

## Knowledge Sharing Among Employees of Assosa Technical, Vocational and Educational Training College

Genene Abera<sup>1</sup> (Assistance Professor)

### **Abstract:**

*Knowledge sharing strategy is established as a most important component of an organization to undertake productive teaching, learning processes as well as to establish good working environments, in any educational institution. This study was conducted to find out the present status of knowledge sharing and to identify the components that influence knowledge sharing activities among employees of the technical vocational and educational training colleges) in Benishangul Gumuz Region. In order to attain these, both primary and secondary data were collected from the study areas. Primary data were collected from 120 sample respondent's selected using a multi stage sampling technique using questionnaires and observation. It was analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics such as mean, percentage, standard deviation as well as an inferential statistics of chi-square test and binary logit model were used for the analysis of the data. The result of binary logit model showed that six independent variables were found to be statically significant up on knowledge sharing. From these; age and time taken to be familiar with their job were found to be negatively related to knowledge sharing, while others showed positive relationship with knowledge sharing .These are some of the major findings which needs to be given due attention.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### **1.1 Background of the Study**

Knowledge is one of the main tools and it is considered as the economic resource for any institutions to perform their tasks next to labor, land and capital. Without knowledge nothing can be performed, even the simplest to the complex tasks (Paulin and Suneson, 2012). Nakkiran and David, (2003) defined knowledge as human expertise which is found in peoples mind and gained through experience, interaction and the like. Knowledge is essential in everyday work. Everyone knows how to carry out his/her work and this knowledge can be reuse later in similar tasks in a similar fashion by implementing that knowledge for new situations (Brown et al., 2002). In other words, knowledge sharing in the work area can be capable of creating new knowledge and new way of doing tasks; these means it is either

created or acquired by that individual. Accordingly, the fulfillment of TVET strategy, Colleges should promote knowledge sharing environment to satisfy their employee and uprising to get the organizational mission as well as the government strategy. At institutional level, management should take steps to support and encourage ability towards the process of knowledge sharing. Ways and means of mobilizing funding need to be arranged, among others, for creating enabling technological facilities for capturing and disseminating knowledge, for organizing and conducting staff exchange programmes as well as national and international conferences and workshops which are all invaluable mechanisms in terms of providing opportunities to associate with the best talent and creating relationships that stimulates learning and growth through knowledge sharing (Rahel and Ermias, 2011).

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

As the knowledge sharing is the centre of motivation in education institutions, effective knowledge sharing within the parent institution becomes critical. The study examines the dynamics of knowledge sharing, and also how trust and organizational culture inhibits the sharing of knowledge within TVET educational institutions in Benishangul Gumuz Region. Even though knowledge sharing has those benefits, implementing knowledge sharing practices faces different obstacles; like organizational culture, loss of knowledge power, motivation factors which can be intrinsic or extrinsic, avoidance of exposure because of insufficient confidence in the knowledge, high respect for hierarchy and formal power and other (Huang and Davison, 2008). Maponya (2005) discussed that, as with all organizations, education institutions today also faces a number of challenges that need plans to be developed in order to remain in the future.

As noted by Hafizi and Nor (2006) knowledge sharing has benefits of cost effectiveness, time saving, quality of job, innovation, and motivation. Knowledge sharing not only reduces the cost of production or service, but also contributes to the success of the organization. Knowledge sharing helps to avoid mistakes and develops the ability to innovate. The organizations like TVET College are educational institutions that need knowledge sharing practice i.e. creating, and utilization of knowledge, because knowledge would help to provide quality education and which in turn produce, knowledgeable and good attitude students for the country as well as institutional sustainability. Most of the time a new employee joins the college, he/she may look difficulties to be aware with the tasks that they are responsible for. Because there is no well documented knowledge to show how tasks are performed in the institutions and also there is no well-organized knowledge sharing culture. This also

diminishes the performance of the institutions. Of course, there are some knowledge improvement practices, facilitate trainings to different institution, but these activities are at the infant stage and insufficient. And also informal communications and documentation activities are very weak.

### **1.3 Objective of the Study**

#### **1.3.1. General objective**

The general objective of this study was to investigate the knowledge sharing practices in Assosa TVET Colleges, in Benishangul Gumuz Region.

#### **1.3.2 Specific objectives**

1. To find out the present status of knowledge sharing in TVET colleges.
2. To identify the components that influence knowledge sharing activities among employees of TVET colleges.

### **1.4. Research questions**

At the end, this study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the current status of knowledge sharing in TVET College?
2. What are the components that influence knowledge sharing behavior in TVET College?

### **1.5. Significance of the Study**

This research may help to examine employees as well as colleges themselves about knowledge needs and how and to what extent those needs can be addressed through the use of knowledge sharing. It was suggested that knowledge sharing applications and services can enable employees to obtain knowledge on sharing and organizational benefits, the behaviors. The knowledge provided need to be situational relevant if it is to enable the employee to improve their workplace income and/or reduce their training cost. It is also important to investigate whether or not employees find it easy to access the knowledge, generate knowledge sharing activity, and also important for policy makers to improve the application of knowledge sharing for the dissemination of knowledge sharing technology. Additionally, the study will also assist as baseline information for further study and provide directions for any interference events.

## **2. Research Design and Methodology**

### **2.1 Description of the Study Areas**

Assosa TVET College is located 675 km north west of Addis Ababa at Assosa town which is the capital city of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State.

## **2.2. Research Design**

The method used to study the problem was descriptive survey method involving both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Sharma (2000) described that a descriptive survey is appropriate for the study of attitudes, opinions, preferences and practices of the subjects under investigation.

## **2.3. Data collection tools**

In order to collect the required data for the study, the following three types of data collection tools were used: observations, questionnaires and interviews.

## **2.4 Sampling Techniques and Sampling Size Procedures**

The target population of this study included of employees who have direct access to the knowledge sharing activity in the TVET colleges. According to Kothari (2004) if a population from which a sample is to be strained, does not constitute a similar group, one of the probability sampling techniques, stratified sampling technique is generally applied in order to obtain a representative sample. From the total population twenty five percent was selected, it was approximately the sample of 120 respondent employees were drawn from each stratum using probability proportional sample size (PPS) sampling technique from the selected colleges. A variant of PPS Cluster Sampling was thus designed and implemented to address the study.

## **2.5. Methods of data analysis**

In this study, different descriptive and inferential statistics method was employed to analyze the data by using statistical software of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Specifically, descriptive statistics like frequency, mean, percentage and standard deviation, and inferential statistics such as chi-square and t-test was applied. Moreover, Pearson's correlation analysis was used to test the magnitude of the relationship and influence among independent and dependent variables.

## **3. Results and Discussion**

### **3.1. Demographic information for respondents**

The demographic variables used in this study are gender, age, educational level, respondents working experience, the maximum time taken to be familiar with their job, and the respondent who takes training.

**Table 2 Demographic information for respondents**

No	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1	<b>Age</b>		
	20-30 years	94	78.3
	31-40 years	22	18.3
	41-50 years	4	3.3
	Above 51 years	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	120	100
2	<b>Gender (Sex)</b>		
	Male	101	84.2
	Female	19	15.8
	<b>Total</b>	152	100
3	<b>Education level</b>		
	Primary	3	2.5
	High school	3	3.3
	10+1 &10+2	3	2.5
	Diploma	49	40.8
	Bachelor's Degree	55	45.8
	Master's Degree	6	5.0
	PhD	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	120	100
4	<b>Working Experience</b>		
	Less than 5 years	89	74.2
	5-9 years	20	16.7
	10-14	9	7.5
	15-20	2	1.7
	Above 20 years	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	120	100
5	<b>Time taken to be familiar with their job</b>		
	0 days	6	5.0
	7 days	32	26.7
	14 days	10	8.3

15 days	5	4.2
17 days	1	0.8
21 days	9	7.5
30 days	36	30.0
60 days	10	8.3
90 days	5	4.2
120 days	2	1.7
150 days	1	0.8
180 days	2	1.7
365 days	1	0.8
Total	120	100

### Age and knowledge sharing

The highest number of respondents comprises of the age group of 20-30 (78.3%), were much better understood and communicated among employees as compared to the age group of 31-40 and 41-50. It was hypothesized that the higher the age of the employee, the more understanding of knowledge sharing utilization. Table 3 also presented, the independent samples t-test result showed that, the average age who responded there is no knowledge sharing was 30.96 years with standard deviation of 6.859, whereas the average age who responded that there is knowledge sharing was 26.49 years with standard deviation of 4.735, the minimum and maximum age of the total respondents were 20 years and 48 years, respectively. According to the independent samples t-test result, there was a statistically significant mean difference at 1% (t-value 3.086 at p= 0.004) between age and knowledge sharing. Age and knowledge sharing had negatively related, when age increases the knowledge sharing ability within the colleagues decreases by (p=0.004). This shows age of employees do affect knowledge sharing.

Table 3 Relation between Age and knowledge sharing

Item	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		t-value	Total
	N	Mean	N	Mean		
Age	95	26.49	25	30.96	3.086***	120

Age = age of respondents, N= number of respondents \*\*\*, statistically significant at 1%

### Gender and knowledge sharing

As indicated in Table 2, from the total sample respondents, 101 (84.2%) were males and 19 (15.8%) were females and based on the demographics and other personal background information obtained, a majority of the respondents were male (84.2%). As presented in Table 4, out of the total respondents 95 (79.17%) were mentioned that there is knowledge sharing and at the same time 25 (20.83%) of the employee were answered that there is no knowledge sharing in the college. Out of all the 25 employees who answered there is no knowledge sharing male contributing 72% whereas female employees were 28%. On the other hand, from the total 95 employees who answered there is knowledge sharing, 87.37 % were male employees and 12.63 % were female employees. The chi-square result shows that there was statistically significant difference at 10% probability level, between male and female employees with regards to their knowledge sharing activity.

Table 4 Influence of Gender on knowledge sharing

Gender of employees	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		$\chi^2$	Total	
	N	%	N	%		N	%
Male	83	87.37	18	72	3.508*	101	84.2
Female	12	12.63	7	28		25	15.8

\* Statistically significant at 10%,  $\chi^2$  = chi-square. N= number of employees

### 3.2. Educational level of the employee and knowledge sharing

It was hypothesized that educational level is an important variable that could affect the knowledge sharing among employees. Accordingly, it was thought that educational level and knowledge sharing were positively related. Of the total respondents, 5% of them hold MSC/MA, whereas BSC/BA, diploma, 10+1 and 10+2, High school and primary school holder were 45.8%, 40.8%, 2.5%, 3.3% and, 2.5% respectively. This indicates, Most of the respondents are Bachelor's degree holders (Table 2). According to the independent samples t-test result, there is a statistically significant mean difference at 1% (t-value = -5.699 at p=0.004) between knowledge sharing and educational level. Table 5 shows that, the average educational level of respondents who responded there is no knowledge sharing within the college was 12.08 years in education with a standard deviation of 2.253, whereas the average

educational level of respondents who agree with the statement there is knowledge sharing within the college was 14.33 years in education with a standard deviation of 1.600. This shows there is difference in knowledge sharing understanding and utilization between employees' educational level. The minimum and maximum educational level of the total respondents being grade 5 and second degree respectively.

Table 5 Educational level of employees and knowledge sharing

Item	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		t-value	Total	
	N	Mean	N	Mean		N	Mean
Educational level	95	14.33	25	12.08	-5.699***	120	3,86
Std. dev.		1.600		2.253			

Std. dev. = standard deviation N= number of respondents \*\*\*, statistically significant at 1%

### 3.3. Employee work position and knowledge sharing

Out of the total 120 respondents about 23 (19.17%) of the sample respondents had a work positions while the remaining 97 (80.83%) did not have any work position (Table 6). Out of all the 25 employees who answered there is no knowledge sharing who had work position contributing 4 (16%) whereas who had no work position were 21(84%). On the other hand, from the total 95 employees who answered there is knowledge sharing, 19(20%) were who had work position employees and 76 (80 %) were who had no work position employees. However, the chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 0.204$  NS) indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between work position of employees on knowledge sharing activities argument.

Table 6 Relation between work position and knowledge sharing

work position /Item/	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		$\chi^2$	Total	
	N	%	N	%		N	%
Have position	19	20	4	16	0.204(NS)	23	19.17
Have no position	76	80	21	84		97	80.83

NS= Not Statistically significant,  $\chi^2$  = chi-square N= number of employees

### 3.4. Employee work experience and knowledge sharing

The independent samples t-test result showed that, the average work experience of respondents who agreed that there is no knowledge sharing was 2.84 years with standard

deviation of 2.544, whereas respondents who responded there is knowledge sharing was 3.71 years with standard deviation of 4.000 (Table 7). As shown table 2, most of the respondents had working experience of less than 5 years (74.2%) and the minimum and maximum work experience of the total respondents was 0 and 20 years, respectively. According to the independent samples t-test result, there is no statistically significant mean difference ( $t\text{-value} = -1.025$  at  $p = 0.689$  NS) between employees work experience and their knowledge sharing activities argument. In line with the hypothesis as experience increases the knowledge sharing ability within the colleagues increases by ( $p = 0.689$ ).

Table 7 Relation between work experience and knowledge sharing

Item	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		t-value	Total	
	N	Mean	N	Mean		N	Mean
Experience	95	3.71	25	2.84	-1.025 <sup>NS</sup>	120	.525

N= number of respondents, NS, statistically significant

### 3.5. Job satisfaction and knowledge sharing

Table 8 depicts that, from the total sampled respondents, 75 (62.50%) were not satisfied with their current job and 45 (37.50%) were satisfied with their current job. Out of all the 25 employees who answered there is no knowledge sharing employee who not satisfied with their current job contributing 12 (48%) whereas who satisfied with their current job were 13(52%). On the other hand, from the total 95 employees who not satisfied with their current job contributing 63 (66.32%) whereas who satisfied with their current job were 32 (33.68%) answered there is knowledge sharing. As presented in Table 8, the Chi-square test result between current job satisfactions along with knowledge sharing indicated that there was statistically significant difference at 10% probability level. Accordingly, employee's satisfaction with the current job increases knowledge sharing also increase as hypothesized.

While, most of the employee responded that they are not satisfied with their current jobs.

Table 8 Influence of job satisfaction on knowledge sharing

Job satisfaction /Item/	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		$\chi^2$	Total	
	N	%	N	%		N	%
Satisfied	32	33.68	13	52		45	37.50
Not satisfied	63	66.32	12	48	2.833 <sup>*</sup>	75	62.50

\* = Statistically significant 10%,  $\chi^2$  = chi-square. N= number of employees

### **3.6. Training and knowledge sharing**

Of the total respondents 85 (70.83%) of them had taken training and 35 (29.17%) of respondents do not take any training. Out of all the 25 employees who answered there is no knowledge sharing who had taken training contributing 10 (40%) whereas who do not take the training were 15(60%). On the other hand, from the total 95 employees who had taken training contributing 75(78.95%) whereas who do not take the training were 20(21.05%) answered there is knowledge sharing. (Table 9). This indicates that, taking training affects knowledge sharing positively. The chi-square test also indicated that taking training had significant effect on knowledge sharing among employees at 5% level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 14.532^{**}$ ).

Table 9 Impact of training on knowledge sharing

Employee training /Item/	take	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		$\chi^2$	Total
		N	%	N	%		
No		20	21.05	15	60		35 29.17
Yes		75	78.95	10	40	14.532**	85 70.83

\*\* Statistically significant at 5%,  $\chi^2$  = chi-square. N= number of employees

### **Time taken to be familiar with the job and its influence in knowledge sharing**

Most of the respondents took 30 days (30.0%) to be familiar with their job (Table 2). The samples t-test outcome showed that, the average time taken to be familiar with their job for those who responded there is knowledge sharing was 25.58 days with a standard deviation of 44.088, and 58.4 days with a standard deviation of 39.264 for those who responded there is no knowledge sharing (Table 10). The minimum and maximum time taken to become familiar with their jobs was 0 and 365 days, respectively. According to the independent samples t-test result, there was statistically significant mean difference at 10% probability level (t-value = 3.383 at p=0.089) between employees' time taken to be familiar with their job and knowledge sharing activity arguments. This indicates that, time taken to be familiar with their job affects knowledge sharing negatively.

Table 10 Time taken to be familiar with the job and knowledge sharing

Item	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		t-value	Total	
	N	Mean	N	Mean		N	Mean
Time taken	95	25.58	25	58.4	3.621*	120	2.82

Time taken = Time taken to be familiar with their job of respondents, N= number of respondents, \* statistically significant at 10%

#### Employee's subjective norm and knowledge sharing

Of the total sample respondents, 33 (27.5%) did not accept the effect of subjective norm have influence on knowledge sharing and the same time 87 (72.5%) were accepted subjective norm influence knowledge sharing. Out of all the 25 employees who answered there is no knowledge sharing that not accepted subjective norm contributing 18 (72%) whereas who accepted subjective norm were 7(28%). On the other hand, from the total 95 employees who do not accepted subjective norm contributing 15 (15.79%) whereas who accepted subjective norm were 80(84.21%) answered there is knowledge sharing (Table 11). As presented in Table 11, the Chi-square test result shows that ( $\chi^2$  31.365\*\*\*, p=0.001) there is statistically significant difference between knowledge sharing and acceptance of subjective norm at 1% level of significance. Accordingly, when subjective norm acceptance increases knowledge sharing also increases as hypothesized. While, most of the employees were responded that accept subjective norm with their beliefs.

Table 11 Subjective norm and knowledge sharing among employees

Subjective Norm	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		$\chi^2$	Total	
	N	%	N	%		N	%
Accept	80	84.21	7	28.		87	72.5
Not accept	15	15.79	18	72	31.365***	33	27.50

\*\*\* Statistically significant at 1%,  $\chi^2$  = chi-square .N= number of employee

#### Perceived behavioral control and knowledge sharing

Of the total sample respondents, 63 (52.5%) believed that there was no knowledge sharing records and control behaviors, whereas 57 (47.5%) believed there was knowledge sharing records and control behaviors. Out of all the 25 employees who answered there is no knowledge sharing who did not believes there was knowledge sharing records and control

behaviors contributing 19 (76%) whereas who did believes there was knowledge sharing records and control behaviors were 6(24%). On the other hand, from the total 95 employees who did not believes there was knowledge sharing records and control behaviors contributing 44 (46.32%) whereas who did believes there was knowledge sharing records and control behaviors were 51(53.68%) answered there is knowledge sharing. As presented in Table 12. The Chi-square test result shows that, there is a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of knowledge sharing records and control behaviors along with knowledge sharing at 1% probability level of significance. Accordingly, respondents' belief with the behavioral control increase knowledge sharing also increased as hypothesized. While, most of the respondents responded to their belief, there is no knowledge sharing record behaviors and behavioral control with the colleagues.

Table 12 Perceived behavioral control and its effect on knowledge sharing

PBC /Item/	There is knowledge sharing		There is no knowledge sharing		$\chi^2$	Total	
	N	%	N	%		N	%
Agree	51	46.32	6	24		57	47.5
Disagree	44	53.68	19	76	6.993***	63	52.5

PBC= perceive behavioral control, \*\*\* statistically significant at 1%,  $\chi^2$  = chi-square, N= number of employees

### 3.7. Regression Model Results

The binary logit model was used to identify possible factors of knowledge sharing among employees. Before running the model analysis test of multicollinearity and co linearity diagnosis was conducted. The method used to test the multicollinearity has been coefficient of contingency and variance inflation factors (VIF), which were computed to check associations between for all dummy and continuous variables, respectively. The result indicated that there was no serious variable investigated that found to be highly correlated for model (as shown in the appendix table 1). Thus, all hypothesized explanatory variables were included in the regression analysis.

#### 3.7.1. Factors affecting knowledge sharing among employees

Econometrics model was used to analyze the explanatory variables that affect knowledge sharing. Thus, the explanatory variables which affected knowledge sharing were discussed as follows. From the total explanatory variables included in the econometric model, 6 of them

were found to be significant. These include, Age, sex, educational level, employee who takes training, how long employee familiar with their jobs, and subjective norm. Estimates of the parameters of the variables expected to affect knowledge sharing are presented in Table 13.

Table 13 Maximum likelihood estimates of the binomial logit model

Variable	Coefficient	S.E.	Wald	Odds Ratio
Age	-0.271***	0.094	8.202	0.763
Sex	1.807*	1.084	2.776	6.090
Educational Level	0.850***	0.298	8.111	2.340
Work Position	0.966	1.214	0.633	2.627
Experience	0.049	0.121	0.160	1.050
Job Satisfaction	0.487	0.920	0.280	1.628
Training	2.857**	1.190	5.763	17.407
TTFJ	-0.014*	0.008	2.901	0.987
Subjective Norm	4.153***	1.203	11.924	63.645
PBC	0.552	0.881	0.393	1.737
Constant	-7.863	4.196	3.512	0.000
Chi-square value	82.415% ***			df =10
-2 Log likelihood	40.402 <sup>a</sup>			
Prediction success	92.5%			
Sample size	120			

TTFJ = Time taken to be familiar with their job

PBC = Perceived behavioral control

\*\*\*, \*\* and \* refers significant at 1%, 5% and 10% probability level respectively.

### 3.7.2. Explanation of the model results

The maximum likelihood estimates discloses that decision to knowledge sharing is determined by the interaction of different possible variables. To test the measure of goodness of fit in logistic regression analysis, the likelihood ratio test that says chi-square distribution with degree of freedom (df) equal to the number of independent variables included in the model (Gujarati, 2003); therefore, the chi-square computed indicated, as the model was significant at 1% significance level. Different types of goodness of fit confirmed that the model fits the data well. The value of Pearson chi-square test show that, the overall goodness of fit of model significant at less than 1 present probability level. This implies that the model's estimate fits

the data at an acceptable level. Another measure of fit in logistic regression analysis is measured by count R<sup>2</sup>, which works on the principle that if the predicted probability of event is greater than 0.50 the event will occur otherwise the event will not occur (Maddala, 1989). The overall prediction of the model is found to be 92.5 present, which is greater than 0.50. The result of maximum likelihood estimates of the model is presented in table 13.

**Age of the employee:** The model indicates that the variable is significant at 1% probability level. As hypothesized, age of employees negatively related to knowledge sharing in the study areas. This means that the probability of knowledge sharing decrease as the age of employees increased. The value of odds ratio for age of employees is -0.763. This indicates that other things being kept constant, knowledge sharing decreases by a factor of -0.763 as the employees age increases by one year.

**Gender of employee:** As expected, the relationship between sex of employees and knowledge sharing was positively related and significant at 10% level of significance. The implication is that, as the employee was male, the probability of knowledge sharing increases. The value of odds ratio for gender of employees is 6.090. This indicates that other things being kept constant, knowledge sharing increases by a factor of 6.090 when the employee was male. These means male employee has a better participant than female in the activity of knowledge sharing. This result is in line with the work of Alhammad *et al.*, (2009).

**Education level of the employee:** Educational level as expected was positively related to knowledge sharing and significant at 1% probability level. The value of odds ratio for educational level is 2.340. This indicates that other things being kept constant, knowledge sharing increases by a factor of 2.340 as the educational level increases by one year. These shows when level of employee education increases the knowledge sharing ability among employee within the colleagues increases by ( $p=0.004$ ). This result is in line with the work of Maponya (2004).

**Training:** The output of the model showed that, training is significant at 5% probability level and positively related with knowledge sharing. The training is the more probability of employees to be understood and utilized knowledge sharing. The value of odds ratio for training is 17.407. This indicates that other things being kept constant, knowledge sharing increases by a factor of 17.407 as the employee taking training. This result is consistent with the work of (Habtam, 2011).

**Time taken to be familiar with job by employees:** This variable is significant at 10% probability level and negatively related to knowledge sharing among employees. It is directly related to the amount of job familiarity days obtained by the employees. The odds ratio in knowledge sharing decreased by a factor of -0.987, when a total time taken increases by one day. The possible explanation for this is that employees, who have taken a few days to be familiar with the job, have the likelihood of becoming knowledge sharing understanding and utilization than those whose yield relatively many number of days. That is as a total job familiarity day increased, knowledge sharing among employees also decrease by ( $p=0.089$ ). This result is consistent with the work of Hareya (2011).

**Subjective norm:** Subjective norm was positively related to knowledge sharing at 1% significant probability level. It is hypothesized that, employee that accept and understood subjective norm had more probability of understanding and utilizing knowledge sharing. The value of odds ratio for subjective norm is 63.65. This indicates that other things being kept constant, knowledge sharing increases by a factor of 63.65 as the subjective norm thinking presents. This result is consistent with the work of (Anne and Abel 2009).

#### 4. Conclusion

In learning institution knowledge sharing is the core elements for effective implementation of knowledge sharing mechanisms. In this context, an effective knowledge sharing programs was seen as an appropriate tool to control working environment as well as business focus. A learning institution is expected to provide the necessary knowledge sharing environment for the employees and helps to support and enhance the teaching learning process of the institution. Though, in realization process, there are different determinants that affect employees in the knowledge sharing activities. From now, make sure of the knowledge sharing process, identification of the challenges that happens to employees of the colleges and taking measures to improve the knowledge sharing have to make on a continual basis. Furthermore, the custom of knowledge sharing in the study areas is very low because of those demographics factors. Therefore, the result of the econometric model discovered that, employees who are satisfied with the current job within the college had the knowledge sharing activity and understanding more than that of unsatisfied employees. Also trained employee's knowledge sharing activity and understanding was more than that of untrained one. Similarly, male employee's knowledge sharing activity and understandings were more comparable to female employees. As work experience increases, knowledge sharing activity and understandings also increase. An employee's educational level increase, knowledge sharing

activity and understanding also increase. Accordingly, it is an opportunity for the two TVET colleges to see the challenges of knowledge sharing in their relevant employees and make it an essential activity to accomplish the knowledge requirements of employees. By improving the knowledge sharing activity and understanding of employees in TVET colleges in turn help to develop learning, working environment and competitive advantages in the organization.

## **5. Recommendations**

Knowledge Sharing practice within TVET Colleges, the following recommendations are forwarded. The binary logit model showed that the educational level of the employees has a positive influence on the knowledge sharing. Hence, expanding and providing education targeting on employees who have less than and equal to diploma holders is necessary to enhance their level of understanding about knowledge sharing and sustain their knowledge sharing activities. But an employee, who has greater than diploma holders, should not be ignored as they may influence the knowledge sharing positively or negatively using their reputation in the community and they have useful knowledge and experience about knowledge sharing. Thus, it is vital to increase the awareness of who have less than and equal to diploma holders by teaching them about the importance of knowledge sharing for their own working environment, and for the future generation which may increase their knowledge sharing activity and understandings. Gender of employees by descriptive statistics indicated statistically significant relationship in knowledge sharing. Out of the total female respondents, 12.63% say there is knowledge sharing activities. Thus, the study recommends that the colleges should give much emphasis for those females, who do not participate in the knowledge sharing activities by, arranging different short term trainings and experience sharing with those who have an experience to improve their attitude and awareness about the knowledge sharing.

According to the result of the regression model show that, employee satisfaction with their current jobs and knowledge sharing are positive related. But most of the respondents are not happy with their jobs in the study area. Hence, the administrators of the colleges should give much emphasis for the employees by providing different incentives if possible, in addition to these providing trainings and awareness creation about the importance of knowledge sharing for employees itself. Additionally, the study mentions that the administrators and working environments should be excited and helpful to employees working activities. Furthermore, most of the respondents were not taking any kinds of training. So the management body of the

colleges must allocate sufficient budget to training and effectively use and transmit it. That would enable the employees to offer effective and efficient knowledge sharing mechanisms within the colleges.

## **6. REFERENCES**

- Alhammad, L., Al Faori, S. and Hussan, L.S., 2009. Knowledge sharing in the Jordanian Universities: *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, 10(3). (<http://www.tlainc.com/article199.htm>)
- Anne, A., and Abel, E., 2009. *Knowledge Sharing Behaviour of Academics in the University of Ibadan, Nigeria.*([https://pnla.memberclicks.net/assets/documents/Quarterly\\_pnlaq77-4\\_summer2013.pdf](https://pnla.memberclicks.net/assets/documents/Quarterly_pnlaq77-4_summer2013.pdf)).
- Brown, J., and Duguid, P., 2002. *Organizing knowledge*. New York, Sage Publications.19-40.
- Gujarati D.N, 2003. Basic Econometrics, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, McGraw Hill...1995. Basic Econometrics, third edition, New York, McGraw, Inc.
- Habtamu Mohammed, 2011. Evaluation of knowledge sharing practice in commercial bank M.Sc. thesis Addis Ababa University. Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
- Hafizi. M. and Nor H., 2006. Knowledge Management in Malaysian Banks: A New Paradigm, *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*:7(3).
- Hareya GebreSlassie., 2011. Knowledge sharing among employees of mesfin industrial engineering M.Sc. thesis Addis Ababa University. Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
- Huang, Q., and Davison, R., 2008. Knowledge Sharing Barriers at the Individual Level in A Chinese Bank, Pacific Asia Conference on Information System (PACIS), Suzhou, Jiangsu China, Proceedings Paper 150.
- Kothari, C.R. 2004. Research methodology methods and techniques, published by New Age International.
- Maddala, G.S., 1989 Limited Development and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics. Cambridge University press. New york.
- Maponya, P., 2004. Knowledge management practices in academic libraries: a case study of the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg Libraries.
- Maponya. P., 2005. *Fostering the culture of knowledge sharing in higher education: South African Journal of Higher Education*, 19(5):900-911 (<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v19i5.25534>.)
- Nakkiran N. and A.David., 2003. An investigation of knowledge management implementation strategies, Proceedings of SAICSIT: 24-36.

Paulin D. and suneson K., 2012. Knowledge Transfer, Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Barriers Three Blurry Terms in KM: *the electronic journal*, 10(1):81-91. (<http://www.ejkm.com/front/search/index.html>)

Rahel Bekele and Ermias Abebe, 2011. Prospects of Knowledge Sharing Among Ethiopian Institutions of Higher Learning: *e-journal of Special issue on Knowledge Exchange*: 3(2): 20□35.

Sharma, R. 2000, "Fundamentals of Educational Research", Mcerut: Inter Publishing House.