



EFFECT OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF KRESTA LAUREL COMPANY IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

¹**Akeem Olalekan Shonubi**
(akeemshonubi@gmail.com)
+2348034644378

²**Samuel Abimbola Odunlami**
(samuelodunlami@augustineuniversity.edu.ng)
+2348122222375

³**Abel Abiodun Akintaro**
(biodunakintaro@gmail.com)
+2348032841086

¹*Department of Business Administration & Marketing, College of Social & Management Sciences, McPherson University, Seriki-Sotayo, P.M.B. 2094, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.*

²*Department of Business Administration & Marketing, College of Humanities, Management & Social Sciences, Augustine University, Ilara-Epe, Epe, Lagos State, Nigeria.*

³*Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Business & Social Sciences, Adeleke University, P.M.B.250, Loogun-Ogberin Road, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria.*

Abstract

One of the challenges of knowledge management is that of encouraging people to share tacit knowledge. In some organisations, sharing is helpful and normal while in some, it is otherwise. It is in view of this that this study investigated the effect of knowledge sharing on organisational performance in Kresta Laurel in Lagos State. This study adopted descriptive survey research design through the use of questionnaire. The population of the study comprised of 123 staff of the company, which was further reduced to 76 staff as the sample size through the use of a formula derived by Taro Yamane. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the staff. The data was analysed using Regression Analysis with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 25.0) at 5% level of significance. Descriptive Statistics was also used to analyse the relevant data. Findings revealed that there is significant effect of knowledge sharing on organisational performance. The study recommended that organisations should encourage knowledge sharing among their staff so as to enhance its performance.

Keywords: Knowledge, Knowledge Sharing, Management, Organisational Performance.

1. Introduction

Knowledge, when created and distributed all over the organisation, has the ability to contribute to the firm's value (Janus, 2016). Ineffectiveness in managing knowledge makes the knowledge immaterial and not useful for organisations (Mohamad&Abu, 2012). Companies that achieve significant growth in knowledge become more active contributors to the nation. Organisational performance is vital to the well-being of a business and knowledge is a crucial resource that needs to be well managed in order to achieve



company's organisational performance (Mohamad & Abu, 2012). Among various resources available to the company, knowledge is the most valuable company's resources because it embodies best practices, routines, Lessons learned, problem-solving methods and creative processes that are often difficult to replicate (Renzel, 2008). Most of the organisations that improved their business performance do not only depend on the successful deployment of tangible assets and natural resources but also on the effective management of knowledge (Lee & Sukoco, 2007). Fast growth of information leads to the importance of managing knowledge in organisations (Zuzana, 2007). Organisations should therefore recognise the value of knowledge and experience of its individual employees, they should capture, organise and store knowledge within an organisation and make it available for others in the organisation. Knowledge sharing needs face-to-face communication and collaboration with workgroup. One of the challenges of knowledge management is that of getting people to share their knowledge (Muhamad, Che & Rosmaini, 2010). In some organisations, sharing is caring and natural (Skyrme, 2008). And there are questions asked on why people do not share knowledge: People have pride in not having to seek advice from others and in waiting to discover new ways for themselves while some people do not realize how useful particular knowledge is to others. Some individuals may have knowledge used in one situation but unaware that other people at other times and places might face similar situations. If people share some of their experience, they use it out of context, mis-apply it and then blame each other or pass it off as their own without giving any acknowledgement or recognition to them as source.

Skyrme (2008) reveals that lack of time is the major reason given by employees in many organisations. It is not all information and knowledge that can be shared within community and society. In an organisation such as Kresta Laurel, there is top secret information which cannot be shared. This classified "Top Secret" information and knowledge which keep organisations have a high values. Only trusted individuals or people know the secret information and knowledge to protect organisations or countries (Muhamad, Che & Rosmaini, 2010). When this is done, it defeats the idea of knowledge sharing and those employees denied of such secret information may see themselves as being alienated from the organisation, hence may hamper the growth of the organisation and result in poor organisational performance.

The main objective of this study is to find out the effect of knowledge sharing on organisational Performance in Kresta Laurel Company in Lagos State.

2. Literature Review

Concept of Knowledge Sharing (KS)

Park and Im (2003) defined knowledge sharing as "the process of transferring knowledge from a person to another in organisations. It is a process to accumulate shared knowledge among members". Bock and Kim (2002) see knowledge sharing as a kind of social



interaction among people. Knowledge, unlike information is locked in the human mind and part of human identity. Frappaolo (2006) claimed that knowledge sharing is about “how people share and use what they know”. In addition, Tasmin and Woods (2008) asserted that knowledge sharing is a social system that supports collaboration and integration which is normally facilitated by technology. Dalkir (2005) also supported the notion that knowledge sharing is to be associated with “appropriate mix” of technological channels for optimizing knowledge exchanges. Creating and exchanging knowledge are intangible activities that can neither be supervised nor imposed. They happen only when people cooperate voluntarily. This exchange of knowledge can lead to the creation of new knowledge, which can be an important source of competitive advantage. Bock and Kim (2002) stated that Davenport (1997) argues that sharing knowledge is often unnatural. Davenport (1997) said that people will not share their knowledge as they think their knowledge is valuable and important. Also, Samieh and Wahba (2007) agreed that the knowledge sharing practice are motivated and executed mainly at the individual levels. Even in the absence of strong organisational norms of knowledge sharing, employees may tend to share knowledge according to their personal benefits and cost. At the end, knowledge sharing practices can help organisations becomes more profitable and undefeated.

Knowledge Sharing Practice at work nowadays, many CEOs and managers in organisations understand the importance of knowledge sharing among their employees and eager to introduce the knowledge management paradigm in their workplaces. Chaudhry (2005) reported that several studies have been conducted during five years to review knowledge management strategies and knowledge sharing practices in the local organisations. Singapore, for example, provides an interesting case study in this regard. Chaudhry (2005) states that Singapore is conservative in adhering to Asian cultural traditions and at the same time open to innovation and creativity. It is a diverse and multi-ethnic society that is eager to stick to meritocracy and system efficiency in its pursuits of innovation and creativity which are crucial to the success of knowledge management activities. Chaudhry (2005) also found that in Malaysia, knowledge sharing practices are not widely implemented. Only several government body and private sectors especially which have link with worldwide company embedding knowledge sharing. Besides, the private companies which embedding knowledge sharing own their innovation and creativity to become more profitable and knowledgeable. Chong (2003) found that knowledge sharing was taking place on informal basis through face-to-face communication and collaborative workgroups. His study reveals that knowledge is supported in this environment by a culture that encourages sharing of knowledge, learning from failures, and developing people’s skills. Rastogi (2000) emphasized that organisational culture required favourable social environment such as trust, shared values, and goodwill to facilitate knowledge sharing. This signifies the importance of trust in knowledge culture and knowledge sharing. Lim, Tang and Yang (2004) agreed that through face-to-face context, people that have knowledge sharing attitudes were getting more evident rather than electronic medium. Employees were found to be more willing to share knowledge with



increased rewards. “Embedding knowledge into everyday work process is time consuming and expensive” Snowden (2002) stated it’s impossible to measure whether someone is sharing their knowledge or not in organisations, but it is possible to measure if they comply with a process. Therefore, employees are not susceptible to directive control in respect of intangible assets such as knowledge. Norris, McQueen and Cutler (2003) supported that knowledge becomes tangible as digitised content, as context that can be digitally shared and through direct and indirect interactions. Knowledge can be created by asking a question and watching responses provoke through conversations, responses, and interactions among network participants.

Why people do not share?

Skyrme (2008) identified the following as the reasons why people do not share their knowledge in an organisation: Syndrome People have pride in not having to seek advice from others and in waiting to discover new ways for themselves; an individual may have knowledge used in one situation but unaware that other people at other times and places might face similar situations; if people share some of their experience, will they use it out of context, mis-apply it and then blame each other or pass it off as their own without giving any acknowledgement or recognition to them as source; lack of time is the major reason given by employees in many organisations. There is pressure on productivity on deadlines, and it’s general rule that the more knowledgeable they are, the more people waiting to collar for the next task; there is not all information and knowledge can be shared within community and society. In organisation, there are or maybe top secret information which cannot be shared. This classified “Top Secret” information and knowledge which organisations have high values. Only trusted individuals or people know the secret information and knowledge to protect organisations or country.

Advantages of Knowledge Sharing Practice in Organisation

The following are the advantages of knowledge sharing in organisational practice as given by Muhamad, Che, and Rosmaini (2010): Kim, Lee and Olson (2006) stated that embedding knowledge sharing practice can be regarded as a public good because people who do not pay or contribute to the organisation or community also can share knowledge. Multiple people also can access and share knowledge at the same time; knowledge sharing practices can make people in organisation innovative and creative to created things. Meetings, discussion and forum are the best platform to share the knowledge and idea among groups. The people in the groups can easily exchange and share knowledge to make their tasks work. It is generally understood that knowledge sharing is an antecedent to many more knowledge management activities. Tasmin and Woods (2008) evinced that knowledge sharing through knowledge management effort has been empirically shown to positively and strongly influence higher innovation activities among manufacturing firms in Malaysia. According to Tasmin and Woods (2008), the predictive constructs of knowledge management enabling practices were able to explain 99% of its variance and innovation activities were 52% of its variance. Most importantly, the influence strength of



KM on innovation was at a magnitude of 0.74. These facts show the significance and importance of knowledge sharing towards innovative activities; when knowledge sharing among people or employees in organisation becomes stronger, it shows that knowledge also becomes more powerful in organisation. Individual or person who shares their tacit knowledge through conversation becomes more innovative and creative in their work. Norris et al. (2003) agreed that much of this tacit knowledge exists and is communicated through conversations in community of practices or networks of practices. Such “know how”, “know who”, “know where” knowledge promises to be more important. As it is aptly said by an industry captain of Hewlett-Packard; one of advantages of embedding knowledge sharing practice in organisation is attitude. Kuo and Young (2008) stated that for knowledge sharing practices, attitude has been shown to be a critical factor because one’s knowledge about how to solve organisational problems could influence one’s trade value. Chowdury (2004) reported, in a case study at Petronas, the importance of the expertise sharing attitude with peers and people in workplaces. People also may consider sharing their knowledge in an organisation if they believe this will be personally important and valuable for them; culture change is never easy and takes time. But cultures can be changed. Takeuchi and Nonaka (2004) stated, in his KM milestone book, that “both IBM and Canon have successfully undergone a transformation and have proven themselves capable of changing as fast as the environment around them...” in those firms environment, effective knowledge sharing deals with cultural change of the people, process transformation, and technological management systems. According to Skyrme (2008), involvement from people or individual in organisation could be some of the best knowledge sharing cultures is where everybody believes their knowledge is respected, valued and used to inform decision. Knowledge sharing practice could make people and individual become valuable.

Concept of Organisational Performance (OP)

Performance is the end result of activities; it includes the actual outcomes of the strategic management process (Alrubaiee, & Jamhour, 2012). Likewise Ben, Louati, and Affes (2015) posited that the organisational performance is represented by the success in achieving its goals. Organisational performance constitutes all behaviours related to organisational objectives depending on the contribution levels of individuals to the organisation (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). However, the organisational performance is the mirror that reflects the organisation’s ability in achieving high productivity provided it is combined with the customers’ satisfaction and having a well market share that can provide a suitable financial refund and do social and ethic responsibilities towards the environment where the organisation works and the society (Tubigi & Al shawi, 2015). Similarly, scholars considered organisational performance as the achieved results of the interaction between the activities of communication and information technology sector and its resources or the difference between the financial goals and the non-financial ones in a specific period of time (Rajneesh & Kaur, 2014). However, organisational existence will be in danger, only if the performance includes non-financial scales, the background image of



the performance will show up the thing which the financial indications fail to do (Zainol&Ayadurai, 2011). In consistent with this, Sink and Tuttle (1989) also realized that performance should not be treated only as a financial concept. Thus, it is suggested that particularly in the service sector, non-financial performance should receive serious consideration. Nofal, Surachman, and Djumahir, (2014) argued that relying only on the financial ratios in evaluating the performance gives incomplete image about the organisation. Therefore, this method in evaluation should be enhanced and supported by operational performance's scales to build measurement system for effective performance in the organisation such as market share, customer retain. To this end, Noruzy, Dalfard, Azhdari, Nazari-Shirkouhi, and Rezazadeh (2013) argued that if the manager cares of the total performance of the organisation, he will be able to create a balance between the operational and the financial interests. Traditionally, firm performance has been viewed and measured in accounting terms. An additional issue should be raised here; due to confidentiality concerns, it is often challenging to obtain actual accounting data from organisations unless they are publicly quoted companies. As a result, previous research studies looking into performance related issues used self-reported financial and non-financial performance measures (Alrubaiee, 2012). However, Tseng and Lee, (2014) pointed out, that some scholars have continually discussed the organisational performance measurement index. For example, Tippins and Sohi (2003) suggested profitability, rate of return on investment, customer retention, and sales growth rate as the organisational performance measurement indexes, while Lee and Choi (2003) suggested market share rate, comparisons of success with other companies, growth rate, profitability, and ability to innovate as the organisational performance measurement indexes.

Organisational performance describes how efficient the organisation is in its quest to achieve the goals that have been set. How well an organisation deploys its resources, human and material, determines how well set goals are accomplished (Richard, Devinney, Johnson, & Yip, 2008). They state that organisational performance consists of four major areas: financial performance, product/market performance, shareholder returns and non-financial performance. Financial performance relates to the measurement of profits, return on assets, return on investment, etc. that an organisation has achieved over a time period. Product/Market performance relates to sales, turnover, market share, etc. Shareholder returns measure the benefits accruable to providers of financial capital to the organisation. Non-financial performance refers to the measure of employee satisfaction and performance, customer service and satisfaction, quality/consistency of products and market share/growth/innovations. Employees contribute immensely to the good fortunes of organisations. These contributions have led to significant successes that organisations have recorded over the years (Collis & Montgomery, 1995).



Theoretical Review

This study is anchored on knowledge management theory. The theory assumes that knowledge management is seen as the process of creating, sharing, using and managing the knowledge and information of an organisation. The main focus of knowledge management theory is basically getting some of the best practices of effectively implementing a knowledge management system and the benefits it brings to organisation as it improves the way employees create, share and find information (McInerney & Koenig, 2011).

Review of Empirical Literature on Knowledge Sharing and Organisational Performance

Bojan, Slobodan, and Akmal (2015) in their journal titled “The Value of Knowledge Sharing”: Impact of Tacit and Explicit Knowledge Sharing on Team Performance of Scientists proposed that knowledge sharing has been tied to team performance in many instances, still in the context of scientific cooperation the investigation has not been attempted. Furthermore, the division of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing is required, as they are quite different in nature, and as they might not contribute to the team performance equally. The study, aimed to explore knowledge sharing between the project team members and to explain influence sharing of tacit and explicit knowledge have on team performance. In the attempt to achieve the goal, they analysed knowledge sharing between scientists, drawing lessons from government funded research projects.

Through the development of a framework an understanding of the relationships between sharing of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing and team performance, in research project teams, had been achieved. In addition, they provided a first analysis of the current state of knowledge sharing on research projects in Croatia. The outcomes of the study shed light on knowledge sharing behavior between researchers, therefore, contributing towards the successful implementation of knowledge sharing initiatives as part of research project knowledge management as well as organisational knowledge management initiatives.

Paavo, Heidi, Snejina, and Kenneth (2015), in their article titled “Knowledge sharing, knowledge leaking and relative innovation performance”: An empirical study, posed that External knowledge sharing and knowledge leakage often pose a strategic dilemma when firms conduct innovation activities. In the study, they focus on the positive and negative effects of the phenomenon. In particular, they empirically examine the effects of a firm's external knowledge sharing on its relative innovation performance under the contingencies of accidental and intentional leakage of business-critical knowledge. The results was based on a survey of 150 Finnish technology-intensive firms which show that external knowledge sharing has a positive effect on innovation performance, but high levels of accidental and intentional knowledge leakage by a firms' employees negatively moderate this relationship. The results contribute to the understanding of the potentially positive and negative issues related to external knowledge sharing and knowledge leakage, which have thus far remained empirically under-researched.

Haixin, and Guiquan, (2018), in their article titled “Linking Transformational Leadership and Knowledge Sharing”: The Mediating Roles of Perceived Team Goal Commitment and



Perceived Team Identification, theorize that transformational leadership can effectively facilitate the sharing of knowledge among followers, but most investigations of the underlying mechanisms were based on the social exchange perspective. Based on a sense giving theory perspective, the article attempts to uncover the mechanisms by which transformational leadership has its impact on employee knowledge sharing behavior by proposing two team-directed mediating mechanisms: perceived team goal commitment and perceived team identification. Results of multi-source and time-lagged data from 186 leader-follower pairs supported the proposed mediating effects. The results also showed transformational leadership facilitates knowledge sharing among employees by enhancing followers' perceived team goal commitment and perceived team identification.

Rudawska (2020), in his paper titled "Knowledge Sharing and Creativity": Individual and Organisational Perspective, found out that the flow of knowledge between employees contributes to the knowledge development which in turn influences individual and organisational creativity. However, knowledge sharing by employees is not a simplistic and homogeneous behaviour. Basing on the literature review in the area of intra-organisational knowledge sharing and creativity, he aims to explain the relation between giving knowledge and individual (giver) creativity and organisational creativity. The knowledge sharing is analysed from the knowledge giver perspective. He also distinguished two forms of knowledge giving; proactive and reactive that is situation depended. The conceptual article indicates that proactive and reactive knowledge sharing relates differently with creativity and that sharing knowledge with others is not always positive to the giver's creativity, while it is influential for organisational creativity. The theoretical deliberations are summarized in nine propositions. They indicate that managers need to take into account the likelihood of individual creativity loss as a cost of reactive knowledge sharing; otherwise, the quality of sharing could be harmed by knowledge manipulation by the sharer, with a negative influence on organisational creativity.

Jacqueline, Ina, Gaule, Guinan, and Karim, (2020) in their study titled "Engineering Serendipity": The Role of Cognitive Similarity in Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Production, consider the implications of knowledge sharing on knowledge production. They theorize that the "cognitive similarity" between two individuals' prior knowledge is systematically related to the effectiveness of knowledge sharing on the knowledge production process. To estimate relationships, they designed and executed a natural field experiment at a medical symposium, in which exogenous variation was introduced to provide some of the 15,817 scientist pairs with opportunities for serendipitous, face-to-face encounters. The data include direct observations of interaction patterns collected using sociometricbadges, and detailed longitudinal data on the scientists' publication records for six years following the symposium. They find both collaborative and competitive effects of cognitive similarity on knowledge production. Interacting scientists were more likely to transfer new knowledge concepts to each other if they shared some similarities in research interests, but were less likely to cite and diffuse each other's knowledge if they worked in the same field or discipline of study. The study therefore suggests that knowledge sharing



may boost organisational knowledge production when potential partners share some prior knowledge overlap, but too much overlap may impede it.

3. Methodology

This study used cross-sectional descriptive survey research design because it involves an investigator to examine variables at one time only. It moreover involves the use of organised questionnaires that are proposed to acquire facts from the respondents (Shonubi, 2017). The population of this study includes 123 staff of Kresta Laurel Company’s Head Office in Lagos State, Nigeria. Basically, the company is made up of six departments namely; procurement /purchasing department with 15 staff, technical department with 40 staff, finance department with 13 staff, store keeping department with 22 staff, training department with 27 staff and digital marketing department with 6 staff.

The sample frame for this study was made up of all staff of Kresta Laurel Company, Lagos, Nigeria. For each department, the sampling size was determined using the Taro Yamane’s formula as shown below:

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

Where n = Sample size; N = Total population; e = the error of 5%

Table 1: The departmental distribution of sample size using Taro Yamane’s Formula:

Units/ Departments	Population	Yamane Formula $\frac{N}{1 + 0.025N}$	Sample size N
Procurement/Purchasing	15	15/(1+0.025(15))	11
Technical	40	40/(1+0.025(40))	20
Finance	13	13/(1+0.025(13))	10
Store Keeping	22	22/(1+0.025(22))	14
Training	27	27/(1+0.025(27))	16
Digital Marketing	6	6/(1+0.025(6))	5

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

Having derived the sample size, in each department, the purposive or judgmental and convenience sampling techniques was used to select respondents for managerial employees and non-managerial employees respectively. The purposive sampling technique will involve a predefined group in mind. This means that, people whose opinions are relevant to the study will be chosen for the study. The purposive sampling technique will be used for managerial employees because they had to meet a criterion of belonging to the predefined group of top level managers. Again, the convenience sampling technique shall be for non-managerial employee.

To achieve the objective of this study, the information was gathered from the primary source of data which involved the use of questionnaire. The research variables are



Knowledge Sharing as independent variable and Organisational Performance as dependent variable. The research data were analysed using regression for the variables in question, using SPSS package version 25. Regression analysis was used because the study attempts to know the effect of independent variable on the dependent variable. The hypothesis was tested at 5% level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$)

4. Results

Table 2: Descriptive Analysis on Knowledge Sharing

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I see knowledge sharing to be strength	14 23.7%	41 69.5%	3 5.1%	1 1.7%	0 0%	59 100.0%
My interpersonal relationship among people has improved through knowledge sharing	17 28.8%	32 54.2%	4 6.8%	3 5.1%	3 5.1%	59 100.0%
Knowledge sharing has enhanced my learning capabilities	16 27.1%	38 64.4%	2 3.4%	2 3.4%	1 1.7%	59 100.0%
Competition for promotion has hindered knowledge sharing	21 35.6%	27 45.8%	7 11.8%	3 5.1%	1 1.7%	59 100.0%
The rules and regulations provided by the organisation has enhanced the share of knowledge	12 20.3%	45 76.3%	2 3.4%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%
I share my mistakes to other employees so as to learn from them	9 15.3%	48 81.3%	1 1.7%	1 1.7%	0 0%	59 100.0%
I listen to the view of people before speaking	13 22%	28 47.5%	13 22%	3 5.1%	2 3.4%	59 100.0%
I am always encouraged to ask questions from my superiors	14 23.7%	39 66.1%	5 8.5%	1 1.7%	0 0%	59 100.0%
I am always respected despite my level of knowledge	24 40.7%	27 45.8%	8 13.5%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%
I am encouraged to learn new skills from anyone in the organisation	24 40.7%	32 54.2%	2 3.4%	1 1.7%	0 0%	59 100.0%

Source: Researchers' Field Survey Report, 2020

Table 2 showed the descriptive analysis of respondents' responses as regards knowledge sharing. By adding up responses under strongly agree, agree and Undecided, 58(98.3%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they can see knowledge sharing to be strength., 53(89.8%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that their interpersonal relationship among people has improved through knowledge sharing., 56(94.9%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that knowledge sharing has enhanced their learning



capabilities., 55(93.2%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that competition for promotion has hindered knowledge sharing., 59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that the rules and regulations provided by the organisation has enhanced the share of knowledge., 58(98.3%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they

Table 3: Descriptive Analysis on Organisational Performance

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Organisational performance can be well understood if learnt	24 40.7%	34 57.6%	1 1.7%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%
Perceived quality of products and services are relative to competitors	21 35.6%	38 64.4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%
Production cost are relative to competitors	18 30.5%	40 67.8%	1 1.7%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%
Market share are relative to competitors	15 25.4%	39 66.1%	4 6.8%	1 1.7%	0 0%	59 100.0%
Performance is relative to competitors	12 20.3%	30 50.8%	13 22.0%	3 5.1%	1 1.7%	59 100.0%
Organisational performance is relative to industry average	14 23.7%	38 64.4%	5 8.5%	1 1.7%	1 1.7%	59 100.0%
I enjoy my time in the office	25 42.4%	32 54.2%	2 3.4%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%
I receive bonus and commission based on my performance	27 45.8%	30 50.8%	1 1.7%	1 1.7%	0 0%	59 100.0%
Career development is encouraged by the HR	24 40.7%	30 50.8%	5 8.5%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%
Division of work and team work improves organisational performance	15 25.4%	40 67.8%	4 6.8%	0 0%	0 0%	59 100.0%

Source: Researchers' Field Survey Report, 2020

share their mistakes to other employees so as to learn from them., 54(91.5%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they listen to the view of people before speaking., 58(98.3%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they are always encouraged to ask questions from their superiors., 59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they are always respected despite their level of knowledge., and lastly, 58(98.3%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they are encouraged to learn new skills from anyone in the organisation. The result demonstrates that knowledge sharing has a significant effect on the organisational performance of Kresta Laurel Company in Lagos state.

Table 3 shows the descriptive analysis of respondents' responses as regards organisational performance. By adding up responses under strongly agree, agree and Undecided,



59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that organisational performance can be well understood if learnt., 59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that perceived quality of products and services are relative to competitors., 59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that production cost are relative to competitors., 58(98.3%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that market share are relative to competitors., 55(93.2%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that performance is relative to competitors., 57(96.6%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that organisational performance is relative to industry average., 59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they enjoy their time in the office., 58(98.3%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that they receive bonus and commission based on my performance., 59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that career development is encouraged by the HR., and lastly, 59(100%) of the respondents agreed and are undecided that division of work and team work improves organisational performance.

Table 4: Analysis of variance

		ANOVA ^a				
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	0.143	10	.014	.321	.000 ^b
	Residual	2.137	48	.045		
	Total	2.280	58			

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Report, 2020.

Table 5: Regression Co-efficients

Model		Coefficients ^a		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		Unstandardised Coefficients	Std. Error			
	B			Beta		
1	(Constant)	23.921	0.602		39.758	0.000
	Knowledge Sharing	0.190	0.026	0.250	7.164	0.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Performance

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Report, 2020

The result on table 4 showed that the F statistic = .321 and was significant at $p < 0.05$ which revealed that the model was significant in explaining the effect of knowledge sharing on organisational performance in Kresta Laurel Company in Lagos State. This finding is supported by a positive and significant unstandardised B coefficient in table 5 that knowledge sharing [B= 0.190, $t = 39.758$, $p < 0.05$]. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that knowledge sharing will not have any significant effect on organisational performance in Kresta Laurel Company in Lagos State is hereby rejected. The regression model used to explain the variation in organisational performance due to effect of knowledge sharing in Kresta Laurel Company in Lagos state can be stated as follows:



Discussion of findings

The regression equation indicates that the parameter estimate in which the constant is 23.921 implies that if knowledge sharing is zero, organisational performance would be 23.921. The coefficient of knowledge sharing was 0.190 and indicates that a 1-unit increase in knowledge sharing was associated with a 0.190 unit increase in organisational performance of Kresta Laurel. This implies that an increase in knowledge sharing will subsequently increase the organisational performance of Kresta Laurel Company. The result of hypothesis demonstrated that knowledge sharing had a significant effect on organisational performance in Kresta Laurel Company in Lagos State.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

Though, the main focus of knowledge management theory is basically getting some of the best practices of effectively implementing a knowledge management system and the benefits it brings to organisation as it improves the way employees create, share and find information (McInerney & Koenig, 2011), though the theory did not show its effect on organisational performance but the finding of this study shows that knowledge sharing has significant effect on organisational performance. The study, therefore recommends that organisations should encourage the practice of knowledge sharing so as to enhance organisational performance.

Limitations and Future Research

This study had encountered some limitations that should be addressed by future studies. Therefore, future studies should extend the study to other sectors such as educational, manufacturing, service, financial, to mention few. Future studies should also extend the geographical scope beyond Lagos State and possibly engage in comparative studies of the subject matter in different sectors.

References

- Alrubaiee, A. S., & Jamhour, L. M. (2012). Effect of Core Competence on Competitive Advantage and Organisational Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7, 192-204.
- Bock, G. W., & Kim, Y. G., (2002). "Breaking the Myths of Rewards": An Exploratory Study of Attitudes about Knowledge Sharing", *Information Resources Management Journal*, 15(2), 14-21.
- Bojan, O., Slobodan, O., & Akmal, H. (2015). "The Value of Knowledge Sharing": Impact of Tacit and Explicit Knowledge Sharing on Team Performance of Scientists.
- Chaudhry, A. S. (2005). "Knowledge Sharing Practices in Asian Institutions": A Multi-Cultural Perspective from Singapore. World Library and Information Congress: 17th IFLA General Conference and Council. Aug. 14th – 18th.
- Janus, S. S. (2016). *Becoming a knowledge sharing organisation, A handbook for scaling up solutions through knowledge capturing and sharing*, Washington, The World Bank Publication.



- Chowdury, N. (2004). "People's perception on various KM issues": Case Study with A Malaysian Oil Company. Gombak, Malaysia: IIUM.
- Collis, D., & Montgomery A. M. (1995). "Competing on Resources: Strategy in the 1990s," *Harvard Business Review*, 73,118-128.
Comment: Place of publication.
- Dalkir, K. (2005). *Knowledge Management in Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.), Duchess street, London, The MIT Press.
- Davenport, T. H. (1997). "Saving its Soul": Human Centered Information Management. *Harvard Business Review*, 72 (2), 119-131.
- Deng-Neng, C., Ting-Peng, L., & Binshan, L. (2010). An Ecological Model for Organisational Knowledge Management, *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 50 (3), 11-22.
- McInerney, C. R. & Koenig, M. E. D. (2011). *Knowledge Management in Organisations: Theoretical Foundations and Practice*, Chapel Hill, Morgan & Claypool Publishers series.
- Haixin, L., & Guiquan, L. (2018). "Linking Transformational Leadership and Knowledge Sharing": The Mediating Roles of Perceived Team Goal Commitment and Perceived Team Identification, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9,1331, published online 2018 July 31. doi.10.3389/fpsy.g.2018.01331.
- Jacqueline, N. L., Ina, G. P., Gaule, E. C., Guinan, & Karim, R. L. (2020). "Engineering Serendipity": The Role of Cognitive Similarity in Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Production, *Harvard Business School*, Working paper 20-058, 1-49.
- Kim, J., Lee, S. M., & Olson, D. L. (2006). Knowledge Sharing: Effects of Cooperative Type and Reciprocity Level, *International Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2(4), 1-16.
- Kuo, F. Y., & Young, M. L. (2008). "Predicting Knowledge Sharing Practices through Intention": A Test of Competing Models, *Computer in Human Behavior*. 24, 2697-2722.
- Lee & Sukoco, (2007). "The Effects of Entrepreneurial Orientation and Knowledge Management Capability on Organisational Effectiveness in Taiwan": The Moderating Role of Social Capital, *International Journal of Management*, 24 (3), (2007).
- Mohamad, N. Y. & Abu, H. A. B, (2012). "Knowledge management and growth performance in construction companies": a framework, *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 62, 128-134.
- Muhamad, S., Che R., & Rosmaini T. (2010). "High-speed knowledge management: integrating operations theory and knowledge management for rapid results", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5, (4), 322-328.
- Norris, D., McQueen, J. M., & Cutler, A. (2003). Perceptual learning in speech, *Cognitive Psychology*, 47, 204-238.
- Paavo, R., Heidi, O., Snejina, M., & Kenneth, H., (2015). Knowledge sharing, knowledge leaking and relative innovation performance: An empirical study, *Technovation: The*



- International Journal of Technological Innovation, Entrepreneurship & Technology Management*, 35, 22-31.
- Park, H. S., & Im, B. C. (2003). "A study on the Knowledge Sharing Behavior of Local Public Servants in Korea".[Internet] <http://www.kapa21.or.kr/down/2003>.
- Rastogi, P. N. (2000). Knowledge management and intellectual capital- The new virtuous Reality of competitiveness, *Human Systems Management*, 19 (1), 39-49.
- Renzel, B. (2008). Trust in management and knowledge sharing: the mediating effects of fear and knowledge documentation, *Omega*, 36(2), 206-222.
- Rudawska, A. (2020). "Knowledge Sharing and Creativity": Individual and Organisational Perspective. In: Zakrzewska-Bielawska A., Staniec, I. (eds) Contemporary Challenges in Cooperation and Coepetition in the Age of Industry 4.0, Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics, Springer, Cham.
- Samieh, H. M., & Wahba, K. (2007). Knowledge Sharing Behavior from Game Theory and Socio-Psychology Perspectives. In: Proceedings of the 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Systems Sciences.
- Shonubi, A. O. (2017). The queuing analysis of system factors and market performance of ATM service in selected deposit money banks in Lagos State. Unpublished PHD Thesis. Babcock University Business School.
- Sink, D. S., & Tuttle, T. C. (1989), Planning and Measurement in Your Organisation of the Future, Norcross, GA, IE Press.
- Skyrme, D. J. (2008). "The 3Cs of Knowledge Sharing": Culture, Co-opetition and Commitment. (64). 1-6.
- Snowden, D. (2002). "Complex Acts of Knowing; Paradox and Descriptive Self-awareness", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(2), 1-14.
- Takeuchi, H., & Nonaka, I. (2004). Hitotsubashi on Knowledge Management. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tasmin, R., & Woods, P. (2008). Knowledge Management Practices and Innovation Activitiesamong Large Manufacturers in Peninsular Malaysia.PhD.Thesis.Multimedia University, Cyberjaya, Malaysia.
- Tippins, M., & Sohi, R. (2003). "IT Competency and Firm Performance": Is Organisational Learning a Missing Link? *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(1), 745–761.
- Tseng S., & Lee S. (2014), "The effect of knowledge management capability and dynamic capability on organisational performance", *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 27 (2), 158-179.
- Zuzana P. (2007). "Knowledge Management and Organisational Performance", *Transformation of Paradigm in Management of Organisations in the context of Industry*, 4, 1045-1288.