

KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES: THE CASE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BOTSWANA LIBRARY

Bojelo Esther Mooketsi*

University of Botswana, Library and Information Studies

mooketsibe@ub.ac.bw

Tsholofelo Sethibe

University of Botswana, Library and Information Studies

Sethibet@ub.ac.bw

Abstract

The University of Botswana (UB) has articulated its intention to capitalise on its information and communication technology (ICT) network system and library and information services to set up a comprehensive knowledge management system (KMS). Research has however established that most of these endeavours fail because of poor knowledge sharing practices in organisations since organisations do not have knowledge-oriented leadership which creates a conducive environment for knowledge sharing. This interpretive study therefore used the UB main campus library as a case study to investigate knowledge sharing practices in the institution. The qualitative study adopted the stagewise thematic map theoretical framework to guide the investigation into factors that affect knowledge sharing in the University of Botswana Library (UBL). Findings show that there are organisational factors that impede knowledge sharing practices in the library. The study recommends that strategies should be set up to facilitate knowledge sharing and knowledge management practices in the library.

Keywords: Knowledge sharing, academic librarian, stagewise thematic map, institutional repository

1.0 Introduction

The strategic plan of UB (2020-2029) ‘Creating a Future for the Knowledge Generation,’ recognizes the need for a comprehensive, advanced, and integrated KMS (University of Botswana, 2020). Knowledge management (KM) is defined as an integrated approach to identify and locate, capture, transfer, convert, protect, retrieve, distribute, share, use and reuse of organisational knowledge assets to contribute to organizational effectiveness, efficiency, and innovation (Alavi & Leidner, 2001; Muftahu & Jamil, 2021). Subsection 7.1.6 of the International Organization for Standard states that “an organisation shall determine the knowledge necessary for the operation of its processes and to achieve conformity of products and services. This knowledge shall be maintained and be made available to the extent necessary” (International Organisation for Standardisation, 2015, p.1). The key goal of KM is to consciously put in place a strategy for moving

the right knowledge to the right people at the right time and ensuring that the knowledge is translated into action to improve organizational performance.

Knowledge management processes are best managed with knowledge management systems (KMS) and these typically comprise different information systems which manage organisational knowledge. These systems ease knowledge transfer and sharing of best practices, remove replication of efforts, ensure faster access to information which results in timely and informed decision making in response to institutional challenges. This inevitably improves organizational performance as it helps organisations to gain insights and understanding from its own experiences (Ramachandran, et. al, 2009). The other advantage of using knowledge management systems to manage knowledge is that the systems are more reliable than people in creating relationships between individual sources, and they are not subjective. In addition, knowledge management systems enable organisations and individuals to identify missing, unexpected, incorrect, or incomplete information.

It is imperative that academic institutions set up knowledge management systems as they have been found wanting when it comes to knowledge management. Furthermore, there have been concerns that knowledge developed within academic institutions is not accessible which inevitably makes the knowledge relatively unknown to the public (Galgotia & Lakshami, 2022). Knowledge management can be used to rectify this as knowledge assets connected to intellectual capital can be organised and managed (de la Torre et al., 2021). It is therefore not remiss that the University of Botswana, just like other universities and other organisations, is setting up knowledge management systems to optimise on its organisational knowledge (Masete & Mafini, 2018).

However, studies such as Israilidis, Siachou and Kelly (2021) have established that most of these projects fail because of poor knowledge sharing processes in organisations. Knowledge sharing is defined as the process whereby individuals impart either both tacit or explicit knowledge, expertise, insights, or understanding to others, within groups, or to the whole organization to either assist or collaborate to solve organisational problems, develop new ideas, or implement policies or procedures (Cyr & Choo, 2010). Knowledge resides in an individual and is shared by an individual. When the individual applies and shares his or her knowledge in an organisation, it attains value at organisational level, where knowledge is applied and attains value.

Although knowledge sharing is voluntary, it is a very difficult process that is affected by both individual or organisational factors such as ‘lack of time to share knowledge, concern about job security, the dominance of explicit knowledge over the tacit knowledge, lack of a motivational system for people willing to share knowledge, bureaucracy, low absorptive capacity from recipients, and a low level of organizational trust’ (Sanchez et al., 2013, p. 391). For knowledge sharing within the organisation to succeed employees have to have the capability to share knowledge and there should be knowledge-oriented leadership to create conducive environments.

Management must embed knowledge-centric behaviours and values, create the right organisational environment, commitment and culture that engages staff, support individual learning, team learning and organisational learning and information sharing (Bolisani & Bratianu, 2017). Knowledge sharing and other knowledge management processes such as knowledge creation, knowledge application are influenced by organizational culture, climate, structure, strategy, and overall organizational efficiency (Jokanovic et al., 2020). Organizational climate is the shared perceptions that employees attach to policies, practices, and procedures together with the behaviours employees see being rewarded, supported, and expected (Schneider, et al., 2017). Organizational culture is the shared assumptions, values, and beliefs that characterize a setting and are taught to newcomers as the proper way to think and feel. Organisational culture shapes and guides actions and behaviours of members of an organisation (Morgan, 1998). Unsupportive organisational culture can break knowledge management processes and behaviours (Ling, 2011). Furthermore, to be effective, knowledge management systems should be incorporated into everyday work routines, allowing for a continual flow of information across the company (Gonzalez-Campo et al., 2021). A comprehensive understanding of knowledge sharing practices is therefore paramount as the University embarks on implementation of knowledge management systems.

UB already has an institutional repository (IR) which is a component of KMS, housed in the UBL (Folorunso, Bamidele, & Adegbilero-Iwari, 2015). Strategies to guide library staff to share knowledge about the IR not only amongst themselves but with academic staff need to be in place. Librarians must also guide other stakeholders to publish, adapt research outputs and re-use of copyrighted works (Nwagwu, 2013; Roy, 2018; Jaguszewiski & Williams, 2013). This is important as the use of creative commons licences would enable academic staff and stakeholders to publish, or re-use copyrighted works to enable the University to attain its goal of making University generated research recognised at national, regional, and global levels. However, IRs are disruptive technologies that are transforming the library science profession and changing the library professionals' roles (Riley-Huff & Rholes, 2011). Skills in creative commons licences (CCLs) which have transformed the publishing industry, are imperative since they are needed for publishing, adapting, or re-using copyrighted works. Librarians must thus be expert users of IR technologies and must innovate and implement these, sometimes without specialized training (Ukwoma & Mole, 2017). This inevitably poses a challenge when librarians are expected to lead others as experts while they themselves might be unprepared. Knowledge gaps on new technologies must be addressed, and one strategy of addressing the gaps is knowledge sharing.

The current study therefore seeks to investigate knowledge sharing amongst librarians at UBL to determine how they meet their information needs regarding creative commons and any work-related information needs. The study further sought to investigate factors that might have a bearing on knowledge sharing practices at the UB academic library. Whilst distinctions are drawn between knowledge sharing, knowledge transfer and knowledge exchange, in this study they were

treated as knowledge sharing (Jashapara, 2011). This study was guided by the following research questions: a) What strategies are in place at the UBL to facilitate knowledge sharing? b) What factors impact on knowledge sharing practices at UBL? and c) What are the perceptions of librarians regarding the capacity of the library to help the University achieve its goals of disseminating research widely?

2.0 Theoretical framework

2.1 Stagewise thematic map

The study used Saghafian, Laumann and Skogstad (2021) stagewise thematic map which is a consolidation of different theoretical frameworks on factors that affect technology implementation and adoption. These factors are divided into stages: pre-change, change, and post-change. Each stage has several themes. The pre-change stage focuses on how the organisation was before introduction of the new technology. The second stage is the change process stage and covers all interventions made by the organisation to support any ongoing change and human-technology interaction. The third stage is the post-change or outcome of the technology adoption. The key argument of the stagewise thematic map is that when a theme or sub theme is dealt with appropriately at the right time, in a way that addresses the contextual issues, it becomes an enabler whilst failure to do so makes the theme or sub-theme a barrier. The stages affect or influence one another; they affect the changes in other components through the lifecycle of technology adoption in the organization.

This study focused on the pre-change stage and its sub-themes only and used the UBL as a case study. Themes in pre-change stage are organizational culture, organizational values and norms, organizational structure, leadership and management, and resources. Of these, the study focused on the themes of organisational culture, organizational values and norms and the sub-themes of knowledge-sharing norm, learning and innovativeness norm, organisational vision and goals and strategy. In the stagewise thematic framework, these themes unpack employee behaviour around technologies that are brought into organisations and have a bearing on whether the technology is adopted or not and affect knowledge sharing and other knowledge management processes such as knowledge creation and knowledge application (Jokanovic, et al., 2020).

2.1.1 Organizational culture

Studies have established that organizational culture is a main barrier to change as it is the foundation of the organization and it permeates all the organisational functions, including technological changes and knowledge sharing. The sub-themes for organizational culture that influence technology adoption are vision, goals, strategy and organisational values and norms (Saghafian, et al., 2021).

2.1.2 Organizational values and norms

Organisational values and norms are usually principles and practices that are taken-for-granted and are entrenched in organisations. These principles guide employee behaviour as they

are reference points that help staff understand what is acceptable or not. New members of staff are exposed to these values and norms by watching them play out and thus become conditioned on how to behave, think, perceive things and situations, and react (Saghafian, et al., 2021). The sub-themes of organisational values and norms are knowledge sharing norm, learning and innovativeness norm, vision and goal, and strategy.

2.1.2.1 Knowledge sharing norm

Knowledge sharing is defined as the process whereby individuals impart either their tacit or explicit knowledge, expertise, insights, or understanding to recipients to solve organisational problems, develop new ideas, or implement policies or procedures (Cyr & Choo, 2010). Organisations with effective knowledge management practices harness and evolve individual staff member knowledge into team and organizational knowledge which then enhances collaboration to meet challenges of adopting new technologies (Saghafian, et al., 2021). Organizations must evaluate their existing norms and assess whether these create a conducive environment that enables employees to try new approaches and solutions, share their knowledge, and learn from their co-workers (Sanchez et al., 2013). Essentially, there should be knowledge-oriented leadership to create conducive environments for knowledge sharing.

2.1.2.2 Learning and innovativeness norm

Learning enables organisational members to develop new skills and competencies and can be done through communities of practice which are voluntary group of peers, practitioners, and other individuals who regularly engage in sharing and learning, based on common interest, to improve their individual performance, the performance of their teams and the performance of their overall organisation. In addition, organisations can use knowledge management to consciously develop strategies for ensuring that the right knowledge is availed to the right people at the right time to enable them to act, which improves the organizational performance (Bolisani & Bratianu, 2017; Wu & Wang, 2006).

2.1.2.3 Vision and goals

Vision is defined as the long-term view of the future state of the organization while goals unpack the objectives, policies, and organizational guidelines necessary for the attainment of the vision. Vision and the goals must be aligned to ensure acceptance of change across an organisation and to avoid divisions on what ought to be done and how it should be done, which affects the change process. In addition, the stagewise thematic map makes the following claims regarding vision and goals and technological readiness: a) whatever technology is brought into an organisation, its purpose and functionalities should be aligned with the organisational vision and goals; b) to improve the chances of adoption of the new technologies, organisations must ensure that there is shared vision and goals across the organisation; c) to facilitate technological change and resolve and manage all possible barriers to technology acceptance and eventual performance, there should be goal congruence between management and staff (Saghafian, et al., 2021).

2.1.2.4 Strategy

Strategy refers to how organisations respond to both the internal and external changes. Four predominant strategies are recognized: inertia, reactive, proactive and isomorphism. Under inertia organisations choose to ignore or not respond to the changing environment because they maintain that there is no threat or opportunity in adopting requisite changes. In the reactive strategy a company adopts a firefighting approach or uncoordinated approach in dealing with change because of lack of a solid or effective response mechanism, leading to instability and avoidance in confronting the future. The proactive strategy is where an organisation assesses and interrogates the external environment for new opportunities and responds accordingly. Such companies tend to be more efficient in adjusting to change. In the isomorphism strategy organisations adopt new technological changes due to normative, mimetic, or coercive pressure applied by the external environment within which the organisation exists.

The proactive and isomorphism strategies are said to be the best for coping effectively with technological advancements while the inertia and reactive strategies render organisations obsolete and unable to compete in the market.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 A case study approach

This idiographic and interpretivist study used the UB main campus library as a case study to investigate KS practices in an academic library. This strategy enabled the study to come up with context-based insights into factors that affect knowledge sharing amongst librarians.

3.2 Data collection

This study used qualitative data collection techniques. Semi-structured interviews were chosen as a data generation method because they enabled the respondents to share their experiences in their own words and in real time context. Denzin and Lincon (2005) state that semi-structured interviews allow one to explore issues better as they are guided by a set of issues that the researcher would like to highlight during the interview whilst allowing for follow up on issues as and when they emerge during the interviews.

The data collection tool was piloted on two librarians at the University library who were subsequently excluded from the random sample. This was to enable the study to re-examine the instruments used in terms of language usage, scope of questions asked, sequencing and format of the questions, thus improving the internal validity of the questionnaires (van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2002). The responses from the respondents were clear and gave back the required feedback which meant the instruments were clear and understandable.

3.3 Study area, respondents, and ethical considerations

This study was conducted at the UBL, main campus. The selection of study area and the respondents was based on the appropriateness of the selected study area and selected respondents

to the phenomenon under study. In this study, the criteria that were critical were the social system within which knowledge sharing ought to take place. This system is affected by social norms or “the established patterns of behaviour that tell members of the system what behaviour is expected” (Bhattacharjee, 2012). The other criterion was the naturalistic inquiry whereby social phenomena is studied within its natural setting as “social phenomena are situated within and cannot be isolated from their social context” (Bhattacharjee, 2012 p.106).

The UBL has about 137 staff members comprising of librarians, senior librarians, and senior management but because this was a preliminary study, the study randomly selected 32 librarians; it was assumed that this is cadre that most likely interacts with the IR. To conceal the identity of the participants, respondents were coded L01 to L032. Research participants were made aware that their participation in the study was voluntary and that they could withdraw from participating at any time during the study including during the interview. They were also informed that they had the right to request that the data they gave not be used. The data was collected from May 2022 to August 2022.

3.4 Data analysis

Data analysis was done iteratively and emerging patterns consistent with concepts and relationships derived from the stagewise thematic map theme of organisational culture were established.

4.0 Findings

4.1 Knowledge sharing

4.1.1 Understanding of knowledge sharing and its benefits

The findings of the study indicate that librarians are knowledgeable about knowledge sharing and were able to state the advantages of the practice. They stated that knowledge sharing allows for knowledge creation and exchange, improving performance of the library to achieve its mission. Further that knowledge sharing enables reuse and regeneration of knowledge at individual and organizational level leading to the creation of new knowledge.

4.1.2 Formal knowledge sharing practises

In terms of formal structures in the library for sharing information, participants stated that they shared information through face-to-face communication and brain storming sessions. However, they stated that the library did not have an open, no blame approach to reporting incidents/events and sharing from lessons learned. They also stated that staff was not encouraged to provide feedback and that reports and training manuals were not publicly shared and there are no structures through which they can ask for information. They stated that coaching and mentoring were not used to support knowledge sharing and that there was no formal training related to knowledge management practices. Furthermore, they stated that experienced workers were not encouraged to transfer their knowledge to new or less experienced workers as there was no system

in place that made this possible. They attributed this to the fact that there was emphasis on academic qualifications to carry out certain functions, and not skills.

4.1.3 Organisational knowledge sharing norms

Participants were asked to indicate if they asked for information on work-related issues or for assistance to perform certain functions from their peers. The study findings show that librarians do ask for work-related information from their peers. Whilst some librarians were able to ask anyone for information or assistance if they felt the officer was an appropriate officer to get assistance from, not everyone did. LO4 stated that she asked a *“select group after assessing them or just ask my seniors.”* Some stated that they *“can’t ask just anyone, because some cannot assist”* (LO2).

Librarians also reported that their colleagues typically responded by saying they had no idea, or that they would help them later as they were still busy. They further said that they would typically be referred or directed to others who were seen as better placed to give the assistance being requested for. They felt that their colleagues responded this way because they either lacked knowledge or the information skills. LO1 stated that, *“sometimes I feel they are not knowledgeable, or they do not want to share their skills and knowledge, and some are unapproachable”*. Some participants felt it could be due to lack of trust and lack of exposure and that they were probably not motivated or felt appreciated. Furthermore, LO7 responded that *“when they do share it is like they’re doing you a favour.”* This leads them to ask only those that they perceive to have the answers they need or those with specialty. However, some reported that in their unit information was shared willingly and were provided with helpful tools including being advised where to locate relevant resources.

Unwillingness to share knowledge was confirmed by the librarians who stated that although their colleagues asked them for information, they did not share information because they did not think their colleagues trusted their knowledge and skills. They expressed that they had fears that if they shared knowledge their colleagues would either pass it off as their own without giving them acknowledgement or recognition or that the knowledge will be used out of context or misapplied, for which they would get blamed.

When asked about the strategies that are in place to lead and inspire library staff to share knowledge to assist academic staff to create, develop, disseminate their research outputs they responded that there were no strategies in place. When librarians were asked how they felt when customers asked for help with the use of the IR, they stated that since they did not have the necessary information and skills, it was frustrating. One librarian stated that *“it’s a big challenge because I am not trained, only some are trained; it is frustrating when customers come, and you fail to help”* (LO17). Librarian LO9 stated that *“it can be scary if you do not know how to help a user.”* They stated that it was *“very worrisome since I would fail to assist my customers”* (LO5).

LO22 stated that *“It is demoralising, and it impacts on the delivery of library mandate.”* Librarians also stated that they felt their customers were lost as there was a lot they did know.

4.1.4 Perceptions about knowledge flow in the library

The experiences outlined above made librarians feel that information on work-related issues does not flow freely in the organization and only flows in cliques. They attributed this to lack of trust among staff, lack of proper structure or office that disseminates information, selfishness, no platform to share knowledge, lack of support from management, lack of training to empower employees, poor infrastructural development to support knowledge flow, poor record keeping and preservation to ensure authenticity of information, poor communication skills, lack of complete and standard regulations and working in silos

However, LO15 stated that she believes information flows freely. She believed *“at times people don’t take steps but expect things to move or people think that they are not worthy to ask others they belittle themselves”*.

4.1.5 Training needs

Librarians expressed that the library needs to reinforce training of staff. LO9 stated that *“one has to be trained in creative commons licences in order to help users.”* The need for training was also echoed by LO3 who stated that *“for one who did not get preservice training on Open Source, knowledge is about self-development so as to be able to assist users.”* Librarians were asked to indicate the areas in which they felt they needed training, and they stated that they needed information and training on innovative technologies, copyright issues and utilisation of the IR. However, the recurring concern was that the employer was not helping to capacitate staff with most of them believing library management was not supporting continuous in-service training and learning, and this was summed up as *“without my employer helping to capacitate me am left to train myself”* (LO19).

4.1.6 Strategies used by librarians to meet their information needs

Given the recognition by librarians of the need for more information and training, librarians were asked about the strategies they employ to meet these needs. They stated that when they lack skills to carry out their duties, they normally take the following steps to get the knowledge they need: a) self-educating where they attend workshops conferences geared towards their needs, Search online, and upskill through continuous professional development or do short courses; and b) collaboration where they ask other librarians outside the University for help, and link up with others through professional networks to learn and exchange knowledge and ideas.

Based on these findings, the study concludes that although employees have opportunities to share knowledge amongst themselves during meetings, the norms in place did not create an environment that motivated and encouraged staff to learn from their co-workers or apply new approaches and solutions learnt from their peers. As a result, the employees have no chance to

learn or collaborate and try new approaches and solutions to existing organisational problems. A similar finding was made by Khoza (2019) who established that generally people are not inclined to share their ideas and knowledge with others either because of lack of trust, conflicting values or attitudinal and behavioural issues.

4.2 Learning and innovativeness norm

When librarians were asked if they believed library management was aware of where knowledge was insufficient and where new knowledge and intellectual capital were needed, they answered that they did not think management was aware. As a result, librarians stated that their main problems were lack of information, reinventing the wheel, poor sharing of knowledge, lack of personal and professional growth, and information hoarding. These findings lead the study to conclude that the library does not have an effective knowledge management strategy in place that could be used to consciously move the right knowledge to the right people for them to carry out organisational activities. This lack of knowledge management strategy has negative implications on the effectiveness of librarians to provide service to clients.

4.3 Vision and goals

Librarians were asked about ways of making the institution's research visible. They stated that the IR is indeed one way of making research visible which means the system or technology is aligned with the University's vision and goals. In terms of common goals and vision between management and employees, librarians were not aware of the goals of the University of Botswana regarding research dissemination and setting up a knowledge management system. They also did not know the role they have to play in ensuring the University attains these goals, as most librarians were clueless in terms of the tasks they need to perform to enable the University to attain these goals.

In addition, librarians were asked about their perceptions on the feasibility of the Universities vision and goals regarding knowledge management and research dissemination and whether the library in its current state can enable the university to effectively accomplish these. Librarians stated that the library was not able to so. LO1 stated that in terms of staff competencies, the librarians themselves were not, as he stated, *"no is not, because everyone should be in a position to help customers and not always referring to other people."* LO6 expressed similar sentiments by stating that *"not in its current state, the library is still ages behind and needs to catch up to where the academic library of today is for it to play an effective role in the university"*. The need for the library to improve was echoed as most stated that there is need for drastic alignment to the best performing institutions. LO7 stated that *"No, the library still lags behind, there is a lot that needs to change, we need to have accountable and strategic leaders to steer the library to developmental phases, improve staff morale and empowerment to perform optimally and provide refresher training and continued professional training"*. Librarians also cited the atmosphere in the library, stating that it was not good as there was *"No transparency in the library*

and this will make whatever good thing UB is planning become unsuccessful as people are demoralised and have no interest in whatever is being planned” (LO2).

4.4 Library strategy to respond to internal and external technological changes

Based on the responses from the librarians, this study concludes that library’s response to internal and external technological changes is the reactive strategy as there seems to be no coordinated and clearly outlined response plan in place to respond to both internal and external changes. This response could eventually make the organization obsolete and unable to compete in the market.

5.0 Discussion

The findings of the study have shown that the library does not have an effective knowledge sharing strategy; the norms in place are not supportive of knowledge sharing and learning. These findings are not surprising as studies have established that rather than share knowledge staff would rather hoard knowledge and reject knowledge from others (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). According to Saghafian, et al., (2021) these are not ideal conditions for successful technological adoption. The onus is on the head of the University library to formulate a vision and policy not only to guide effective use of knowledge but to also assist in successful institutionalisation of such issues. The need for academic libraries to have functional knowledge management has also been stated by, among others, Kim and Abbas (2010) and Wanangeye and George (2016). Gallager and Hazlett (2004, p.8) argue that “knowledge sharing begins with vision and direction from upper management” as it cannot grow on its own. The University library leadership must embed knowledge-centric behaviours and values. According to Maponya (2004) whilst the function of academic libraries is traditionally to collect, process, disseminate, store and utilise information to provide service to the university community, this has changed as academic libraries have to expand their roles and responsibilities and provide strong leadership in knowledge management. In addition, the library management has to come up with strategies to build trust amongst staff. Trust amongst staff functions as a facilitation tool for knowledge management processes. High level of trust leads to a high level of knowledge sharing behaviours.

This study also concludes that while the institutional repository purpose and functionalities are aligned with the organisational vision and goals there is no goal congruence between University of Botswana strategic vision management and staff. In addition, the vision and goals have not been cascaded across the organisation, and this affects the chances of adoption of the new technologies as librarians have not aligned their tasks to enable the University to attain some of its goals (cf. Saghafian, et al., 2021). This is problematic as there is need for a common long-term vision across the University. It is imperative that the strategy is cascaded because lack of knowledge about the strategy by stakeholders results in failure in implementation. Cascading the strategy ensures that there is clarity about tasks and key indicators, decision-making powers,

division of tasks, responsibilities that must be prioritised and coordinated for the strategy implementation process (Eresia-Eke & Soria Kumar, 2021; Alharty, Rashid, Pagliari, Khan, 2017).

To enable the University as the parent organisation to successfully execute the organisational strategy, the academic library, like all other units in the University, should carry out activities that support the university's core priorities while also promoting the library's value and impact especially since the university has explicitly stated its knowledge management strategies and aspirations (Saghafian, et al., 2021). Library management must recognise the importance of aligning the library strategy to the university strategy. Other academic libraries elsewhere are aligning to university goals. For example, Chiware (2014) states that Cape Peninsula University library has formulated its own goals in response for each of the university's goals.

The respondents are of the opinion that library management is unaware of the information needs of librarians nor is the management leveraging on existing internal knowledge resources. A manager who is unaware cannot respond appropriately, because for a manager to restructure and modify operational processes he or she must be aware of what is taking place in and around the organisation and how it impacts organizational changes. The library cannot thrive without aligning its workings directly to the core mission of the host institutions (Saghafian, et al., 2021). To be sustainable, the library must maintain a balance between the library's operations and environmental fluctuations.

6.0 Conclusion

The study concludes that the UBL has not dealt appropriately with the themes and sub-themes of organizational culture that affect technological changes. As mentioned earlier, if a theme is dealt with appropriately at the right time, in a way that addresses the contextual issues, it becomes an enabler whilst failure to do so makes the theme or sub theme a barrier. The library management must recognise the importance of strategic leadership, as implementation strategies ought to combine planning and prioritizing, which when done lead to successful implementation. failure to do so inevitably lead to failure. Library management needs to investigate ways in which barriers to knowledge sharing can be resolved; library management ought to take the lead in putting in place a knowledge management driven library by creating an environment that is conducive for knowledge sharing and other knowledge management activities. More research needs to be conducted to evaluate the technological readiness of the University library in depth by exploring other themes.

References

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107–113.

- Alharthy, A. H., Rashid, H., Pagliari, R., & Khan, F. (2017). Identification of strategy implementation influencing factors and their effects on the performance. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 8(1), 34-44.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices textbooks. collection*. Book 3. Global Text Project.
- Bolisani, E. & Bratianu, C. (2017). Knowledge strategy planning: An integrated approach to manage uncertainty, turbulence, and dynamics. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 21(2), 233- 253. DOI: 10.1108/JKM-02-2016-0071.
- Chiwere, M. (2014). The efficacy of course-specific library guides to support essay writing at the University of Cape Town. *South African Journal of Libraries & Information Science*, 80(2), 27–35. doi:10.7553/80-2-1522.
- Cyr, S. & Choo, C.W. (2010). The individual and social dynamics of knowledge sharing: An exploratory study. *Journal of Documentation*, 66, 824-846. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220411011087832>.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business School Press.
- De la Torre, G. E., Pizarro-Ortega, C.I., Dioses-Salinas, D.C., Ammendolia, J., & Okoffo, E.D. (2021). Investigating the current status of COVID-19 related plastics and their potential impact on human health. *Curr Opin Toxicol*, 27, 47-53. doi: 10.1016/j.cotox.2021.08.002.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd Edn). Sage.
- Eresia-Eke, C.E., & Soria-Kumar, A. D. (2021). Strategy implementation barriers and remedies in public sector organisations. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 12(1), 46-62.
- Folorunso, O., Bamidele, O., & Adegbilero-Iwari, L. (2015). Standards and practices of knowledge management in academic libraries: Ekiti State University in perspective. *Information Studies*, 21(1).
- Galgotia, D., & Lakshmi, N. (2022). Implementation of knowledge management in higher education: A comparative study of private and government universities in India and abroad *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1-10.
- Gallager, S., & Hazlett, S. (2004). Using the knowledge management maturity model as an

evaluation tool. [Online]. Available WWW: <http://s.gallagher@qub.ac.uk>

González-Campo, C. H., Murillo-Vargas G., & García-Solarte, M. (2021). Effect of high-quality accreditation of knowledge management in higher education institutions. *Form. Univ.* 14, 155–164. doi: 10.4067/S0718-50062021000200155.

International Organisation for Standardisation. (2015). *Knowledge Management*. <https://committee.iso.org/iso-9001-quality-management.html>

Israilidis, J., Siachou, E. & Kelly, S. (2021). Why organisations fail to share knowledge: An empirical investigation and opportunities for improvement. *Information Technology and People*, 34(5), 1513-1539.

Jaguszewski, J. M., & Williams, K. (2013). New roles for new times: Transforming liaison roles in research libraries. *Association of Research Libraries*, 1-17. <http://www.arl.org/nrnt>.

Jashapara, A. (2011). *Knowledge Management, An Integrated Approach* (2nd Edn.), Pearson Education Limited.

Jokanovic, B., Zivlak, N., Okanovic, A., Culibrk, J. & Dudak, L. (2020). The model of knowledge management based on organisational climate. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3273 10.3390/su1208373.

Khoza, L.T. (2019). Measuring knowledge sharing behaviour among software development teams. *South African Journal of Information Management*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v21i1.1076>

Kim, Y., & Abbas, J.M. (2010). adoption of library 2.0 functionalities by academic libraries and users: A knowledge management perspective. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36, 211-218.

Ling, C. (2011). Culture and trust in fostering knowledge-sharing. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(4), 328-339.

Maponya, P. (2004). Knowledge management practices in academic libraries: A case study of the University of Natal. *Pietermaritzburg Libraries*, 1-31.

Masete, M. Z., & Mafini, C. (2018). Internal barriers to supply chain management implementation in a South African traditional university. *Journal of Transport and Supply Chain Management*, 12, 1–12. doi: 10.4102/jtscm. v12i0.389.

- Morgan, G. (1998). *Images of organization*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Muftahu, M. & Jamil, H. (2021). Sustainable knowledge flow and innovation in higher education: the implementation of change management in universities. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 15(2), 159 – 168.
- Nwagwu, W. (2013). Open access initiatives in Africa: Structure, incentives and disincentives. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(1), 3–10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2012.11.024>
- Ramachandran, S., Choy, C., & Ismail, H. (2009). The practice of knowledge management processes: A comparative study of public and private higher education institutions in Malaysia. *Vine*, 39(3), 203-222.
- Riley-Huff, D. A., & Rholes, J. M. (2011). Librarians and technology skill acquisition: Issues and perspectives. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 30(3), <https://doi.org/10.6017/ital.v30i3.1770>
- Roy, B. K. (2018). Opportunities and barriers of Indian open access repositories. *International Research: Journal of Library and Information Science*, 8(1)24–33.
- Saghafian, M., Laumann, K., & Skogstad, M.R, (2021). Stagewise overview of issues influencing organizational technology adoption and use. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17, 1-23. 12:630145. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.630145.
- Sanchez, J.H., Sanchez, Y.H., Collado-Tuiz, D., & Cebrian-Tarrason, D. (2013). Knowledge creating and sharing corporate culture framework. *Procedia: Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 74, 388-397.
- Schneider, B., González-Romá, V., Ostroff, C., & West, M. A. (2017). Organizational climate and culture: Reflections on the history of the constructs in the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 468–482. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000090>
- Ukwoma, S., & Mole, A. (2017). Utilisation of institutional repositories for searching information sources, self-archiving and preservation of research publications in selected Nigerian universities. *African Journal of Library, Archives & Information Science*, 27(2).
- University of Botswana. (2020). *University strategy: Creating a future for the knowledge generation – 2020-2028*. University of Botswana.

van Teijlingen, E., & Hundley, V. (2002). The importance of pilot studies. *Nursing standard: official newspaper of the Royal College of Nursing*. DOI: 10.7748/ns2002.06.16.40.33.c3214.

Wanangeye, W., & Omallah, B. (2016). Knowledge management practices and performance of academic libraries: A case of Mount Kenya University, Kigali Campus Library. *World Journal of Computer Application and Technology*, 4(2), 34-39. 10.13189/wjcat.2016.040202.

Wu, J.H., & Wang, Y.M. (2006). Measuring KMS Success: A respecification of the Delone and Mclean's model. *Information & Management*, 43(6),728-739.