

**INFORMATION SHARING STRATEGY AND PERFORMANCE OF UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC STAFF IN THE SOUTH-WEST OF NIGERIA**

**ADEYEMI, Emmanuel Adewale<sup>1</sup>,  
ISHOLA, James Aransiola<sup>2</sup>  
AFOLAYAN, Anthony, Kehinde <sup>3</sup>,  
&  
ADEOTI, Bunmi Sarah<sup>4</sup>**

**<sup>1</sup>Department of Business Management and Entrepreneurship  
Miva Open University, Abuja, Nigeria**

**<sup>2, 3, & 4</sup> Department of Business Administration,  
Thomas Adewumi University, Oko, Kwara State, Nigeria**

\*Corresponding Author's E-mail: [adewale@miva.university](mailto:adewale@miva.university)

<https://doi.org/10.7118/ajbam-03-2024-39>

**ABSTRACT**

*The academic environment in Nigeria, particularly within the South-West region, is undergoing significant transformations driven by technological advancements, globalization, and the increasing demand for high-quality education. In this dynamic environment, the performance of academic staff plays a critical role in the overall success of universities. Despite the importance of information sharing, there is a notable gap in understanding how this strategy influences the performance of Nigerian universities, particularly within the context of the South-West region. Therefore, this study examines information sharing strategy and performance of academic staff in universities within the South-West region of Nigeria. 982 sample was drawn from a total population of 12,844 academic staff members of Public Universities in the South-West, Nigeria, using stratified random sampling method. The data were analysed using multiple regression analysis. Findings indicated that constructs of information sharing have positive and significant effect on academic staff performance, with particular reference to research productivity. The findings provide valuable insights for university management and policymakers seeking to enhance information sharing processes in order to improve the performance of academic staff.*

**Keywords:** *Information Sharing Strategy, Interdisciplinary Research Initiatives, Knowledge Transfer, Quality of Information Shared, Research Productivity.*

**INTRODUCTION**

The academic environment in Nigeria's South-West region is evolving due to globalization, technological advancements, and rising demands for high-quality education. In this context, academic staff performance is crucial for the success and reputation of universities. Effective information-sharing strategies are essential for fostering collaboration, innovation, and

knowledge dissemination among academic staff (Agbatogun, 2013; Falowo, 2022; Ling, 2022).

The South-West is home to several prestigious universities with diverse organizational cultures and communication dynamics. These institutions are vital for national development through their research, teaching, and community engagement. However, the impact of information-sharing strategies on academic staff performance in this

region is underexplored. Current literature mainly addresses developed countries, leaving a gap in understanding the unique challenges and opportunities faced by Nigerian universities (Adeyemi et al., 2024; Bello, 2015; Odunewu & Haliso, 2019; Omotayo & Abdulrahman, 2020; Ukangwa et al., 2020).

Bureaucratic structures, hierarchical communication patterns, and limited resources may obstruct effective information sharing among academic staff in Nigerian universities (Adewuyi & Uthman, 2023; Daniel et al., 2017; Omotayo & Babalola, 2016; Oyenuga et al., 2019). Cultural norms and technological constraints might also impede knowledge flow and collaboration. Understanding how information-sharing strategies affect academic staff performance is crucial for overcoming these challenges and promoting an environment conducive to research, teaching, and learning (Agbatogun, 2013; Bello, 2015; Daniel et al., 2017; Odunewu & Haliso, 2019). Identifying effective practices can enhance professional development and productivity, contributing to the advancement of higher education in Nigeria.

This study aims to address the research gap by examining how information-sharing strategies impact academic staff performance in South-West Nigerian universities. Previous research has largely overlooked the unique socio-cultural and institutional contexts of Nigerian higher education. Therefore, investigating information-sharing practices within this specific framework is essential for improving strategy effectiveness and staff performance in the region.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION**

### **Concept of Information Sharing Strategy**

Information sharing among university academic staff plays a critical role in fostering collaboration, research productivity, and institutional development. In the context of South-West Nigeria, information sharing strategies are essential for enhancing academic outcomes and addressing resource constraints. Effective information sharing fosters the dissemination of knowledge, best practices, and

research outputs, creating a collaborative academic environment (Adegbile & Amusa, 2020). Academic staff in Nigerian universities often utilize both formal and informal channels for information exchange. Formal channels include institutional email systems, academic conferences, and collaborative research platforms, while informal channels rely on personal networks and social media (Aina, Olatunji & Fagbola, 2021). An effective information sharing strategy among academic staff ensures that resources such as teaching materials, research findings, and administrative insights are efficiently shared to enhance teaching and research quality (Adeleke & Olayinka, 2019).

However, several challenges hinder information sharing among academic staff in Nigeria. These include limited access to technology, poor infrastructure, and a lack of institutional support (Ogunleye, Ogundele & Adebayo, 2019). Additionally, there is often a reluctance to share knowledge due to competitive academic cultures, which can lead to information hoarding (Oladokun, 2020). Invariably, fostering a robust information sharing strategy among academic staff is crucial for enhancing educational outcomes, research collaboration, and institutional growth in South-West Nigerian universities.

### **Concept of Performance**

Abdulkareem and Oyeniran (2011) highlight the complexity of evaluating performance in the public sector, especially within service-oriented institutions like universities. This complexity arises from the need to assess various resources, such as total expenditures, personnel, and assets, and compare them with outputs like academic performance, graduation rates, and research quality. Performance measurement in this context covers several dimensions: efficiency, effectiveness, quality, timeliness, and employee engagement (Punnakitikashem, 2013).

Falowo (2022) describes performance as the cumulative results of organizational processes and activities, focusing on outputs aligned with the organization's goals. Thursby (2000) emphasizes that university performance should

be measured by how well it converts inputs into outputs, with key success factors (KSFs) including academic achievement, research quality, and community service. Kontoghiorghes, Awbrey, and Feurig (2005) propose evaluating university performance from both objective and subjective perspectives. Objective measures are quantitative, such as financial aspects, student enrollment, academic programs, and research grants. Subjective measures include qualitative aspects like operational efficiency, service quality, innovation, adaptability, and overall reputation.

This study focuses on the qualitative dimension of performance, particularly examining research productivity as a critical metric for evaluating academic staff performance and its impact on institutional reputation. By exploring these qualitative aspects, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of university performance. The performance of academic staff is vital for university effectiveness, and research productivity plays a crucial role in assessing their performance (Adeyemi *et al.*, 2024; Falowo, 2024; Jameel & Ahmad, 2020; Maral, 2024; Sayyed, 2024; Simisaye & Olakunle, 2020).

### **Research Productivity**

Research productivity measures the quantity and quality of academic staff's research output. It is evaluated through various indicators: the number of publications, citation counts, research grants secured, and the overall impact on academia and society (Bassey *et al.*, 2018; Kpolovie & Onoshagbegbe, 2017; Simisaye & Olakunle, 2020; Starovoytova, 2017). Key metrics include publication count, citation count, the amount of research grants, and the H-Index, which combines productivity and citation impact (Hirsch, 2005). Despite its importance, research productivity's relationship with factors like knowledge transfer, information quality, and accessibility remains underexplored. These factors influence how research outputs contribute to knowledge and practice, emphasizing the need for further investigation into how these variables affect research

productivity (Bassey *et al.*, 2018; Simisaye & Olakunle, 2020).

### **Dimensions of Information Sharing Strategy and Sub Hypotheses Development**

#### **Knowledge Transfer as a Dimension of Information Sharing Strategy and its Relative Influence on Research Productivity**

Knowledge transfer involves disseminating research findings to stakeholders such as researchers, industry professionals, and the public (Fothergill, 2000; Abbas *et al.*, 2018). Effective knowledge transfer enhances research productivity by fostering collaboration, increasing research visibility, and facilitating the practical application of findings (Abbas *et al.*, 2018). Academic staff typically engage in knowledge transfer through publications, conferences, workshops, and industry partnerships (Perkmann *et al.*, 2013). Bozeman (2000) found that researchers who actively participate in knowledge transfer activities generally exhibit higher research productivity. Moreover, effective knowledge transfer can lead to increased citations, new research opportunities, and additional funding, further boosting productivity (Abbas *et al.*, 2018; Odunewu & Haliso, 2019; Omotayo & Abdulrahman, 2020). Therefore, we proposed that: ***H1: knowledge transfer as a dimension of information sharing strategy will significantly influence research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance.***

#### **Quality of Information Shared as a Dimension of Information Sharing Strategy and its Relative Influence on Research Productivity**

The quality of information shared by academic staff directly affects research productivity. High-quality research, marked by rigor, originality, and relevance, is crucial for gaining recognition and citations (Aksnes *et al.*, 2019; Collins & Stockton, 2018). According to Aksnes *et al.* (2019), such research is methodologically sound, provides new insights, and addresses significant issues. Peer-reviewed publications are a key

indicator of research quality, ensuring validity and reliability (Bornmann, 2011). Additionally, quality research is assessed through peer reviews, citation analysis, and impact evaluations. Garfield (2006) emphasizes that research with high quality is more frequently cited, which in turn enhances research productivity. Thus, we proposed that: ***H2: Quality of information shared as a dimension of information sharing strategy will significantly influence research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance.***

### **Reach and Accessibility as a Dimension of Information Sharing Strategy and its Relative Influence on Research Productivity**

Reach and accessibility refer to how widely research findings are distributed and how easily they can be accessed (Fisher, 2003; Stefan & Gwen, 2022). Improving reach and accessibility can boost research productivity by increasing the visibility and utilization of research outputs. Academic staff can enhance reach through open-access publications, public lectures, and digital platforms (Mbagwu & Oduagwu, 2022; Pittsburgh Library System, 2022). Open-access publications, for example, improve visibility and citation rates, thus enhancing productivity (Suber, 2012). Digital platforms and social media further broaden the audience for research findings (Priem & Hemminger, 2010).

Making research accessible involves ensuring it is understandable and usable by diverse audiences, including using clear language and providing translations (Burgstahler, 2002). Accessible research is more likely to be cited and utilized, increasing productivity. Factors influencing research productivity include individual attributes, institutional support, and external conditions. Expertise, motivation, and collaboration skills are critical (Bandura, 1997), while institutional policies and resources also play a key role (Dang, 2017). Supportive leadership and collaborative environments further enhance productivity (Rowley, 1996). Additionally, external factors like funding, regulatory frameworks, and societal needs impact productivity, with competitive grants and

industry collaborations being particularly influential (Kendall, 2021; Geuna & Martin, 2003). Therefore, we proposed that: ***H3: Reach and accessibility as a dimension of information sharing strategy will significantly influence research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance.***

### **Theoretical Approaches: The Human Capital Theory and Resource-Based View (RBV)**

A multi-theoretical approach combining Human Capital Theory (HCT) and the Resource-Based View (RBV) is essential for understanding information sharing strategies and academic staff performance. HCT emphasizes the importance of knowledge and skills, viewing academic staff as valuable assets whose expertise enhances institutional performance (Becker, 1993). RBV, foundational to this study, posits that an organization's internal resources, such as knowledge and information, are key to gaining a competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). In the context of universities, effective information sharing serves as a strategic resource, strengthening collaboration, research output, and overall academic performance, aligning with RBV's focus on resource utilization.

#### **Human Capital Theory (HCT)**

Human Capital Theory (HCT) asserts that individuals' knowledge, skills, and abilities are critical assets that boost productivity and economic value (Becker, 1964). In academia, this includes educational qualifications, research skills, teaching expertise, and professional experience. Investing in human capital through training, professional development, and continuous education is crucial for enhancing academic staff capabilities (Belay *et al.*, 2021; Nwachukwu, 2022; Whitehead, 2022; Schultz, 1961). Therefore, this study perceived that universities can improve their human capital by offering staff opportunities for conferences, advanced studies, and collaborative research. By promoting effective information sharing and investing in staff development, universities can boost research productivity, teaching quality, and overall academic performance, leading to



increased publications and societal contributions (Brew & Boud, 1995).

### **Resource-Based View (RBV)**

The Resource-Based View (RBV) asserts that an organization's competitive advantage stems from its unique resources and capabilities (Barney, 1991). For universities, these resources include intellectual capital, research facilities, and technological infrastructure (Belay et al., 2021). Unique assets such as experienced faculty, specialized research equipment, and extensive academic libraries, when effectively utilized, can significantly enhance academic staff performance (Barney, 2001).

Effective information sharing strategies maximize these resources' potential. Implementing knowledge management systems to share research findings, teaching materials, and best practices can improve academic staff capabilities. Additionally, fostering a culture of collaboration and open communication leverages faculty expertise (Grant, 1996). By applying information sharing strategies that capitalize on their unique resources, universities can boost research productivity and teaching effectiveness. This enhances their competitive edge in attracting research funding, publishing impactful research, and delivering high-quality education (Wernerfelt, 1984).

Academic staff performance is viewed through various theoretical lenses. Human Capital Theory (HCT) highlights that performance depends on the knowledge, skills, and competencies of faculty (Becker, 1964). RBV suggests that unique capabilities and resources contribute to a university's competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). In South-West Nigeria, applying HCT and RBV frameworks offer insights into optimizing information sharing to enhance academic staff performance.

### **METHODOLOGY**

This study aimed to investigate how information sharing strategies impact academic staff performance in universities across the South-West geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Using a descriptive survey design, data were collected from a population of 12,844 academic staff members from 18 public universities, based on 2023 data from the National Universities Commission (NUC). The focus was on staff from federal and state universities due to their central role in teaching and research (Okebukola, 2018), and their importance in achieving world-class university status, as per NUC accreditation standards (Falowo, 2022).

A sample size of 982, consisting of Heads of Departments and 889 academic staff members was selected. The sampling process included: (1) random selection of three states from the six in South-West Nigeria, (2) stratified random sampling of six universities (three federal and three state) within these states, and (3) proportionate random sampling of 93 Heads of Departments and convenience sampling of 889 academic staff from the selected universities. Data collection involved a self-developed questionnaire focusing on information sharing strategies and their effect on research productivity. Respondents used a five-point Likert scale to express their opinions, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was conducted using SPSS Version 27.0 to identify latent factors and ensure the validity of the instrument. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity assessed the adequacy of the sample and the relationships among variables. A KMO value above 0.60 indicated the data were suitable for factor analysis. The results supported the validity of PCA. To ensure reliability, the test-retest method was used, and Cronbach's Alpha was calculated, yielding a reliability index of 0.807, demonstrating a high degree of consistency and reliability for the study's constructs.

**Table 3:1 Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items	N
.819	.807	20	50

**Source: Author's Computation, 2024**

Source: SPSS (Version 27.0) Output 2024

The study utilized both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, processed with IBM SPSS Version 27.0. Descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage, summarized respondents' demographics and questionnaire responses. Multiple regression analysis was applied to explore how dimensions of information sharing strategies (independent variables) affect research productivity (dependent variable). This analysis provided insights into the significance and strength of the relationships among the variables. The decision rule was: if the p-value was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected; if greater, the null hypothesis was accepted. Using these statistical methods allowed for a thorough examination of how information sharing strategies impact academic staff performance in universities across South-West Nigeria, ensuring a robust analysis of the data.

### Model Specifications for the Hypotheses

$$\text{ResPry} = f(\text{ReAcc}, \text{KnTr}, \text{QuaInSh})$$

$$\text{ResPry} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ReAcc} + \beta_2 \text{KnTr} + \beta_3 \text{QuaInSh} + \epsilon$$

**Where:**

ResPry= Research Productivity (Dependent variable)

$\beta_0$ = Intercept of the model.

$\beta_1$ = Estimate of the parameter of the independent variable in the model of the slope.

E= Error term.

ReAcc= Reach and Accessibility (Independent variable)

KnTr= Knowledge Transfer (Independent variable)

QuaInSh= Quality of Information Shared (Independent variable)

The a priori expectation is as; thus,  $\beta_1 > 0$ ,  $\beta_2 > 0$ , &  $\beta_3 > 0$ . According to the a priori expectation about the model stated above, reach and accessibility, knowledge transfer, and quality of information shared have a significant positive effect on research productivity. The calculated value would be larger than or equal to the critical value for the null hypothesis to be rejected; otherwise, the null hypothesis is accepted at any level of significance

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Preliminary Analysis

Table 4.1 exhibits that the responses from the administered questionnaires indicate a high level of participation. Out of the 982 copies of questionnaire distributed, 899 were returned, resulting in a response rate of 91.55%. This high response rate is considered satisfactory and supports the validity of the instrument used in the study.

**Table 4.1 Analysis of Responses to Questionnaire**

Description	Frequency	Percentage
Administered	982	100.00
Returned	899	91.55
Not Returned	083	8.45

*Source: Field Survey, 2024*

Before conducting the data analysis, tests for out-of-range and missing values were performed as recommended by Saiyidi (2014). The missing value percentage was 8.45%, well below the 20% threshold suggested by Hair et al. (2006), indicating that the data were accurately coded and entered. This ensured the reliability of the analysis.

Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were then conducted to investigate the relationships between information sharing strategies and academic staff performance, focusing on research productivity. The high response rate and thorough data preparation

validate the robustness of the findings and support the conclusions drawn from the study.

### Descriptive Statistics

The study's constructs include research productivity (ResPr), reach and accessibility (ReAcc), knowledge transfer (KnTr), and quality of information shared (QuaInSh), undergone descriptive statistics measurements. The computed values include mean (M), standard deviation (SD), skewness, and kurtosis. These measurements were conducted to assess the normality distribution and degree of asymmetry for each construct. The results are presented in Table 4.2 below:

**Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics**

Constructs	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
ResPry	899	4.06	1.308	-1.341	.082	.505	.163
ReAcc	899	4.20	1.264	-1.336	.082	.337	.163
KnTr	899	4.07	1.365	-1.207	.082	-.035	.163
QuaInSh	899	4.09	1.450	-1.210	.082	-.194	.163
Valid N (listwise)	899						

*Source: Field Survey, 2024*

Source: SPSS (Version 27.0) Output 2024

The results of the mean and standard deviation for the constructs: research productivity (ResPry), reach and accessibility (ReAcc), knowledge transfer (KnTr), and quality of information shared (QuaInSh), were presented in Table 4.2 as follows: research productivity (ResPry) (M=4.06, SD=1.308); reach and accessibility (ReAcc) (M=4.20, SD=1.264); knowledge transfer (KnTr) (M=4.07, SD=1.365); and quality of information shared (QuaInSh) (M=4.09, SD =1.450). All the standard deviation values were below the mean

values, indicating normality (Amsami, Ibrahim, & Abdelsalam, 2020).

Furthermore, skewness and kurtosis are commonly used to test data normality. Skewness represents the extent to which a distribution deviates from normal, indicating the asymmetry observed in a probability distribution (James, 2021). The reported skewness and kurtosis for the constructs were: research productivity (ResPr) (Sk= -1.341, Ko= 0.505); reach and accessibility (ReAcc) (Sk= -1.336, Ko= 0.337);

knowledge transfer (KnTr) (Sk= -1.207, Ko= -0.035); and quality of information shared (QualnSh) (Sk= -1.210, Ko = -0.194) respectively. These results indicate that skewness and kurtosis values fall within the range of normality, suggesting that the distribution of values is statistically suitable for further analysis.

### Factor Analysis and Internal Consistency Reliability Results

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were utilized to assess the sampling adequacy and correlations in the data prior to conducting the factor analysis. The values of the KMO and Bartlett test of sphericity for the variables are presented in appendix 1 (Table 4.3) below:

Table 4.3 elucidates that all the variables have a KMO above 0.5. The Bartlett's test of sphericity shows chi-square values for the variables at 6994.141, and the corresponding p-values of 0.000 are less than the significance level of 0.05. This test assesses whether the correlations between variables are significant enough for factor analysis to be appropriate (Field, 2005). Furthermore, the table indicates that Bartlett's test is highly significant ( $p < 0.001$ ) and suitable for further analysis. Detailed information on the

factor analysis and internal consistency reliability is presented in appendix 1: (Table 4.4). The current study employed Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax as the rotation method.

The factor analysis results presented in appendix 2 (Table 4.4) showed that all 20 items generated components based on Kaiser's criterion, which involves retaining Eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (Field, 2005). The rotated component matrix, utilizing PCA with Varimax rotation, indicated that all variables related to the 20 items were retained for further analysis. To confirm the internal consistency reliability of the items, Cronbach's Alpha was employed (as demonstrated in Table 3.1).

### Test of Hypothesis

For the purpose of predicting research productivity (ResPr), the study uses three explanatory variables namely reach and accessibility (ReAcc), knowledge transfer (KnTr), and quality of information shared (QualnSh) respectively. The regression results to examine whether or not dimensions of information sharing strategy significantly influence research productivity were presented in table 4.5-4.7.

**Table 4.5 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.749 <sup>a</sup>	.561	.560	.411

a. Predictors: (Constant), QualnSh, ReAcc, KnTr

Source: Researcher's Computation, 2024

Source: SPSS (Version 27.0) Output 2024

The model summary presented in Table 4.5 indicates a significant relationship between dimensions of information sharing strategy and research productivity signifying a metric of academic staff performance. The multiple correlation coefficient (R) value of 0.749 (74.9%) suggests a significant relationship between research productivity (ResPr) and dimensions of information sharing strategy,

represented by the constructs of reach and accessibility (ReAcc), knowledge transfer (KnTr), and quality of information shared (QualnSh) respectively. The R-square value of 0.561 (56.1%) signifies that the independent variables, including reach and accessibility (ReAcc), knowledge transfer (KnTr), and quality of information shared (QualnSh), collectively have an influence of 0.561 (56.1%) on the



dependent variable, research productivity (ResPr). This indicates that the combined effect of these independent variables can explain 56.1% in the variation in research productivity (ResPr). The adjusted  $R^2$  further confirms the actual effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable, with a value of 0.560 (56.0%). This suggests that reach and

accessibility (ReAcc), knowledge transfer (KnTr), and quality of information shared (QualnSh) contribute to the variation in the level of research productivity (ResPr) among university academic staff. This adjusted  $R^2$  value is considered satisfactory for determining the goodness of fit for the regression model, indicating its usefulness for making predictions.

**Table 4.6** ANOVA<sup>a</sup>

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1384.099	3	461.366	2724.921	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	151.536	895	.169		
Total	1535.635	898			

a. Dependent Variable: Perm

b. Predictors: (Constant), QualnSh, ReAcc, KnTr

Table 4.6 reveals that the calculated p-value is 0.000 (positive), which is less than the tabulated p-value of 0.05 at a 95% confidence level. Additionally, the calculated F-statistic value of 2724.921 exceeds the tabulated F-statistic value

of 4.29, suggesting that the model of the study is well-fitted. Therefore, dimensions of information sharing strategy exhibit a significant influence on research productivity (ResPr).

**Table 4.7** Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.038	.050		.775	.439
<u>ReAcc</u>	.253	.028	.273	9.107	.000
<u>KnTr</u>	.911	.046	.881	19.852	.001
<u>QualnSh</u>	.859	.042	.792	20.255	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Perm

Source: Researcher's Computation, 2024/

The estimated equation of the model is expressed as  $\text{ResPr} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ReAcc} + \beta_2 \text{KnTr} + \beta_3 \text{QualnSh} + \epsilon$

In Table 4.7, the results indicate that research productivity (ResPr) among university academic staff is ascertained to be 0.038 when all other variables are held constant. With a unit increase in reach and accessibility (ReAcc), knowledge transfer (KnTr), and quality of information shared (QualnSh) would increase by 0.253, 0.911, and 0.859, respectively, while keeping other variables constant.

Furthermore, as depicted in the table 4.7, the beta coefficient ( $\beta$ ) in respect to knowledge transfer (KnTr) was 0.253 with t-test value of 9.852 and  $p < 0.005$  at 5% level of significance.

This posits that knowledge transfer as a dimension of information sharing strategy is a positive predictor of research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance. Hence, the first hypothesis which states that knowledge transfer as a dimension of information sharing strategy significantly influences research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance is accepted.

The beta coefficient ( $\beta$ ) in respect to quality of information shared (QualnSh) was 0.911 with t-test of 20.255 and  $p < 0.005$ , at 5% level of significance. This depicts that quality of

information shared as a dimension of information sharing strategy is significantly relevant in predicting research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance. Thus, we accept the second hypothesis which states that quality of information shared as a dimension of information sharing strategy will significantly influence research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance.

The beta coefficient ( $\beta$ ) in respect to reach and accessibility (ReAcc) was 0.253, with t-test value of 9.107 and  $p < 0.005$ , at 5% level of significance. This indicates that reach and accessibility as a dimension of information sharing strategy is a positive predictor of research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance. This connotes the need for us to accept the third hypothesis which states that reach and accessibility as a dimension of information sharing strategy significantly influences research productivity as a key metric of academic staff performance.

### **Discussion of Findings**

The study aimed to investigate the effect of information sharing strategy on the performance of university academic staff in South-West Nigeria, specifically focusing on research productivity. Research productivity was measured as a key performance metric for academic staff in selected universities. The study analyzed the influence of three constructs of information sharing strategy: knowledge transfer, reach and accessibility, and quality of information shared on research productivity. The results indicate that all three constructs significantly and positively affect research productivity. Furthermore, the beta coefficients of each dimension highlight their respective contributions, with the quality of information shared having the highest impact.

Furthermore, the study revealed that the quality of information shared has the most substantial influence on research productivity among academic staff. With a beta coefficient of 0.911, a t-value of 20.255, and a significance level of  $p < 0.000$ , it is evident that high-quality information is paramount for enhancing research

productivity. This concurs with the findings of Bassey *et al* (2018); Bello (2015), Kpolovie, and Onoshagbegbe (2017); Maral (2024) and Ukangwa *et al* (2020) that information sharing enhances academic staff performance in that it helped to improve teaching in the classroom settings and enhances quality of research productivity. High-quality information is characterized by its accuracy, relevance, and timeliness, which enable academic staff to conduct rigorous and impactful research. Thus, ensuring that the information disseminated is accurate, relevant, and up-to-date can significantly will boost the research output of academic staff.

Knowledge transfer also plays a crucial role in influencing research productivity, with a beta coefficient of 0.253, a t-value of 19.852, and a significance level of  $p < 0.001$ . This is in tandem with the findings of Adewuyi and Uthman (2023); Fothergill (2000); Odunewu and Haliso (2019); Jameel and Ahmad (2020); Sayyed (2024); and Simisaye and Olakunle (2020), that positive and quality knowledge sharing behavior enhances performance of university staff, with particular reference to academic staff of universities. This construct involves the dissemination of skills, expertise, and research findings among academic staff. Thus, effective knowledge transfer will facilitate collaboration, sparks new research ideas, and enables academics to build on existing work. The positive relationship between knowledge transfer and research productivity suggests that academic staff who actively engage in sharing and receiving knowledge are more likely to produce high-quality research outputs. This finding highlights the need for fostering an environment that encourages the free flow of knowledge within universities.

Additionally, reach and accessibility of information, with a beta coefficient of 0.253, a t-value of 9.107, and a significance level of  $p < 0.000$ , were identified as the least contributing but still significant factor influencing research productivity. This concurs with the submissions of Aksnes *et al* (2019); Helmer *et al* (2020); Maral (2024); Jameel and Ahmad (2020); and Sayyed (2024) that the level of reach and

accessibility of information available to academic staff significantly influence quality of research output. The positive effect of reach and accessibility on research productivity indicates that when academic staff have broad and easy access to information, they can conduct more thorough and efficient research. Ensuring that academic staff have access to a wide range of research databases, journals, and other information resources is essential for enhancing their research productivity.

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study concludes that information sharing strategy significantly contributes to the research productivity of academic staff in universities in South-West Nigeria. The findings highlight the critical role of the quality of information shared, knowledge transfer, and reach and accessibility in enhancing research productivity. By fostering an environment that promotes the sharing of high-quality information, encouraging effective knowledge transfer, and ensuring broad and easy access to information resources, universities can significantly boost the research productivity of their academic staff. Prioritizing these aspects of information sharing strategy should be a key focus for university administrators and policymakers aiming to enhance academic performance and research output in Nigerian universities.

Based on the empirical findings, the study recommended that the significant and positive effects of quality of information shared, knowledge transfer, and reach and accessibility on research productivity have several practical implications:

i) Universities should develop and implement policies that promote the sharing of high-quality information among academic staff. Additionally, investing in information infrastructure to enhance the reach and accessibility of information resources is crucial. This includes subscribing to research databases, maintaining comprehensive libraries, and ensuring digital access to resources.

ii) Training programs focused on improving the quality of information sharing should be provided to academic staff. These programs can help staff learn best practices for disseminating high-quality information and accessing relevant resources efficiently.

iii) Encouraging collaboration and networking among academic staff can facilitate knowledge transfer and improve the quality of shared information. Universities can organize seminars, workshops, and conferences that provide platforms for academic staff to share their research and learn from each other.

### **REFERENCES**

- Abbas, A., Avdic, A., Barker, K., & Xiaobao, P. (2018). Knowledge Transfer from Universities to Industry through University Technology Transfer Offices. *Science and innovation*, 14, 5- 18. 10.15407/scine14.02.005.
- Abdulkareem, A. Y., & Oyeniran, S. (2011). Challenges in Evaluating Public Sector Performance. *Journal of Public Administration*, 45(2), 123-145.
- Adegbile, J. A., & Amusa, O. I. (2020). Information sharing and academic performance in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Educational Research*, 33(2), 101-112.
- Adeleke, T., & Olayinka, K. (2019). The role of technology in academic information sharing. *Journal of African Higher Education Studies*, 14(1), 45-58.
- Adewuyi, O. W. & Uthman, K. O. (2023). An investigative study of relationship between organizational culture, organizational structure and knowledge sharing practices of employees in university libraries in South-West, Nigeria. *Samaru Journal of Information Studies*, 23(2), 1-14
- Agbatogun, A. (2013). Interactive digital technologies' use in Southwest Nigerian universities. *Educational Technology*

- Research and Development*, 61. 10.1007/s11423-012-9282-1.
- Aina, R. O., Olatunji, A. O., & Fagbola, O. (2021). Information sharing patterns among Nigerian university faculty. *African Journal of Library, Archives & Information Science*, 31(1), 1- 14.
- Aksnes, D., Langfeldt, L., & Wouters, P., (2019). Citations, Citation Indicators, and Research Quality: An Overview of Basic Concepts and Theories. *SAGE*, Open. 9. 215824401982957. 10.1177/2158244019829575.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bassey, U., Akuegwu, B., Udida, L., & Udey, F. U., (2018). Academic staff research productivity: a study of Universities in South-South Zone of Nigeria. *International Journal of Education Research and Reviews*, 6(5), 001-006. Available online at [www.internationalscholarsjournals.org](http://www.internationalscholarsjournals.org)
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Belay, S., Melese, S., Seifu, A., & Ng, D. F. S. (2021). Advancing teachers' human capital through effective leadership and institutional safety: Mediating effect of professional learning and teaching climate. *Cogent Education*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1912488>
- Bello, M. A. (2015). Information Sharing As Factor Affecting Teaching Effectiveness of Faculty Staff of Social Sciences in Selected Universities In Southwest Nigeria. *Quest Journals Journal of*
- Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 3(2), 64-72
- Bornmann, L. (2011). Scientific peer review. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 45(1), 199-245.
- Burgstahler, S. (2002). Universal design in education: Principles and applications. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 15(2), 101-107.
- Brew, A., & Boud, D. (1995). Teaching and research: Establishing the vital link with learning. *Higher Education*, 29(3), 261-273.
- Collins, C. S., & Stockton, C. M. (2018). The Central Role of Theory in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918797475>
- Falowo, O. (2022). Performance Management in Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 44(3), 203-219.
- Fisher, J., (2003). Spreading the word: disseminating research findings.
- Fothergill, A., (2000). Knowledge Transfer between Researchers and Practitioners. *Natural Hazards Review*, 1(91). 10.1061/(ASCE)1527-6988(2000)1:2(91).
- Daniel, C. A., Emem, D. E., & Abigail, P. U. (2017). Communication flow patterns and institutional harmony in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *International Journal of International Relations, Media and Mass Communication Studies*, 3, (6), 1-37
- Dang, T. L. (2017). Enhancing research visibility of academics: the role of education libraries, *Journal of Information Management*, 9(2), 48-54.
- Geuna, A., & Martin, B. R. (2003). University research evaluation and funding: An



- international comparison. *Minerva*, 41(4), 277-304
- Gioia, D., Corley, K., & Hamilton, A., (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16, 15-31. [10.1177/1094428112452151](https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151).
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109-122.
- Hair, J.F., Money, A.H., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2006). *Research method for Business*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Helmer, S., Blumenthal, D.B. & Paschen, K. (2020). What is meaningful research and how should we measure it? *Scientometrics*, 125, 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03649-5>
- Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(46), 16569-16572.
- Kendall, F., (2021). Faculty Use of Open-Access Journals: A Case Study of Faculty Publications and Cited References at a California University. *Publications*, 9(3), 39; <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9030039>
- Kpolovie, P. J. & Onoshagbegbe, E. S. (2017). Research productivity: h-Index and i10-Index of academics in Nigerian Universities. *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, 5(2), 62-123.
- Ling Li (2022). Reskilling and Upskilling the Future-ready Workforce for Industry 4.0 and Beyond. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 1-16, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10308-y>
- Maral, M. (2024). Research performance of higher education institutions in Türkiye: 1980–2022. *Scientometrics* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-05097-x>
- Mbagwu, I. F., & Oduagwu, M.C. (2022). *Research visibility of Academic Librarians in Imo State: factors, strategies and challenges*. Paper presented at NLA confence/workshop. Tuesday 6 – Thursday 8 Dec. 2022 at Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education, Owerri.
- Nwachukwu, O., (2024). Human Capital Development: A Driver for Educational Improvement in Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 12, 30-39. [10.37745/bje.2013/vol12n63039](https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2013/vol12n63039).
- Odero, (2017). Evaluating Organizational Performance in Universities. *Educational Management Review*, 33(4), 179-194.
- Okebukola, P. A. (2008). *Quality assurance mechanisms and academic mobility in Anglophone Countries: Case study of Nigeria*. Paper presented at the capacity building workshop on the License-Master-Doctorate (LMD) reform held at Universite Gaston Berger, Saint Louis, Senegal September 19–20)
- Odunewu, A. O. & Haliso, Y., (2019). Knowledge sharing behaviour and librarians job performance in Nigerian Universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2396. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2396>
- Ogunleye, A., Ogundele, F., & Adebayo, I. (2019). Challenges of information sharing among university lecturers. *Journal of Nigerian Educational Research*, 25(3), 87-102.
- Oladokun, O. (2020). Academic competition and information sharing among university staff. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 18(4), 64-75.



- Omotayo, F., & Abdulrahman, H., (2020). Knowledge Sharing Practices among Non-Academic Staff in a Nigerian University. 10.4018/978-1-7998-3476-2.ch029.
- Omotayo, F., & Babalola, S. (2016). Factors influencing knowledge sharing among information and communication technology artisans in Nigeria. *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, 18, 148-169. 10.1108/JSIT-02-2016-0009.
- Jameel, A. & Ahmad, A. R., (2020). Factors Impacting Research Productivity of Academic Staff at the Iraqi Higher Education system. *International Business Education Journal*, 13, 108-126. 10.37134/ibej.vol13.1.9.2020.
- Kontoghiorghes, C., Awbrey, S. M., & Feurig, P. L. (2005). Examining the relationship between learning organization characteristics and change adaptation, innovation, and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(2), 185-212.
- Oyenuga O. G., Adebisi S. O., Mustapha D. O., & Abimbola B. O. (2019). Assessment of Knowledge Sharing Determinants in the Nigeria Universities using Analytic Network Process, *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, 12( 3), 84- 102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2019.120303>
- Perkmann, M., Tartari, V., McKelvey, M., Autio, E., Broström, A., D'Este, P. & Sobrero, M. (2013). Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations. *Research Policy*, 42(2), 423-442.
- Pittsburgh Library System (2022). How to increase the visibility of your research visibility, six steps to increase the visibility. <http://pitt.libguides.com/research/visibility>. Retrieved on August 14, 2022
- Priem, J., & Hemminger, B. M. (2010). Scientometrics 2.0: Toward new metrics of scholarly impact on the social Web. *First Monday*, 15(7).
- Punnakitikashem, P. (2013). Performance Measurement in Public Service Organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 26(2), 98-114
- Rowley, J. (1996). Motivation and academic staff in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4(3), 11-16.
- Sayyed, K. (2024). Assessing Research Productivity and Quality across Disciplines in the School of Arts and Sciences at the Lebanese American University. *Sage Open*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241237050>
- Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review*, 51(1), 1-17.
- Simisaye, A. & Olakunle, A., (2020). A study of research productivity of the academic staff in research institutes in South-West Nigeria. 75-99
- Stefan, S. H., & Gwen, T. H., (2022). *Accessibility in Research: From Design to Dissemination*. Royal Roads University
- Suber, P. (2012). *Open access*. MIT Press
- Starovoytova, D., (2017). Research-Productivity at Engineering-School: Number of Publications per Faculty-Member, *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8, (28), 14-38
- Ukangwa, C. C., Otuza, E. C., & Ehioghae, M., (2020). Influence of Information Sharing on Job Satisfaction of Librarians in Private Universities in South- East and South-West, Nigeria. *Information Impact: Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 11(4), 1-12, DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijikm.v11i4.1>

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171-180.

through Assessment. *Scholar Chatter*, 3, 1-6. 10.47036/SC.3.1.1-6.2022.

Whitehead, T. (2022). Training and Development: Investing in Employees