



## Information Sharing As Factor Affecting Teaching Effectiveness of Faculty Staff of Social Sciences in Selected Universities In Southwest Nigeria

Bello Mujidat Adeola  
Fountain University, Osogbo, Nigeria

Received 23 January, 2015; Accepted 28 February, 2015 © The author(s) 2014. Published with open access at [www.questjournals.org](http://www.questjournals.org)

**ABSTRACT:-** The evaluation of teaching effectiveness of social scientists is the most influential information decision in promotion and tenure decision of universities. The goal of this study is to investigate the effect of information sharing on teaching effectiveness of faculty staff of social sciences in selected universities in southwest Nigeria.

A descriptive survey research design was adopted for this study. The study population consisted of 1479 social scientists from eleven universities. However, 20% was sampled from each university making a total of 292 respondents that were sampled. Data were collected using questionnaire and analysis was carried out using descriptive statistical technique (frequency counts and percentages).

Finally, the result revealed that information sharing has helped to improve teaching in the classroom settings. The study thus concluded that provision of adequate course materials to enhance teaching is important for lecturers to achieve the effectiveness on their teaching. It has been established from this study that the immense contribution of information sharing on teaching effectiveness cannot be over emphasized

**Keywords:** - Information sharing, Teaching effectiveness, Social sciences

### I. INTRODUCTION

Social science is composed of diverse field of study. As defined in the dictionary of the social sciences (2002), it is an academic discipline concerned with the study of the social life of human groups and individuals including anthropology, communication studies, economics, human geography, history, political science, psychology and sociology. Meho and Tibbo (2003) qualifies that a social science scholar is a member of one, or a combination of two or more, of the following academic sub disciplines, anthropology, area studies, communication, economics, education, geography, history, political science, psychology, public administration, sociology and women's studies.

Popoola and Haliso (2011) reiterated that the faculty of social sciences in the university is charged with the responsibility of teaching, research and service. These functions are mutually interdependent. Teaching and service are expected to be enriched by the improved subject matter, knowledge obtained through research, whilst research strategies and conclusion should be enriched by the feedback from student and society. In this respect, University administrators are usually very concerned with how to motivate their academics to undertake innovative research and teach effectively.

To teach can be described as to enable or cause somebody to do something by instructing and training him. Teaching take place when a specific lesson is given to the learners at school or elsewhere on a relevant course, or when a teacher explains, shows and states something, by way of instruction to learners. Thus teaching is the act of impacting knowledge. Azikwe (1998) affirms that before teaching could be said to be effective, teacher must consider some principles of learning and teaching namely: environment and background of learners, individual differences, and transfer of learning, organization, motivation, methodology, reward and evaluation. (Adeoye and Popoola 2011).

Akinleye (1999) in his own contribution to teaching effectiveness identifies eight principles of teaching and learning namely: perception, evaluation, multiple learning, and practice and transfer integration/association. He sees these principles of teaching and learning as the fundamental reasoning or assumption upon which effective learning and teaching are based.

In this vein, teaching effectiveness can be defined as lecturing / teaching that create an environment in which deep learning outcome for students are made possible, where high quality student learning is promoted and where superficial approaches to learning are discouraged (Ramsden 1992). Similarly, Bastick (1995) views effective teaching as maximizing students' academic attainment and course satisfaction. Delvin (2003) states that effective teaching is teaching that is well organized and presented clearly and enthusiastically with student involvement. The effectiveness of teaching is affected by a number of factors. These include teacher, student and environmental factors (Leung and Wong 2005). A teacher, the leader of the environment should manipulate the student and the environment to make the learning effective.

Popoola and Haliso (2011) define teaching effectiveness as the ability of a teacher to inculcate knowledge and skills in student as well as change their behavior for better living. Adam (1993) and Ismaila (1999) noted that teacher's knowledge of subject matter, skill proficiency and resourcefulness could be linked to school effectiveness, teacher effectiveness and students academic performance. Universities are to directly serve students. They can only be responsive to students' need and improve the effectiveness of student outcome if they first establish what the students believe to be effective teaching. Before this can take place, there need to be team spirit which is brought about by the level of information shared among lecturers.

Information sharing can be described as the degree to which faculty members share information with one another. It is the result of conscious and deliberate attempts to exchange work related information, keep one abreast of activities, and inform one another of key developments.

Universities are increasingly relying upon the outputs of knowledge based research project and faculty team sharing. An intuitive expectation is that knowledge based team shared and ultimately benefit from a greater pool of available information and member's collective processing of that information thereby resulting to effective teaching on the part of the lecturers. Sharing unique information builds the available knowledge stock, directly improving the faculty staff teaching outcomes.

Information sharing is a central process through which team members collectively utilize the available informational resources. The importance of information sharing in the university cannot be overstated. The rapid and reliable availability of accurate and complete information about the course of subject and teaching is essential to virtually all faculties and departments in the university.

Lecturers do not automatically know which information source contains the needed information and where exactly to find it. Such information is critical to the achievement of effective teaching but is not easy to obtain. Universities would function more efficiently if it were less stressful to determine the right information source.

Research in social science depends heavily on availability of information. Access to the right information is a difficult task because information is abundant, but users do not know whether it is available and where to locate it. Unless mechanisms for the organization of information are evolved to send information to the target user, all expenditure and efforts on its generation become wasteful.

Information is a required commodity in any research activity because of its potential value in policy formation and decision making. Social science research has become diversified, giving birth to a number of new research areas. Information needs of social scientists have become both discipline- oriented and mission – oriented. Information in the forms of data, both raw and processed is heavily relied upon by social scientists that increasingly use official records, archival materials, files, committee\ commission reports, addresses and proceedings of political parties, legislative proceedings, rules, database, newspapers and bulletin etc.

## **II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

In the field of social sciences, we have come across student's complaint about their teachers or lecturers being ineffective. Some of them as heads of departments, school or faculties have received anonymous letters from students complaining about ineffective lecturers. On the other hand, information sharing is crucial to the advancement of the scientific knowledge on which so many disciplines depends on innovation in the global world. Despite wide spread recognition of this imperative, however, information withholding is not uncommon in the teaching profession institutions. Greater understanding of this concept, underlying patterns of information withholding can offer insight into the cause of this behavior among social scientists and advance our understanding of the conditions under which individual decide to withhold rather than share information in professional as well as institutional settings.

It is in the light of the fore going that this study seeks to investigate the effect of information sharing on teaching effectiveness of faculty staff of the social science in selected Universities in South West Nigeria.

### **Objectives of the study**

The goal of this study is to investigate the effect of information sharing, on teaching effectiveness of faculty staff of social sciences in selected universities in south western Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study are to;

- 1) Find out whether the lecturers have a style of sharing information among themselves.
- 2) Ascertain the awareness of information sharing benefit on teaching effectiveness by lecturers.
- 3) Determine if there is a significant benefit in sharing information on teaching effectiveness
- 4) Ascertain the effects of information sharing on teaching effectiveness.

### **Research questions**

This study will provide answers to the following research questions.

- 1) Do social scientists share information among themselves?
- 2) Does information sharing; has any benefit on teaching effectiveness?
- 3) What extent could the level of information sharing be used to predict their teaching effectiveness
- 4) What are the positive effects of information sharing on teaching effectiveness?

### **Scope of the study**

The scope of the study is the teaching effectiveness of social scientists associated with the way they share information. This study particularly targeted the faculty of social sciences and its staff, attention was on the lecturers and the way they share information to achieve their primary goal which is to teach effectively, while students' perception on their lecturers teaching was excluded.

### **Significance of the study**

The role of information has been acknowledged as an important aspect in the research activities of social scientists. However, it is believed that a better understanding of the information sharing methods of lecturers is fundamental to the achievement of effective teaching. This is because information sharing is key competency, which will be needed as social scientists embark on their teaching career.

In this vein, a study on information sharing as factor affecting teaching effectiveness of faculty staff of social science has the potential of stimulating interest in the way social scientists share information in order to enhance teaching. This study will contribute to the body of knowledge in information science.

## **III. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Teaching effectiveness of social scientists**

Teaching and learning can be described synonymous as the two sides of a coin. The most accepted criterion for measuring good teaching is the amount of student learning that occurs. To teach can be described as to enable or cause somebody to do something by instructing and training him. Teaching take place when a specific lesson is given to the learners at school or elsewhere on a relevant course, or when a teacher explains, shows and states something, by way of instruction to learners. Thus teaching is the act of impacting knowledge. It can be said that before teaching could said to be effective teacher must consider the following eight principles of learning and teaching: Environment and Background of Learner, Individual Differences, Transfer of Learning, Organization, Motivation, Methodology, Reward, Evaluation. A teacher's effectiveness is again about student learning.

Akinyele (1999) in Adeoye & Popoola (2011) defines education as the process of learning in order to develop physically, socially, emotionally, intellectually and economically. An educated person is not only literate but has also developed his or her mental and reasoning powers and is knowledgeable. Thus, the ground purpose of education is to draw out all desirable changes in the behavior through the growth and development of the learner's physical, mental and spiritual capabilities to enable him have a useful, enjoyable and productive life in the society, workplace and home.

Braskamp (2000) suggests that instructors use the data formatively to develop and improve their teaching effectiveness. Effective teaching can also be seen as a process which produces beneficial and purposeful student learning through the use of appropriate methods and procedures.

Braskamp and Ory, (1994) include teaching and learning in their definition, defining effective teaching as the "creation of situations in which appropriate learning occurs; shaping those situations is what successful teachers have learned to do effectively". Many researchers have focused on whether or not students are legitimate judges of teaching effectiveness.

Akinyele (1999) in his own contributions to teaching effectiveness identifies eight principles of teaching and learning namely: perception, readiness, motivation, participation, evaluation, multiple learning, practice and transfer/integration/ association. He sees these principles of teaching and learning as the fundamental reasoning or assumption upon which effective learning and teaching are based.

According to Popoola and Haliso (2009) teaching effectiveness is seen as the ability of a teacher to inculcate knowledge and skills in students, as well as change their behavior for better living. Also Adam (1993) and Ismaila (1999) noted that teachers' knowledge of subject matter, skill proficiency and resourcefulness could be linked to school effectiveness, teacher effectiveness and students' academic performance.

In other words, one of the requirements for teaching effectiveness is improved knowledge of subject matter acquired through research, use of library information resources and services.

Teaching effectiveness variables and indicators could be used to assess the effectiveness with which social scientists discharge their teaching functions, much in the same way as the quality of their research functions is usually assessed by the quality of research activities and publications, self evaluation of the teachers themselves and students' evaluation of their teachers' quality of teaching.

In general, issues on effective teaching have been raised by scholar such as Bastick (1995), who defines effective teaching as maximizing student academic attainment, and teacher and student course satisfaction. He stated that effective teaching can be measured by using the Three-Ability Framework (3AF) which consists of technical skills, professional competence and professional attitude.

Berk (2005) derived twelve strategies to measure effective teaching which include student ratings, peer ratings, self evaluation, videos, student interviews, alumni ratings, employer ratings, administrator ratings, teaching scholarship, teaching awards, learning outcome measures and teaching portfolios.

In the light of the foregoing, it can be said that one of the requirements for the teaching effectiveness of social science teachers in universities is improved knowledge of subject matter acquired through research and service. In addition, such teachers should possess teaching skill proficiency and resourcefulness. Among the strategies that demonstrate such skills include: clear goal setting, good structuring of curriculum content, clarity of presentation of lectures, frequent questioning of students, use of exercises immediately after presentation of new content, use of evaluation, feedback and connective instruction, effective class management, etc.

Teaching effectiveness variables and indicators could be used to assess the effectiveness with which social scientists in Nigerian universities perform their teaching functions, much in the same way as the quality of their research functions is usually assessed by the quality of research activities and publications. In this regard, self evaluation by lecturers themselves and students' evaluation of their teachers' quality of teaching have been emphasized in the literature as good methods of ascertaining the teaching effectiveness of academic staff in educational institutions.

Cawley and Zimmaro (2000) in Popoola and Haliso (2009) submitted that teachers who had extensive mastery of subject matter were more logical in their presentation of instruction. They provided helpful and timely feedback, and graded materials and examinations regularly.

### **Information sharing among social scientists**

Moberg et al. (2002) observe that information sharing is a key ingredient for institutions seeking measures to remain relevant. The understanding and practice of information sharing is becoming increasingly essential for institutions to stay connected and boost productivity. Further research demonstrates that restricted information flow through application of stringent rules not only renders institutions unable to prepare for sudden changes in the environment but also impedes their adaptation to environmental changes.

The free flow of information relates to the movement of information or data between members of an organization. Most discussions of information sharing and knowledge management distinguish data, information, and knowledge.

To facilitate timely response activities, information sharing between and among organization members needs to be encouraged and supported by the culture itself. For increased performance to occur, new information needs to be disseminated continually to key individuals within organizations and as a result is treated as an economic resource. Li and Lin (2006), in an empirical study of the impact of environmental uncertainty, intra organizational facilitators, and inter organizational relationships on information sharing and information quality in supply chain management, conclude that information sharing is a key ingredient for any supply chain management system.

Developing positive information sharing behaviors will lead to increased productivity among workers. An organization can speed up information flow, improve efficiency and effectiveness, and respond to customers' changing needs faster when information sharing is encouraged. Organizations that encourage information sharing have been found to gain competitive advantage in the long term.

Knowledge has become an important foundation of competitive advantage and a primary driving force behind an organization's success. Contextual factors such as industry type, organization size, and type of organizational structure may influence the quality of information being shared (Li & Lin, 2006). For example, hierarchical structures often result in information overload due to the restrictions on acquisition of new information and rules that lead to bureaucratic red tape, causing delays in decision making. Useful information and knowledge reside within individuals who create, recognize, archive, access, and apply information in carrying out their tasks.

The movement of information across individual and organizational boundaries into organizational routines and practices is dependent on employees' information sharing behaviors. Limited information sharing across an organization is most likely to result in information gaps. Information exchange within organizations generally involves networks of organizational members. Members with high-intensity networks are more likely to access higher-quality information than those with lower-intensity networks.

Information sharing practices have usually been described with distinctions such as the use of person vs. documentary sources, formal vs. informal channels, and social vs. technical searching. These distinctions seem to be oriented towards explaining why scholars do not always use the document retrieval systems designed to assist them, describing aspects of scholars' information seeking that are important from the viewpoint of information professionals. These distinctions may not adequately capture the actual social, networked, and collective practices of scholars in seeking, finding, and using information. In information science literature, information sharing has mainly been analyzed as private labor, although information acquisition and filtering can be, and often is, undertaken as a collective and collaborative effort.

### Research Design

This study employed the descriptive survey research design, which falls within the empirical research methodology model. This research design relies on careful observation of existing practices and representative samples. It was found to be appropriate for this study.

#### Study Population

The population of the study comprise of social scientists in selected private universities in south-western Nigeria. An enumeration of the faculty staff of the institutions is presented below.

**Table 1.1: Study population Selected private universities in south western Nigeria**

	<b>Name of Institutions</b>	<b>No of Staff</b>
<b>1</b>	Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti	72
<b>2</b>	Achievers University, Owo,	100
<b>3</b>	Bells University, Ota, Ogun	105
<b>4</b>	Bowen University Iwo, Osun	196
<b>5</b>	Caleb University, Imota, Lagos	60
<b>6</b>	Covenant University, Ogun	382
<b>7</b>	Crawford University, Ogun	77
<b>8</b>	Crescent University, Abeokuta Ogun	105
<b>9</b>	Lead City University, Ibadan	109
<b>10</b>	Pan Africa University Lagos	47
<b>11</b>	Redeemers University, Lagos	226
	<i>Total</i>	<i>1479</i>

*Source-Nigerian University Commission (NUC)*

Altogether, the study population consisted of 1479 social scientists from the selected private universities in south western Nigeria. Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

The sampling method adopted for the purpose of this study is the simple random sampling technique. The sampled respondents for this study are drawn from the total population of 1479 social scientists from eleven selected private universities. However, 20% was sampled from each university. With this, a total of 292 staff was sampled. The study sample is presented in Table 1.2 below:



**Table 1.2 Study sample**

	<b>Name of Institutions</b>	<b>No of Staff</b>	<b>Sample Size</b>
<b>1</b>	Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti	72	14
<b>2</b>	Achievers University, Owo,	100	20
<b>3</b>	Bells University, Ota, Ogun	105	21
<b>4</b>	Bowen University Iwo, Osun	196	39
<b>5</b>	Caleb University, Imota, Lagos	60	12
<b>6</b>	Covenant University, Ogun	382	74
<b>7</b>	Crawford University, Ogun	77	15
<b>8</b>	Crescent University, Abeokuta Ogun	105	21
<b>9</b>	Lead City University, Ibadan	109	22
<b>10</b>	Pan Africa University Lagos	47	9
<b>11</b>	Redeemers University, Lagos	226	45
	<i>Total</i>	<i>1479</i>	<i>292</i>

**IV. METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS**

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics of frequency counts and percentages to describe variables and their occurrences.

Data Analysis and Interpretation The analyses and interpretation of the data collected are presented below:-

**Table 1.3: Distribution of the respondents by Name of institution**

<i>Name of institution</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<b>Bowen university</b>	16	<b>7.5</b>
<b>Achievers university</b>	19	<b>9.0</b>
<b>Bells university</b>	15	<b>7.1</b>
<b>Afe Babalola university</b>	17	<b>8.0</b>
<b>Crescent university</b>	19	<b>9.0</b>
<b>Lead city university</b>	18	<b>8.5</b>
<b>Pan African</b>	9	<b>4.2</b>
<b>Redeemers university</b>	30	<b>14.2</b>
<b>Caleb university</b>	12	<b>5.7</b>
<b>Covenant university</b>	50	<b>23.6</b>
<b>Crawford university</b>	7	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above table showed that 16(7.5%) respondents were from Bowen University while 19(9.0%) were from Achievers university, 15(7.1%) were from Bells university and 17(8.0%) were from Afe Babalola, 19(9.0%) were from Crescent university. 18(8.5%) were from Lead city university, 9(4.2%) were from Pan African university while 30(14.2%) were from Redeemers university, 12(5.7%) were from Caleb university, 50(23.6%) were from Covenant university and 7(3.3%) were from Crawford university respectively.

**Table 1. 4: Distribution of the respondents by Sex**

<i>Sex</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<b>No response</b>	147	<b>69.3</b>
<b>Male</b>	48	<b>22.6</b>
<b>Female</b>	17	<b>8.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 1.4 showed that 48(22.6%) of the respondents were Male while 17(8.0%) were Female and 147(69.3%) of the respondents gave no response. It is shown that more male participated in the study than female; it can also be deduced from this analysis that there are more Male social scientists than female.

**Table1.5: Level of information sharing in selected Universities**

S/N	Information sharing	SD	D	A	SA	Mean	S.D
1	The management of my institution have shown their total support for information sharing	28 13.2%	6 2.8%	84 39.6%	94 44.3%	3.15	<b>.99</b>
2	My department encourages lecturers to share information	18 8.5%	14 6.6%	115 54.2%	65 30.7%	3.07	<b>.84</b>
3	I don't share information any how because of the value of information	22 10.4%	31 14.6%	70 33.0%	89 42.0%	3.07	<b>.99</b>
4	I have realized that information sharing is beneficial to my institution	25 11.8%	14 6.6%	100 47.2%	73 34.4%	3.04	<b>.94</b>
5	The management of my institution are not interested in changes that will enhance information sharing	19 9.0%	47 22.2%	54 25.5%	92 43.4%	3.03	<b>1.01</b>
6	Sharing information among my colleagues is done from time to time	13 6.1%	19 9.0%	140 66.0%	40 18.9%	2.98	<b>.72</b>
7	I share information only with my close colleagues	23 10.8%	31 14.6%	108 50.9%	50 23.6%	2.87	<b>.90</b>
8	My colleagues and I share information only when there is a round table discussion	24 11.3%	54 25.5%	83 39.2%	51 24.1%	2.76	<b>.95</b>
9	The management of my institution is not interested in funding information management	24 11.3%	63 29.7%	80 37.7%	45 21.2%	2.69	<b>.93</b>
10	<b>The management of my department is against information sharing</b>	<b>35 16.5%</b>	<b>75 35.4%</b>	<b>40 18.9%</b>	<b>62 29.2%</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>1.08</b>

The ranking of the level of information sharing in selected Universities is as follows:-

The management of my institution have shown their total support for information sharing (Mean =3.15) was ranked highest by their mean score rating and was followed by My department encourages lecturers to share information (Mean =3.07), I don't share information any how because of the value of information (Mean =3.07), I have realized that information sharing is beneficial to my institution (Mean =3.04), The management of my institution are not interested in changes that will enhance information sharing (Mean =3.03), Sharing information among my colleagues is done from time to time (Mean =2.98), I share information only with my close colleagues (Mean =2.87), My colleagues and I share information only when there is a round table discussion (Mean =2.76), The management of my institution is not interested in funding information management (Mean =2.69) and lastly followed by the management of my department is against information sharing (Mean =2.61) respectively.

The above result revealed that the management of the institutions selected has shown their total support for information sharing. This implies that information sharing is beneficial to institutional development.

**Table 1.6: Benefits of sharing information on teaching effectiveness in selected Universities**

S/N	Benefits of sharing information	SD	D	A	SA	Mean	S.D
1	I share work related information that can help to improve my teaching in the class	11 5.2%	15 7.1%	96 45.3%	90 42.5%	3.25	<b>.80</b>
2	My teaching has rely improved because of my level of information with my colleagues	13 6.1%	13 6.1%	101 47.6%	85 40.1%	3.22	<b>.81</b>
3	I often share information because it serves as my backbone in the teaching profession	6 2.8%	25 11.8%	100 47.2%	81 38.2%	3.21	<b>.76</b>
4	I easily accept that information sharing is significant to teaching effectiveness	20 9.4%	7 3.3%	95 44.8%	90 42.5%	3.20	<b>.89</b>
5	Teaching effectiveness is synonymous to information sharing	22 10.4%	20 9.4%	98 46.2%	72 34.0%	3.04	<b>.92</b>
6	I hate hoarding information from my colleagues	18 8.5%	29 13.7%	96 45.3%	69 32.5%	3.02	<b>.90</b>
7	My colleagues mostly rely on sharing information to be able to teach effectively	12 5.7%	45 21.2%	84 39.6%	71 33.5%	3.01	<b>.88</b>
8	Sharing information among my colleagues has helped in my teaching career	16 7.5%	10 4.7%	144 67.9%	42 19.8%	3.00	<b>.74</b>
9	I do not believe information sharing has any	14	40	92	66	2.99	<b>.88</b>

	benefit on teaching	6.6%	18.9%	43.4%	31.1%		
<b>10</b>	<b>I don't believe there is anything advantageous in sharing information</b>	<b>16</b> <b>7.5%</b>	<b>35</b> <b>16.5%</b>	<b>98</b> <b>46.2%</b>	<b>63</b> <b>29.7%</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>.88</b>

The ranking of the Benefits of sharing information on teaching effectiveness in selected Universities is as follows:-

I share work related information that can help to improve my teaching in the class (Mean =3.25) was ranked highest by their mean score rating and was followed by My teaching has rely improved because of my level of information with my colleagues (Mean =3.22), I often share information because it serves as my backbone in the teaching profession (Mean =3.21), I easily accept that information sharing is significant to teaching effectiveness (Mean =3.20), Teaching effectiveness is synonymous to information sharing (Mean =3.04), I hate hoarding information from my colleagues (Mean =3.02), My colleagues mostly rely on sharing information to be able to teach effectively (Mean =3.01), Sharing information among my colleagues has helped in my teaching career (Mean =3.00), I do not believe information sharing has any benefit on teaching (Mean =2.99) and lastly by I don't believe there is anything advantageous in sharing information (Mean =2.98) respectively.

Social scientists in the selected institutions share work related information that helps to improve their teaching in the class; sharing information is seen as been beneficial to classroom teaching.

**Table 1.7: Level of teaching effectiveness in selected Universities**

S/N	Teaching effectiveness	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Mean	S.D
1	Provision of adequate course materials to supplement teaching	-	11 5.2%	47 22.2%	83 39.2%	71 33.5%	4.01	.88
2	Subject teacher giving rapid feedback to students on their academic performance	-	14 6.6%	89 42.0%	77 36.3%	32 15.1%	3.60	.82
3	Teaching methodology of the subject tutor	3 1.4%	7 3.3%	91 42.9%	94 44.3%	17 8.0%	3.54	.75
4	Expertise of the subject teacher	3 1.4%	11 5.2%	102 48.1%	68 32.1%	28 13.2%	3.50	.84
5	Subject teacher fairness, equity and justice in dealing with matters affecting students	3 1.4%	15 7.1%	82 38.7%	98 46.2%	14 6.6%	3.50	.78
6	Human relation of the subject teacher	-	21 9.9%	89 42.0%	82 38.7%	20 9.4%	3.48	.80
7	Competency of the subject teacher	3 1.4%	12 5.7%	106 50.0%	66 31.1%	25 11.8%	3.46	.83
8	Giving continuous assessment to students	-	22 10.4%	97 45.8%	67 31.6%	26 12.3%	3.46	.84
9	Class control of the subject teacher	-	13 6.1%	119 56.1%	63 29.7%	17 8.0%	3.40	.72
10	Communication skills of the subject teacher	-	21 9.9%	109 51.4%	58 27.4%	24 11.3%	3.40	.82
11	Teacher punctuality in class	3 1.4%	16 7.5%	115 54.2%	60 28.3%	18 8.5%	3.35	.80
12	Class management of the subject teacher	5 2.4%	17 8.0%	114 53.8%	65 30.7%	11 5.2%	3.28	.78

The ranking of the level of teaching effectiveness in selected Universities is as follows:-

Provision of adequate course materials to supplement teaching (Mean =4.01) was ranked highest by their mean score rating and was followed in succession by Subject teacher giving rapid feedback to students on their academic performance (Mean =3.60), Teaching methodology of the subject tutor (Mean =3.54), Expertise of the subject teacher (Mean =3.50), Subject teacher fairness, equity and justice in dealing with matters affecting students (Mean =3.50), Human relation of the subject teacher (Mean =3.48), Competency of the subject teacher (Mean =3.46), Giving continuous assessment to students (Mean =3.46), Class control of the subject teacher (Mean =3.40), Communication skills of the subject teacher (Mean =3.40), Teacher punctuality in class (Mean =3.35) and lastly by Class management of the subject teacher (Mean =3.28) respectively.



This analysis revealed that provision of adequate course materials to supplement classroom teaching is an important determinant in the teaching effectiveness of lecturers.

## V. CONCLUSION

This study, using survey research design, examined the information sharing as factor affecting teaching effectiveness of faculty staff of selected universities in south west Nigeria. The findings of the study are thus summarized below:

According to the results of this study which was about the effect of information sharing on teaching effectiveness.

It has been established from this study that the immense contribution of information sharing on teaching effectiveness cannot be over emphasized. It was gathered from literature that the four dimensions of teaching effectiveness by which students judged their teachers, namely: student/ teacher rapport, communication style, instructional style and stimulation. Their most prevailing teaching effectiveness methods used by the respondents included those that hold students' interest, recommend valuable reading texts, enhance presentation of lesson with humor, discuss current development in the field, amount others.

This study revealed that most faculty staff of social sciences in the selected institutions share work related information that helps to improve their teaching. Also the benefit of sharing information in the institution was shown with the support of the management of each institution. It was observed that information sharing is a key instrument for institutions seeking to remain relevant in its chosen field..

The study also found that there was significant relationship between information sharing and teaching effectiveness. The study shows that there is no significant difference in the teaching effectiveness by department, and that there is no significant difference in the benefit of sharing information in the department. Lastly, this study also shows that there is no significant difference in the information sharing by department.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Adam, M. (1993) Students' Perception of Teacher Effectiveness and their Class Work Examination Performance in Secondary Schools in Borno State, Nigeria. Unpublished M. Ed. Dissertation, University of Maiduguri, 128p. (5)
- [2]. Adedibu, L., & Adio, G. (1997). Information needs and information seeking patterns of medical students at Lautech, Ogbomosho. *Aslib Proceedings* 49 :9: 238-242.
- [3]. Adeleke, A.A. (2005) Use of Library Resources by Academic Staff of the Nigerian Polytechnics, *Journal of Library Science*, 12(2) 15-24.(8)
- [4]. Adeoye, M.O & Popoola, S. O (2011) Teaching effectiveness, availability, accessibility and use of library and information resources among teaching staff of school of nursing in Osun and Oyo state Nigeria. *Library, philosophy and practice*.
- [5]. Akinyele, D.K (1999) Principles and practice of management in healthcare services OAUTH, Ilesa
- [6]. Azikwe, U. (1998) Language teaching and learning. Onitsha: Africana FEP Publishers Ltd.
- [7]. Bastick, T. (1995), 3AF: The three – ability framework for assessment in tertiary education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 16;267-278. Bates, M.1999. The invisible substrate of information science(4)
- [8]. Berk, R.A (2005) Survey of 12 Strategies to Measure Teaching Effectiveness, *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*.(9)
- [9]. Braskamp, L. A. (2000). Toward a more holistic approach to assessing faculty as teachers. In K. E. Ryan (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching in higher education: A vision for the future*. New directions for teaching and learning, 83, 109-123. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass.
- [10]. Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and instructional performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-(7)
- [11]. Cate, H.F & Staten, E.M (2000) The value of Information Sharing. National Retail Federation's Protecting Privacy
- [12]. in the New Millennium Series
- [13]. Deggs, D.M., Machtmes, K.L., and Johnson, E. (2008). The Significance Of Teaching Perspectives Among Academic Disciplines. *College Teaching Methods & Styles Journal*. 4.8.
- [14]. Doyle, T (1998) Evaluating Teachers Effectiveness. Retrieved July 24, 2012, from [http://ferris.edu/fctl/Teaching\\_and\\_Learning\\_Tips/.../EvalTeachEffec.htm](http://ferris.edu/fctl/Teaching_and_Learning_Tips/.../EvalTeachEffec.htm). (6)
- [15]. Erdelez, S. & Rioux, K. (2000). Sharing information encountered for others on the Web. *New Review of Information Behaviour Research* 1; 1, 219-233.
- [16]. Ismaila, B.A (1999) The relationship between teachers characteristics and students academic achievement in secondary schools in Adamawa state, Nigeria. Unpublished M.Ed Dissertation, Uni Maid, 152p.
- [17]. Li, S., & Lin, B. (2006). Accessing information sharing and information quality in supply chain management. *Decision Support Systems*, 42.3; 1641–1656. (11)
- [18]. Meho, L.I., & Tibbo, H.R. (2003). Modelling the information-seeking behaviour of social scientists: Ellis's study revisited. *Journal of the American for Information Science and Technology*, 54 (6): 570-587.(1)
- [19]. Popoola, S. O. (2008). The use of information sources and services and its effect on the research output of social scientists in Nigerian universities. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available: <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/popoola.htm>
- [20]. Popoola, S.O., & Haliso, Y. (2009). Use of library information resources and services as predictor of teaching effectiveness of social scientists in Nigerian universities. *AJLAIS* 19(1): 65-77. (2)
- [21]. Ramsden, P. (2003) *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London; Routledge.(3)
- [22]. Scriven, M. 1995. Student ratings offer useful input to teacher evaluations. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 4.7;1-5. Retrieved May 27, 2012 from <http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=4&n=7>
- [23]. Stoen, S.K. (1991). Research and information retrieval among academic researchers: implication for library instruction. *Library Trends* 39.3: 238-257.