GUSAU JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (GUJOBA)

Vol. 4 Issue 1, June, 2025; Pp 116 - 129

ISSN: 2811-1702

A Publication of the Department of Business Administration, Federal University Gusau, Nigeria

KNOWLEDGE SHARING PRACTICES AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN THE EDO STATE CIVIL SERVICE

***Blessing Oghogho Ikuvbogie[1] and Enarunaehimwenma Idubor[2]**

Department of Human Resources Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

*Correspondence: blessingikuvbogie@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the impact of explicit, implicit, and tacit knowledge sharing on employee performance within the Edo State Civil Service. A quantitative research design was adopted, using structured questionnaires administered to a representative sample of Three hundred and fifty-five (355) civil servants, drawn from a population of 2,901 employees across various ministries and departments in Benin City. The sample size was determined using the Yamane formula. Data were collected through face-to-face interviews and analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics, including correlation and multiple regression techniques, via SPSS version 24.The findings revealed that explicit knowledge sharing ($\beta = 10.158$, $p < 0.001$) and tacit knowledge sharing ($\beta = 6.693$, $p < 0.001$) had a statistically significant positive effect on employee performance. However, implicit knowledge sharing ($\beta = –0.188$, $p = 0.851$) did not exhibit a significant relationship with performance. In light of these findings, the study recommends the implementation of structured knowledge management systems, such as digital knowledge repositories and formal mentoring programs, to facilitate the effective transfer of knowledge and enhance employee performance and operational efficiency across public sector institutions.

Keywords: Organizational Performance, Knowledge Sharing Practices and Civil Service.

1. INTRODUCTION

In our fast-changing world today, knowledge assumes a central role. It stands as the foremost asset within any organisation to winning competition. As technology continues its rapid evolution and software assumes control over much of the task-oriented responsibilities, the expertise possessed by employees continues to reign supreme as the principal asset of any organisation. Thus, organisations that persist in conventional operations without a commitment to ongoing reflection, learning, adjustment, iteration, and the application of effective solutions may discover themselves trailing behind those that leverage knowledge to shape their service delivery (Drucker 1993,69). Lejeune (2011) emphasized that departing employees often carry away invaluable insights and adeptness in problem-solving, resulting in an immediate reduction of organisational knowledge which triggers a series of consequential effects. Often, the full impact only becomes apparent after these employees have left particularly when critical knowledge was held by a key individual or expert, or when that knowledge remained largely undocumented and unknown to others. Additionally, Omotayo (2015:15) opined that when an employee departs from an organisation, the managerial focus should extend beyond the retrieval of company assets such as vehicles and identity cards. It should also encompass a concerted effort to extract as much knowledge as feasible from the departing employee. This strategic emphasis is crucial because allowing employees equipped with pertinent knowledge to exit without capturing that knowledge in databases or files can expose the enterprise to vulnerabilities. Competitors might capitalize on the expertise of these departing employees, with potential ramifications related to copyrights and intellectual property. Organisations often face substantial knowledge loss resulting from employee turnover, transfers, retirements, mobility, and evolving work arrangements. To address this, it is essential for members to actively create and share knowledge, embracing a mind-set that views knowledge as a core part of oneself demanding personal responsibility and commitment.

According to Le, Lei, and Than (2018:706), knowledge sharing plays a vital role in enhancing employee

interaction and communication, leading to the generation of innovative ideas that significantly contribute to personal growth and development. Additionally, it strengthens the organisation's knowledge capital by equipping individuals with a well-rounded set of skills and expertise, enabling them to achieve objectives more efficiently and effectively. Furthermore, Mohajan (2019) suggested the integration of reward systems aimed at motivating and encouraging employees possessing valuable knowledge to actively engage in knowledge-driven activities.

Statement of the Research Problem

The rise of the knowledge-based economy has highlighted the critical role of knowledge management, particularly knowledge sharing, in driving organisational success. Despite this, a persistent challenge remains; employees often show reluctance to share knowledge.Emumejakpor, Ikpe, and Wilson (2023:31) noted that many employees take pride in avoiding collaboration, preferring instead to develop their own methods independently. While leadership support is crucial (Le & Lei, 2019:532), a weak organisational culture can further reduce employees' motivation to share, acquire, and disseminate knowledge (Abeyrathna&Priyadarshana, 2020:2). Other contributing factors include an overemphasis on employees' intellectual abilities (Andem, Akpan&Ogosi, 2022), and individual perceptions of personal knowledge value (Muafi, 2020), among others. Although knowledge sharing has attracted significant academic attention especially in developed countries where its impact on organisational performance has been extensively studied (Ang, Fabeil, & Pang, 2022; Huie, Cassaberry, & Rivera, 2020; Maharani, Hosen, Lius, &Dharmawan, 2020; Sunarta, Rohman, &Kawedar, 2020; Lopez-Cabarcos, Srinivasan, Monteiro, & Rodriguez, 2019) yet research in developing contexts like Nigeria remains limited. This gap underscores the need for further investigation into knowledge sharing practices within such environments. This geographical gap is particularly noticeable in public service agencies, such as the Edo State Civil Service, where the impact of knowledge sharing on organisational performance remains insufficiently examined. Though knowledge sharing continues to attract global interest, its practical implementation within civil service institutions presents both opportunities and challenges. In the Edo State Civil Service, specific barriers to effective knowledge sharing include a rigid organisational structure, limited opportunities for knowledge exchange, communication breakdowns, and a culture where managerial staff may exhibit pride or reluctance to share information. Addressing these challenges is essential, as strategic knowledge sharing initiatives have the potential to foster employee creativity, drive innovation, and enhance overall performance. However, existing research on knowledge sharing in Nigeria has largely focused on industries such as oil and gas (Iyamah&Ohiorenoya, 2015), food and beverage (Akpa, Akinlabi, Asikhia, &Nnorom, 2020), higher education (Emumejakpor, Ikpe, & Wilson, 2023; Olubukola, Olufemi, &Ibidapo, 2022; Ehijiagbone& Olatokun, 2020), faith-based organisations (Dickson & Onyeinkorikiye, 2019), and the health sector (Andem, Akpan, &Ogosi, 2022). Research exploring knowledge sharing within public sector institutions remains limited (Imam &Jagodic, 2021; Ononye&Igwe, 2019).Furthermore, few studies have examined only a single dimension of knowledge sharing (Shonubi, Odunlami, &Akintaro, 2020; Evwierhurhoma&Oga, 2020; Adeyemi, 2019), limiting the generalisability of their findings. Little attention has been paid to the multidimensional frameworks proposed by Koenig (2012) and Choudhary&Sarikwal (2017), which may offer deeper insights into the relationship between knowledge sharing and employee performance particularly in the Nigerian public sector context, and more specifically in Benin City. This study seeks to bridge this critical gap.

Research Hypotheses

During the study, the subsequent null hypotheses will undergo testing:

i. Explicit knowledge sharing has no significant effect on the organisational performance of employees in the Edo State Civil Service.

ii. Implicit knowledge sharing has no significant effect on the organisational performance of employees in the employees in the Edo State Civil Service.

iii.Tacit knowledge sharing has no significant effect on the organisational performance of employees in the Edo State Civil Service.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Organisational Performance

Organisational performance refers to the extent to which a company successfully achieves its goals, encompassing both financial and non-financial outcomes. Although there are varying perspectives on how best to define and measure organisational performance reflecting the complexity and multifaceted nature of the concept yet a prevalent approach adopted by many researchers revolves around assessing the organisation's capability to attain its economic

objectives through the efficient and effective utilisation of available resources(Karanjia, 2014).Organisational performance involves an organisation's capacity to achieve heightened productivity and a substantial market share that can yield favourable financial returns while upholding social and ethical responsibilities towards the environment and society within which the organisation operates (Tubigi&Alshawi, 2015). According to Korma, Kolluju, Kumitha, and Kareem (2022) organisational performance stems from collective efforts across all units of an organisation, fostering teamwork through innovative strategies to attain organisational goals and objectives.This notion is echoed by, (Kalogiannidis2022) who perceived organizational performance as assessing the present condition of a commercial or service-oriented firmin order to evaluate how effectively or inadequately employees have carried out a particular task. It is a measure of how effectively and efficiently an organisation is using it resources both human or non-human to accomplish it mission and deliver value to its stakeholders.

Measures of Organisational Performance

While researchers have continued to debate the growing consumer demand for improved public service delivery, driven by technological advancements and an increasingly competitive landscape across both public and private sectors in many developing nations, the need to measure performance has become crucial in assessing organisational success. According to Tariq, Rosmaini, Mohammed and Rumman(2022) enhancing a commercial or service-oriented firm is unfeasible without assessing its present condition. Evaluating firm performance entails determining how effectively or inadequately an individual has carried out a particular task or job.

Traditionally, organisational performance has been confined to accounting metrics. But, obtaining precise accounting data from organisations can be challenging, especially when they are not publicly traded. While financial performance data for large, publicly listed companies is readily accessible, obtaining similar information for smaller firms is often difficult. Such data tends to be more subjective and is not held to the same rigorous accounting standards required of companies legally obligated to report to investors. Over time, attention has increasingly shifted toward non-financial performance indicators, such as customer satisfaction, innovation capacity, productivity, operational efficiency, employee commitment, product or service quality, and the ability to attract and retain skilled talent (Katou&Budhwar, 2007). Additionally, Alrubaiee and Jamhour, (2012) suggested that managers should focus on voluntarily, disclosed performance indicators, encompassing both financial (e.g., sales, profit, market share) and non-financial aspects (e.g., efficiency, quality, productivity, satisfaction, intention to quit, commitment). Consequently, the selection of performance indicators is influenced by various factors such as the accessibility of relevant information and the environmental circumstances associated with the specific research question.Gutterman (2023) noted that each category has its own merits and drawbacks offering a distinct perspective on the overall issue of measuring organisational performance.

Concept of Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing has been interpreted from different perspectives, including knowledge diffusion, knowledge transfer, knowledge distribution, knowledge dissemination, and information sharing (Najla, Filipovic, &Kovac, 2017).Tran (2022), described it asa culture of social interaction characterised by the exchange of employees' knowledge, experiences, and skills throughout an entire department or organisation. According to Lin;Bhatti andQureshi 2007, knowledge sharing occurs at the individual and organisational levels. Both levels engage the employees in active knowledge dissemination and systematicreuse within the organisation for effective decision-making. Al-Hawamdeh (2003) defined knowledge sharing as the exchange of various types of knowledge, including explicit knowledge (such as information, know-how, and know-who), implicit knowledge (based on experience), and tacit knowledge (encompassing skills and competencies). However, Nonaka (1994) noted that the success of knowledge sharing depends not only on the willingness and capability of individuals to share their knowledge but also on the receptivity and effective mechanisms within the organisation. Knowledge sharing within a social framework depends on individuals' mutual willingness to actively listen and respond to each other's ideas. Constructive and supportive relationships create an environment where people feel comfortable sharing their insights and openly discussing concerns(Krogh, Ichijo, &Nonaka,2002).According to Wamundila (2008), to encourage employees to share the knowledge they possess, organisations must provide a sense of job security and implement an effective reward system.

Explicit Knowledge Sharing

Explicit knowledge is the type of knowledge that can be clearly articulated, documented, and expressed through language, symbols, or numerical data. This knowledge is structured in paper and electronic formats, and its accessibility does not necessitate extensive discussions (Santos & Lopes 2014). Ipe (2013) noted that the

distribution and transmission of explicit knowledge are relatively straightforward compared to sharing tacit knowledge, as explicit knowledge is easily communicated and does not typically necessitate encouragement for sharing. Its comprehensive nature permits it to be shared through various channels such as visual means(video clips), audio recordings, printed materials (books, manuals), databasesand expert systemssuch thatindividuals can easily retrieve or adapt it to foster their intellectual advancement(Gonzalez & Martins, 2017;Sun & Scott, 2018).Omotayo (2015) argued that although explicit knowledge is important, it is not sufficient on its own to drive innovation. Its value and adaptability are largely dependent on the dynamic nature of tacit knowledge. In a knowledge-driven context, information serves as the currency, with the human mind functioning as the bank where knowledge is stored, invested, and exchanged. Consequently, Pangil and Nasurddin (2013) added that sharing explicit knowledge enhances employees' efficiency, leading to increased productivity and competence in their work.

Implicit Knowledge Sharing

Implicit knowledge refers to the practical application of explicit knowledge within an organisation. It is commonly shared through collaborative teamwork, where employees apply what they know in real-time situations, often leading to the discovery of the most effective solutions and actions. Implicit knowledge cannot be acquired solely from instructional manuals; rather, it is derived from the actual application of information found in those manuals or other forms of documented explicit knowledge in real-world scenarios (Nonaka&Konno, 1998). It also encompasses best practices and skills that employees bring from previous work experiences, which vary from person to person. Lee (2001), opined that implicit knowledge is regarded as a pivotal element contributing to a firm's competitive advantage, owing to its heightened resistance to imitation by competitors and it sharing routines stem from accumulated experience and specialised expertise. Koeing (2012), suggested that implicit knowledge is not explicitly laid out in tangible forms but has the potential to be articulated explicitly. Sometimes, it is shared unconsciously simply because of the cost-effective policy made by top-management. Nickols (2013) noted that knowledge which has not been formally expressed or articulated should be classified as implicit knowledge. While it resides within an individual, it remains inaccessible to others unless intentionally shared or demonstrated. This often makes it difficult to document. Examples are know-how, know-where, know-whom, and expertise. Some Organisations facilitates its sharing among employees through the use of subject matter experts(SMEs)(Teece,2007).

Tacit Knowledge Sharing

Tacit knowledge resides in action, dedication, context specificity, and is derived from personal experiences. It is challenging to convey visually or verbally, as it is deeply rooted in the subconscious level (Faizuniah and Aizzat (2009). Although tacit knowledge stems from competencies that are continuously shaped by individual actions and experiences, it is seldom communicated or shared due to its subjective, intuitive nature and the difficulty in capturing it. As a result, this knowledge often leaves the organisation when the individual who holds it departs(Othman& Abdullah 2010; Santos& Lopes, 2014). However, it can be transferred through socialisation processes such as apprenticeship, mentoring, coaching, interaction, observation, imitation, storytelling, and the use of narratives. Alternatively, it may be externalised through the use of assumptions, analogies, and metaphors.The effectiveness of successful tacit knowledge transfer is determined by its alignment with the context or situation and a shared understanding (Matošková et al., 2013).Omotayo (2015) opined that sharing tacit knowledge occupies a vital domain within the sphere of knowledge management. Not only does it introduce new avenues for theorising about organisational nature in this era of knowledge, but it also holds the potential to enhance it.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in the Knowledge-Based View (KBV) of the firm, as proposed by Robert McQueen Grant in 1996.Thetheory, posit that within the firm, there exist distinctivediverse knowledge structures that are essential prerequisites for attaining a competitive advantage. Accordingly, firms exist for individuals to integrate their specialist knowledge which is done in a defined boundary that cut across hierarchical structures. Thus, competitive advantage is attained when individuals who possessed specific knowledge capabilitiessuch as; absorptive, innovative, combinative, protective, and knowledge transferare involved in knowledge sharing behaviour(Williamson, 1999). This sharing behaviour aids organisational learning by providing strategies for achieving strategic and unique knowledge that leads to differential levels of performance. This level of performance puts the organisation in a position of ever-increasing progress, efficiency and effectiveness

3. METHODOLOGY

The study employed a cross-sectional survey research design, as data on the variables of interest were collected from sampled respondents at a single point in

time using a structured questionnaire. The target population comprised permanent employees of the Edo State Civil Service (EDCS), including both male and female staff across junior, senior, and management levels.The junior, senior, and management staff had a population of 588,2047 and 266 respectively (Data and statistic department, EDCSC 2020). The sample size for this study is 355, determined using the Taro Yamane (1967) formula to ensure a representative sample of the population. Thus;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where N = Total staff population
e = (0.05),
1 = constant

$$n = n, = \frac{2901 = 355}{1 + 2901(0.05)^2}$$

To account for potentially invalid copies of the questionnaires, a 10% margin was added, resulting in a revised sample size of 391.This sample size (n=391) was then proportionally distributed among the staff using the proportional allocation formula proposed by Kumar (1976), as follows:$nh = (Nh \div N) \times n,$ Where nh = sample size for stratum h; Nh = population size for stratum h; N = total population.

Table 1: Proportionate allocation of the number of questionnaires to be distributed.

S/N	Institution	category	Computation	Sample size
1.	Edo State Civil Service	Junior staff	$(588 \div 2901) \times 391 = 79.25$	79
		Senior staff	$(2047 \div 2901) \times 391 = 275.869$	276
		Management staff	$(266 \div 2901) \times 391 = 35.852$	36
	Total		2901	391

Source: Researcher's Fieldwork (2024)

Research Instrument

A total of 391 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 355 were completed and deemed suitable for analysis. The instrument used to measure organisational performance was adapted from Miah (2020), while items assessing knowledge sharing practices were drawn from the works of Mbah and Maduafor (2022), Atif (2015), and Jacobs and Roodt (2007). The questionnaire was structured into three main sections: Section A, Section B, and Section C. Section A collected demographic information about the respondents and included semi-open-ended questions. Section B focused on items related to the dependent variable, organisational performance, while Section C addressed the independent variables concerning knowledge sharing practices. Except for Section A, all other items were designed using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *Strongly Disagree (SD)* to *Strongly Agree (SA)*, with intermediate options being *Disagree (D),Undecided (U),* and *Agree (A).* Corresponding numerical values from 1 to 5 were assigned to these response categories.

Model Specification

This study opined that knowledge sharing can affect organisational performance and as such the study specified the regression model belowas, developed by Friedrich Gauss in 1794. Thus,

$ORGPPERF = KSP$ … … ……. (1)

Where $KSP = EKS, IKS, TKS$

$ORGPERF = f(EKS, IKS, TKS)$ ……. (2)

This model is further expressed mathematically as:

$ORGPERF = \beta_0 + \beta_1 EKS + \beta_2 IKS + \beta_3 TKS + \varepsilon$……..……(3)

Where:

$ORGPERF$= Organisational Performance; EKS= Explicit knowledge sharing; IKS= Implicit knowledge sharing; TKS= Tacit knowledge sharing; andε= Error term

The Apriori expectation was stated as: $\beta_1>0$, $\beta_2>0$, and $\beta_3>0$ and it indicates that an increase in explicit, implicit, and tacit knowledge sharing practices will result to increased organisational performance.

Methods of Data Analysis

The data were coded in the Microsoft Excel sheet and copied into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 24). The descriptive statistics were used to present the percentages, frequencies, and means of the data. Consequently, multiple regression analysis was used to revealed the relationships between the dependent and independent variables. This also formed the basis upon which the formulated hypotheses were tested.

Validity and Reliability of Research Instrument

To ensure that the questions effectively capture the constructs being investigated, the questionnaire underwent a thorough validation process. This process involved a review and evaluation by lecturers within the department to verify the relevance and clarity of the items. Additionally, a pilot test was conducted in which 20 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to assess its reliability. The results of the pilot test were evaluated using Cronbach's alpha technique, which is shown in the table below:

Table 2: Reliability Test

Number	Attribute	Question No.	Item Count	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Organisational performance	Q7 – Q12	6	0.743
2.	Explicit knowledge sharing	Q13 – Q17	5	0.707
3.	Implicit knowledge sharing	Q18 – Q21	4	0.726
4.	Tacit knowledge sharing	Q22 – Q26	5	0.709

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Description of Respondents Demographic

This section consists of data presentation, analysis and interpretation. The hypothesized relationships between the dependent and independent variables are shown and finally, the findings are also discussed.

The socio-demographics of the respondents are shown in the below table.

Table 3: Demographic description of the respondents

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	Category	Frequency	
		No.	%
Gender	Male	196	54.9
	Female	160	45.1
	Total	**355**	**100**
Age	25-30	63	17.7
	31-35	69	19.4
	36-40	82	23.1
	41-45	75	21.1

	46-65	66	18. 6
	Total	**355**	**100**
Marital Status	Single	83	23.4
	Married	268	75. 5
	Separated	4	1.1
	Total	**355**	**100**
Educational Attainment	SSCE/WAEC	16	4. 5
	HND/BSc.	249	70.1
	MSc/MBA/ Ph.D.	90	25.4
	Total	**355**	**100**
Job Category	Junior	61	17.2
	Senior	241	67.9
	Management	53	14.9
	Total	**355**	**100**
Work Experience	0-5 years	110	31.0
	6-10 years	86	24.2
	11-15 years	82	23.1
	16- 20 years	33	9.3
	Above 21 years	44	12.4
	Total	**355**	**100**

Source:Field Survey, 2024

Table 2 presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents. A majority (54.9%) were male, while females made up 45.1% of the total respondents. The age distribution reveals that the highest proportion (23.1%) fell within the 36–40 years' age group. This was followed by respondents aged 41–45 years (21.1%), 31–35 years (19.4%), and 46–65 years (18.6%). The remaining 17.7% were aged between 25 and 30 years. For job categories, 17.2% of the respondents were junior staff, 67.9% were senior staff, and 14.9% held management positions across the various ministries surveyed. In terms of work experience, 31% of the respondents had less than five years of service, 24.2% had six to ten years, 23.1% had eleven to fifteen years, 9.3% had sixteen to twenty years, and 12.4% had over twenty-one years of work experience within their respective ministries.

Table 4: Respondents Responses to Research Variables

S/N	Research Variables	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	**Organisational Performance**	28	36	29	162	100	3.76	1.144166667

2	**Explicit Knowledge Sharing**	19	24	17	169	126	4.01	1
3	**Implicit Knowledge Sharing**	27	56	54	136	82	3.5325	1.19625
4	**Tacit Knowledge Sharing**	31	35	44	147	98	3.688	1.20472
	Average	26	38	38	151	102	3.7435	1.133656667

Source: Field survey, 2024.

Table 5: Pearson Correlation Coefficients among Research Variables

		Organisational performance	**Explicit knowledge sharing**	**Implicit knowledge sharing**	**Tacit knowledge sharing**
Organisational performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.707**	.600**	.665**
Explicit knowledge sharing	Pearson Correlation	.707**	1		
Implicit knowledge sharing	Pearson Correlation	.600**	.667**	1	
Tacit knowledge sharing	Pearson Correlation	.665**	.621**	.775**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level(2-tailed)

1. ***Organisational Performance (OrgPerf)**: *

-Pearson Correlation with Explicit Knowledge Sharing (EKS): 0.707** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

- Pearson Correlation with Implicit Knowledge Sharing (IKS): 0.600** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

- Pearson Correlation with Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TKS): 0.665** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

2. ***Explicit Knowledge Sharing (EKS): ***

- Pearson Correlation with Organisational Performance: 0.707** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

3. ***Implicit Knowledge Sharing (IKS): ***

- Pearson Correlation with Organisational Performance: 0.600** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

- Pearson Correlation with Explicit Knowledge Sharing: 0.667** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

4. ***Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TKS): ***

- Pearson Correlation with Organisational Performance: 0.665** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

- Pearson Correlation with Explicit Knowledge Sharing: 0.621** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

- Pearson Correlation with Implicit Knowledge Sharing: 0.775** (Significant at the 0.01 level)

Interpretation:

-A strong positive correlation is observed between Organisational Performance and Explicit Knowledge Sharing (EKS) (r = 0.707).

- Organisational Performance also shows positive correlations with Implicit Knowledge Sharing (IKS) (r = 0.600) and Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TKS) (r = 0.665).

- Among the three knowledge sharing practices, Explicit Knowledge Sharing (EKS) has the strongest correlation with Organisational Performance (r = 0.707).

- All correlations are statistically significant at the 0.01 level, which provides strong evidencesupporting the observed relationships.

Table 6: Coefficients[a]showing the relationship between knowledge sharing practicesand organisational performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.407	4.549		.841	.000
	Explicit knowledge sharing	10.158	.563	.482	.055	.000
	Implicit knowledge sharing	-.188	-.014	-.011	.076	.851
	Tacit knowledge sharing	6.693	.376	.374	.056	.000
R = .763a R Square =.583 Adjusted R Square =.579 Std. Error of the Estimate = 2.96393 Durbin-Watson = 2.002 F= 163.371						

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance

The model yielded a coefficient of determination (R^2) 0.583, indicating that 58.3% of the variance in Organisational Performance is explained by the combined effects of tacit, explicit, and implicit knowledge sharing practices. The adjustedR^2 value of 0.579, confirms a good model fit, accounting for the number of predictors used. Additionally, the Durbin–Watson statistic of 2.002 suggests the absence of significant autocorrelation, as it approximates the ideal value of 2, indicating that residuals are largely independent.

The F-Statistic was at a value of 163.371 with a P-value less than 0.05. This showed that knowledge sharing practices is a significant variable for the organisational performance of employees of Edo State Civil Service.

Hypothesis 1

H_{01}: The sharing of explicit knowledge does not have a significant impact on the organisational performance of employees within the Edo State Civil Service.

The regression analysis presented in Table 6 shows that explicit knowledge sharing has a coefficient of 10.158 with a p-value of 0.000, which is well below the 0.05 significance threshold. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that explicit knowledge sharing has a statistically significant and positive impact on organisational performance.

Practical interpretation: A one-unit increase in explicit knowledge sharing (e.g., via manuals, databases, documentation) is associated with a 10.158, unit improvement in organisational performance. For instance, a 10% increase in explicit knowledge sharing is projected to result in an approximately 1.02, unit increase in performance. This underscores the substantial practical value of investing in formal knowledge dissemination mechanisms within the civil service.

Hypothesis 2

H_{02}: The sharing of implicit knowledge does not exert a significant influence on the organisational performance of employees within the Edo State Civil Service.

As shown in Table 6, implicit knowledge sharing has a coefficient of –0.188 with a p-value of 0.851, which exceeds the 0.05 threshold. Thus, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, indicating that implicit knowledge sharing does not have a statistically significant effect on organisational performance.

Practical implication: Although implicit knowledge (unspoken practices, habits, or intuition) might play a role in day-to-day work, the analysis shows it does not lead to measurable performance gains in this context. This may be due to its informal and unstructured nature, which limits its transferability and practical impact unless explicitly captured or formalized.

Hypothesis 3

H_{03}: The sharing of tacit knowledge does not exert a significant impact on the organisational performance of employees within the Edo State Civil Service.

The regression results indicate that tacit knowledge sharing has a coefficient of 6.693 with a p-value of 0.000, confirming that it is statistically significant at the 5% level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, signifying that tacit knowledge sharing positively and significantly impactsorganisational performance.

Practical interpretation: A one-unit increase in tacit knowledge sharing, such as through mentorship, informal dialogue, or storytelling, is associated with a 6.693-unit increase in performance. A 10% improvement in tacit knowledge sharing can lead to a 0.67-unit performance increase, reinforcing the need for collaborative and experiential knowledge-sharing environments within the civil service.

Discussion of Findings

The analysis of questionnaire responses from employees of the Edo State Civil Service, coupled with the results from ordinary least squares regression and hypothesis testing, led to the following findings:

The analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between explicit knowledge sharing and the organisational performance of employees within the Edo State Civil Service. These findings are consistent with previous studies by Park, Vertinsky, and Becerra (2015), Adaileh and Abualzeat (2017), Evwierhurhoma and Oga (2020), and Ang et al. (2022). These researchers have emphasised that explicit knowledge sharing plays a crucial role in enhancing organisational performance by improving business operations and strategic management. Moreover, fostering knowledge management systems and developing integrated platforms for sharing knowledge can significantly enhance organisational outcomes.

The analysis also showed a positive yet non-significant relationship between implicit knowledge sharing and organisational performance.These findings align with the work of Ramayah, Yeap, and Ignatius (2013), Omar, Dahalan, and Yusoff (2016), and Guptara (2017), who noted that cultural and institutional barriers, along with the formal structure of many organisations, impede the effective integration of implicit knowledge sharing. Additionally, organisations often fail to make implicit knowledge part of employees' daily practices, limiting its impact on performance.

Furthermore, a significant positive relationship was found between tacit knowledge sharing and organisational performance within the Edo State Civil Service. These results are in line with studies by Lopez-Cabarcos et al. (2019), Ehijiagbone and Olatokun (2020), and Imam and Jagodic (2021), which underscore the importance of tacit knowledge sharing as a key driver of organisational success. Tacit knowledge sharing is a vital factor for gaining economic advantage and improving organisational efficiency, contributing significantly to the overall effectiveness of operations.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study explored the impact of knowledge sharing practices on the organisational performance of employees within the Edo State Civil Service. The findings reveal that explicit, implicit, and tacit knowledge sharing practices significantly influence organisational performance. The positive correlations

between these dimensionsof knowledge sharing and organisational performance underscore the importance of fostering a culture that supports knowledge sharing. By implementing policies and practices that enhance knowledge sharing, institutions like the Edo State Civil Service can create a more innovative, creative, and high-performing work environment that maximizes the unique strengths and contributions of all employees. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

A.the institutions should encourage active participation in organisational knowledge-sharing initiatives. Involving employees in knowledge-related activities will stimulate the generation of creative ideas, driving organisational innovation and improving operational effectiveness and efficiency. Additionally, such engagement will enable the acquisition of valuable knowledge assets within various ministries ultimately enhancing organisational processes and proficiency.

B.the management and relevant authorities should adopt strategic and ambitious approaches to encourage the sharing of implicit knowledge. This can be achieved through targeted training and development programs, as well as empowerment initiatives that foster an environment where employees feel motivated to share their knowledge and experiences.

C.finally, civil service institutions should implement mentoring and coaching programs to facilitate tacit knowledge sharing among employees. These initiatives will support the development of employees' skills and competencies, leading to improved performance across various ministries.

Managerial Implications

The findings of this study have important implications for leadership and knowledge management practices within public sector institutions, particularly in the Edo State Civil Service.

i. ***Institutionalize Explicit Knowledge Sharing Systems:***The strong positive effect of explicit knowledge sharing on organisational performance highlights the need for leadership to formalize knowledge documentation and dissemination processes. Managers should invest in digital repositories, policy manuals, and structured training materials to ensure that critical information is accessible and transferable across departments.

ii. ***Create Platforms for Tacit Knowledge Transfer:*** Since tacit knowledge was found to significantly influence performance, public sector managers should foster environments that enable mentorship, job rotation, and collaborative problem-solving. These practices help surface the experiential know-how that is often underutilized but crucial for strategic execution and innovation.

iii. ***Design Knowledge-Driven HR Policies***: Human resource departments should incorporate knowledge-sharing behaviours into performance appraisal systems, promotion criteria, and employee recognition programs. This reinforces a culture where sharing knowledge is not only encouraged but rewarded as a driver of organisational success.

iv. ***Develop Leadership Capabilities for Knowledge Management***: Leaders must be trained not just in operational management but also in knowledge leadership, the ability to inspire, model, and sustain a culture of openness, learning, and collaboration. Regular workshops, leadership coaching, and cross-functional forums can help achieve this goal.

v. ***Support Knowledge Sharing with Technology***: The adoption of ICT tools such as intranets, enterprise knowledge portals, and collaboration platforms (e.g., Microsoft Teams, SharePoint) should be prioritized to facilitate real-time knowledge exchange among staff, especially across departments and locations.

REFERENCES

Abeyrathna, G. &Priyadarshana, M. (August, 2020). The impact of knowledge sharing on performance of public sector employees in Sri Lanka: Evidence from Sri Lankan state sector employees. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management, Architecture, Technology and Engineering (IJARMATE),6*(8),1-9.

Adaileh, M., &Abualzeat, H. (2017). Impact of knowledge sharing and leakage on innovative performance. *Journal of Sustainable Development, 10*(1), 92-111.

Al-Hawamdeh, S. (2003). *Knowledge management cultivating knowledge professionals.* Chandos Publishing, Oxford.

Alrubaiee, A., &Jamhour, L. (2012). Effect of core competence on competitive advantage and organisational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management, 7*(3),192-204.

Andem, F., Akpan, D., &Ogosi, F. (2022). *The effect of knowledge sharing strategy on operational*

performance in University of Uyo Teaching Hospital, Uyo, Nigeria. Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operation Management, Nsukka, Nigeria.

Ang, H. L., Fabeil, N. F., & Pang, Y. Y. (2022). The influence of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing on organisational performance among manufacturing companies in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 12*(3), 572–587.

Atif, M. (2015). *The impact of knowledge sharing on organisational performance: The mediating role of innovation capability.* Retrieved from Doi:10.13140/RG.2.1.2301.6564.

Bhatti, K.K. & Qureshi, T.M. (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers, 3*(2), 54-68.

Choudhary, P. &Sarikwal, L., (2017). The conceptual framework on organisational factors on explicit and tacit knowledge sharing. *Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 19*(1), 34-38.www.iosrjournals.org

Drucker, P. (1993). *Post-capitalist society*. Butterworth: Heinemann.

Ehijiagbone, A. &Olatokun, W. (2020). Tacit knowledge among lecturers: Observation from Nigerian premier university. *Library Philosophy and Practice(e-journal)4502*. Htttp://digitalcommons.uni.edu/libphilprac/4502

Emumejakpor, E., Ikpe, E. & Wilson, B. (2023). Knowledge sharing and academic performance in Cross River Institute of Technology and Management, Cross River, Nigeria. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR), 9*(1), 111-120.

Evwierhurhoma, E. D., &Oga, K. C. (2020). Organisational performance: The role of knowledge sharing. *International Academic Journal of Management and Marketing, 6*(5), 95-105.

Faizuniah, P. &Aizzat, M.N., (2009). Assessing the relationship between business commitment and knowledge sharing behaviour. *Malaysia and Management Journal, 1*3(1& 2), 35 – 50.

Gonzalez, R. V. D. & Martins, M. F. (2017). *Knowledge management process: A theoretical conceptual research. Gesture Production 24*(2).

Guptara, P. (2017). *What should knowledge management focus today? Retrieved from http://www.tallyfox.com/insight/prof-prabhu-guptara-what-should-knowledgemanagement-focus-today?*

Gutterman, A.S. (2023). Organisational performance and effectiveness. *International Journal of Knowledge Management, 14(1),* 1-66.

Imam, M. &Jagodic, G. (2021). *The impact of knowledge management on organisational performance and competitiveness. Proceedings of Management Knowledge and learning international conference.*

Ipe, M. (2003). Knowledge sharing in organisations: A conceptual framework. *Human Resource Development Review, 2*(4), 337-359.

Jacobs, E. &Roodt, G. (2007). The development of a knowledge sharing construct to predict turnover intentions. *Aslib Proceedings, 59*(3), 229-248.

Kalogiannidis, S. (2021). Impact of employee motivation on organisational performance: A scoping review paper for public sector. *The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management, 8*(3), 984-996.

Karanjia, J. (2014). Effects of corporate culture on organisational performance. *IOSR Journal of Mathematics,10*(6), 59.

Katou, A.A., &Budhwar, P.S. (2007). The effect of human resource management policies on organisational performance in Greek manufacturing firms. *Thunderbird International Business Review,49*(1), 1-35.

Koeing, M. E. D. (2012). What is Knowledge? Knowledge management explained. KM World.

Korma, M., Kolloju. N., Kummitha, H.R., Kareem, M.A. (2022). Impact of organisational culture on organisational performance: A study on the employees in educational institutions. *Business Systems Research, 13*(1), 138-155.

Krogh, G., Ichijo, K. &Nonaka, I. (2002). *Enabling knowledge creation: How to unlock the mystery of tacit knowledge and release the power of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kumar, R. S. (1976). *A manual of Sampling Techniques*, London: Heinemann Limited.

Le, P.B., & Lei, H. (2019). Determinants of innovation capability: The role of transformational leadership, knowledge sharing and perceived organisational support. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 23*(3), 527-547.

Le, P.B., Lei, H., & Than, T.S. (2018). How leadership and trust in leader's foster employees behaviour toward knowledge sharing. *Social Behaviour and Personality: An International Journal, 46*(5), 705-720.

Lee, J.N. (2001). The impact of knowledge sharing: Organisational capability and partnership quality on IS outsourcing success. *Information and management, 38*(5), 323-335.

Lejeune, M. (2011). Tacit knowledge: Revisiting the epistemology of knowledge. *Journal of Education, 46*(1), 91- 106.

Lin, H. F. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation in employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of Information Science, 33*(2), 135–149.

Lopez-Cabarcos, M., Srinivasan, S., Monteiro, S. & Rodriguez, P. (2019). Tacit knowledge for firm performance relationship: The role of product innovation and the firm level capabilities. *Journal of Business Economics and Management, 20*(2), 330-350.

Matošková, J., Řeháčková, H., Sobotková, E., Polčáková, M., Jurásek, M., Gregar, A., &Švec, V. (2013). Facilitating leader tacit knowledge acquisition. *Journal of Competitiveness, 5*(1), 3-15.

Mbah, S.I. &Maduafor, C.A. (2022). Knowledge management and organisational Performance of pharmaceutical firms in Enugu State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Information Systems and Technology Research, 10(4), 24- 41.*

Miah, M.M., (2020). *The impact of employee job satisfaction towards organisational performance.* GA: Jonny Press

Mohajan, H.K. (2019). Knowledge sharing among employees in organisations. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People, Alliance of Central-Eastern European Universities,8*(1), 52-61.

Muafi, U. (2020). A nexus among strategic orientation, social network, knowledge sharing, organisational innovation and MSMEs performance. *Journal of Asian Economics and Business, 7*(6), 327-338.

Najla, P., Filipovic, D., &Kovac, M. (2017). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability in Croatian ICT companies. *International Journal of Manpower, 38*(4), 632-644.

Nickols, F. (2001). *The knowledge in knowledge management. In the knowledge management yearbook 2000-2001*, J.A. Woods, Ed: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd, 2001.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organisational knowledge creation. *Organisation Science, 5*(1), 14–37.

Nonaka, I., & Konno, N. (1998). The concept of Ba: Building a foundation for knowledge creation. *California Management Review, 40*(3), 40-55.

Omar, M. K., Dahalan, N. A., &Yusoff, Y. H. M. (2016). Social media usage, perceived team efficacy and knowledge sharing behaviour among employees of an oil and gas organisation in Malaysia. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 37*(2), 309-316.

Omotayo, F. O. (2015). Knowledge management as an important tool in organisational management: A review of literature. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal).* Paper 1238.

Ononye, U. H., &Igwe, A. (2019). Knowledge sharing process and innovation success: Evidence from public organisations in Southern Nigeria. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge and Management, 14*(1), 183- 198.

Othman, A.K. & Abdullah, H.S. (2010). *The influence of emotional intelligence on tacit knowledge sharing in service organisations: Knowledge management in emerging economies*, In Minwir Al-Shammari (Ed.). Social, Organisational and Cultural Implementation,171–185.

Pangil, F. &Nasurddin, A. (2013). *Knowledge and the importance of knowledge sharing in organisations. In Conference on Business Management Research EDC, University Utara Malaysia*, Sintok

Park, C., Vertinsky, I., & Becerra, M. (2015). Transfers of tacit vs. explicit knowledge and

performance in international joint ventures: The role of age. *International Business Review, 24*(1), 89-101.

Ramayah, T., Yeap, J. A., & Ignatius, J. (2013). Assessing knowledge sharing among academics: A validation of the knowledge sharing behavior scale (KSBS). *Evaluation review, 38*(2), 160-187.

Santos, D. F., & Lopes, T. I. (2014). *The linkage between tacit knowledge and models of innovation*. In B. Galbraith (Ed.), Innovation and entrepreneurship (556-564). Sonning Common, UK: Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited.

Shonubi, A., Odunlami, S., &Olatokun, Akintaro, A. (2020). The effect of knowledge sharing on organisational performance: A study of krestakaurel company in Lagos state, Nigeria.*Lapai International Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *12*(2), 1-17.

Tariq, A. Z., Rosmaini, T., Mohammed, A., Rumman, A. (2020). The relationship between knowledge management, organizational culture, and organisational performance. *TEST Engineering & Management*, 83, 2957-2972.

Teece, D.J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and micro-foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13),1319-1350.

Tran, N.T. (2022). Literature review on knowledge sharing among university lecturers. *Cross Current International Journal Economics Management Media Studies, 4*(4), 43-50.

Tubigi, M. &Alshawi, S. (2015). The impact of knowledge management processes on organisational performance: The case of the airline industry. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management, 28*(2), 167-185.

Wamundila, S. (2008). *Developing guidelines for a knowledge management policy to enhance knowledge retention at the University of Zambia, Thesis(Masters), Pretoria, University of South Africa.*

Williamson, O. E. (1999). Strategy research: Governance and competence perspectives. *Strategic Management journal, 20*(12), 1087-1108.

Yamane, T. (1987). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row