A. I., Al-Marzooqi, N. Y., & Mohammed, Y. F. (2007). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: Critical success factors. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 11*(2), 22–42.

Al-Kurdi, O., El-Haddadeh, R., & Eldabi, T. (2023). Knowledge sharing in higher education: A systematic review. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 36*(2), 421–444.

Arazy, O., & Haas, M. R. (2012). Three levels of organizational knowledge sharing: The role of technology, competition, and culture. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 10*(1), 32–43.

Cabrera, Á., & Cabrera, E. F. (2002). Knowledge-sharing dilemmas. *Organization Studies, 23*(5), 687–710.

Cavaliere, V., & Lombardi, S. (2015). Exploring different cultural configurations: How do they affect knowledge sharing? *Journal of Knowledge Management, 19*(2), 141– 163.

Chang, H. H., & Lin, C. S. (2015). The impact of organizational culture and knowledge management on job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research, 68*(11), 2345–2353.

Chang, C. M., Hsu, M. H., & Lee, Y. J. (2012). Factors influencing knowledge sharing in professional virtual communities: A comparison between posters and lurkers. *Journal of Information Science, 38(3), 276–297.*

Chua, A. L., Banerjee, S., & Lin, C. (2019). Knowledge sharing in the digital workplace: A social media perspective. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems, 49*(2), 218–235.

Del Giudice, M., Scuotto, V., Caputo, F., & Carayannis, E. G. (2021). Knowledge management and organizational learning in the digital age: Towards a research agenda. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 25*(2), 441–463.

Fullwood, R. (2013). Knowledge sharing among academics: A UK university case study. *International Journal of Educational Management, 27*(1), 56–70.

Heo, M., & Yoo, Y. (2002). Learning and knowledge sharing in virtual communities of practice: Motivations, opportunities, and barriers. *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction, 1*(1), 75–94.

Huang, Q., Davison, R. M., & Gu, J. (2020). The impact of trust, guanxi orientation and face on the intention of Chinese employees and managers to engage in peer-to- peer tacit and explicit knowledge sharing. *Information Systems Journal, 30*(5), 799–827.

Kim, S., & Lee, H. (2006). The impact of organizational context and information technology on employee knowledge-sharing capabilities. *Public Administration Review, 66*(3), 370–385.

Kianto, A., Vanhala, M., & Heilmann, P. (2018). The impact of knowledge management on job satisfaction. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 22*(4), 789–804.

Kurniawati, M., Tjahjono, H., & Nurmandi, A. (2023). Motivational factors influencing knowledge sharing: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 27*(6), 1299–1322.

Lawal, O. O., Oriogu, C. D., & Ogbuiyi, S. U. (2017). Knowledge management and knowledge sharing among academic staff in Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 1521*, 1–15.

Liao, S., & Wu, C. (2021). Individual cognitive styles and knowledge sharing: The mediating role of learning orientation. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 25*(5), 1078–1096.

McDermott, R., & O'Dell, C. (2001). Overcoming cultural barriers to sharing knowledge. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 5*(1), 76–85.

Meihami, B., & Meihami, H. (2024). Knowledge management in universities: Opportunities and challenges in the digital era. *International Journal of Knowledge and Learning, 18*(1), 22–39.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Omotayo, F. O. (2019). Knowledge management as an important tool in organizational management: A review of literature. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 1*(2), 1–23.

Razmerita, L., Kirchner, K., & Nielsen, P. (2021). What factors influence knowledge sharing in organizations? A social dilemma perspective of social media communication. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 25*(7), 1720–1741.

Santoro, G., Thrassou, A., & Bresciani, S. (2024). Knowledge management in higher education: Emerging trends and future directions. *The Learning Organization, 31*(1), 75–92.

Sari, R. F., Haryanti, T., & Prasetyo, A. (2021). Digital platforms and knowledge sharing behavior: Evidence from higher education. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 18*(4), 531–546.

Secundo, G., Schiuma, G., & Passiante, G. (2023). Knowledge management in higher education: A framework for innovation. *Studies in Higher Education, 48*(5), 901– 917.

Stewart, T. (2007). *The wealth of knowledge: Intellectual capital and the twenty-first century organization*. Crown Business.

Steyn, G. M. (2004). Harnessing the power of knowledge in higher education. *Education, 124*(3), 615–631.

Wagner-Döbler, R. (2004). Continuity and change in knowledge systems: The role of knowledge sharing and knowledge codification. *Scientometrics, 60*(3), 465–482.

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(2), 115–131.

Zhang, P., de Pablos, P. O., & Xu, Q. (2020). Culture and knowledge sharing in higher education institutions: A comparative study. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 24*(3), 509–531.

AUTHORS' PROFILES



Izdihar Abdulwakil Saleh is a dedicated librarian at Maryam Abacha American University of Nigeria (MAAUN) with over a decade of professional experience in library and information science. She holds M.Sc., B.Sc., and Diploma in Library and Information Science from Bayero University, Kano. Her specialisation in information science underscores her expertise in managing, organizing, and disseminating knowledge in innovative and impactful ways. Izdihar is a Certified Librarian of the LRCN. She is also an active member of the NLA, Kano State Chapter, and a contributing member of the NLA Information Technology Section. These affiliations highlight her commitment to professional development and engagement within the library and information science community. In addition to her professional accomplishments, Izdihar is deeply passionate about literacy advocacy and knowledge sharing. She actively works to inspire a reading culture and supports initiatives that encourage book writing and the empowerment of marginalized groups. Beyond her academic and professional pursuits, Izdihar values quality time with family and friends, further enriching her balanced approach to life and work.



Aishatu Hassan Muhammad began her education at St. Catherine's Nursery and Primary School, Jericho Ibadan. She completed her secondary education at Federal Government Girl's College Abaji, Abuja. She then attended advanced school in Offa, Kwara State, and completed her IJMB in Ilorin, Kwara State. Aishatu pursued remedial studies at Bayero University Kano, where she later earned her BA in Library and Information Science. Currently, she serves as a librarian at the Federal Polytechnic, Bauchi. In addition to her professional role, Aishatu is a dedicated housewife, mother, entrepreneur, researcher and lecturer. Aishatu has participated in numerous local and international conferences, seminars, and workshops, enhancing and contributing to knowledge while networking with collegues. Aishatu is the founder of the EESHA LEARNING FOUNDATION, a non-governmental organization dedicated to educating the less privileged ones in the society. Under this foundation, she runs the Eesha Book Club Society, which fosters meaningful discussions and engagements around literature. Aishatu's multifaceted career and commitment to education and community service exemplify her dedication to making a positive impact.



Dalhatu Usman Mairiga holds B.A Library and Information Science/Political Science and Master in Library and Information Science both from Bayero University Kano (BUK) with many years of experience on research activities in library and information science. Mairiga specialises on Information Science. His research interests are knowledge management, ICTs and Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies in academic libraries and management information systems. Mairiga is a passionate researcher, footballer and loves spending time with family and friends either outdoors or indoors.