International Journal of Information Movement *Vol. 10 Issue X* *February 2026*
Website: www.ijim.in *ISSN: 2456-0553 (online)* **Pages 17-27**

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES OF KU, KURUKSHETRA AND MDU, ROHTAK: A STUDY

Suman Vishnoi
Research Scholar, DLIS
Baba Mastnath University, Asthal Bohar, Rohtak
E-mail: suman.roz29@gmail.com

Dr. Sheela Dabas
Professor, DLIS
Baba Mastnath University, Asthal Bohar, Rohtak
E-mail: sheeladabas8@gmail.com

Dr. Bhanu Partap
Assistant Librarian,
Nehru Library, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar
Email-id: bpartaps2005@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines the Knowledge Management (KM) practices adopted in the university libraries of Kurukshetra University (KU), Kurukshetra and Maharshi Dayanand University (MDU), Rohtak. The main purpose of the study is to assess the level of awareness and understanding of knowledge management among library professionals, identify its applications, goals, benefits, and the challenges faced during its implementation. The findings reveal that most of the respondents possess a moderate to high level of awareness of knowledge management and clearly understand its relationship with information management. The primary goals of KM implementation include knowledge preservation, enhanced knowledge sharing, improved library services, and support for academic activities such as teaching, learning, and research. The study also reveals some of the benefits of KM, including improved operational efficiency, better decision-making, enhanced collaboration, and long-term preservation of organizational knowledge. Despite the positive outcomes, the study identifies some challenges mainly related to human and organizational factors, such as lack of training, limited awareness, resistance to change, and insufficient motivation for knowledge sharing. The study concludes that although KM practices are positively perceived and partially implemented in the libraries of KU and MDU, sustained institutional support, continuous training, and a strong knowledge-sharing culture are necessary for effective and successful KM implementation.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Knowledge processing, University libraries, Digital era, KUK, MDU, Haryana.

1.0 Introduction

Knowledge management is not a new concept and it has existed since ancient times; however, known in different terms in different eras. In this technological driven era, digital contents are the backbone for any academia, research institutions, and libraries. Earlier, libraries particularly of higher educational institutions dealt with handling print resources and the main focus was to accumulate and store the resources. But, now in this digital era, most of the contents are generated in digital form, hence, libraries have to manage digital contents or resources along with print resources. The main motto of any higher educational institutional library is to promote the right use to the right user and get the users' satisfaction. Knowledge management directly deals with the contents/resource's creation, storage, processing, and dissemination in a way in which users get their desired information timely and in an efficient way.

Knowledge management (KM) involves the systematic process of recognizing, structuring, retaining, and sharing information throughout an organization. Knowledge is derived from human experiences and reflections. It is the culmination of accumulated information in a specific domain. In other words, knowledge management is a field that advocates for a unified strategy to identify, manage, and disseminate an organization's informational resources, irrespective of their location or format.

The present research study entitled "Knowledge Management Practices in University Libraries of KU, Kurukshetra and MDU, Rohtak: A Study" is designed to investigate the awareness about Knowledge Management (KM), KM practices and strategies adopted by the libraries of Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak of Haryana state of India. The primary area of a library and information centre is planning, developing, and organizing knowledge resources in an effective way as well as fulfilling its parent organization's goals apart from user satisfaction.

2.0Knowledge Management in Expert Views

A few renowned experts have been defined knowledge management in their words as given below:
Santosus and Surmacz (2005) elaborated in their statement about the Knowledge Management (KM) that "it is the process through which organizations generate value from their intellectual and knowledge-based assets; however, there is no universal definition of KM just as there is no agreement as to what constitute knowledge in the first place, and for this reason, it is best to think of KM in the broadest context".
Davenport (1994) has defined "Knowledge Management is the process of capturing, distributing, and effectively using knowledge."
Townley (2001) treats knowledge management as "a set of processes that create and share knowledge across an organization to optimize the use of judgment in the attainment of mission and goals".

3.0 Literature review

Awoyemi and Ipadeola's (2024) conducted a study to know the knowledge management in academic libraries in Ondo State, Nigeria, and explored that "improving library services, managing information explosions, and meeting information needs of users were some of the main purposes of implementing Knowledge Management (KM) in academic libraries, while the highest rated areas of KM in academic libraries found digital and online services, reference services, technical services, policy and decision making, information literacy program, and resource management. Awoyemi and Okojie's (2024) study examined the strategies and best practices for Knowledge Management (KM) in Nigerian academic libraries, and revealed "some of the main purposes of implementing KM in academic libraries such as improving library services, managing information explosions, and meeting information needs of users. On the other hand, Dawuda and Hardi's (2024) study explored the role of knowledge enhancement and sharing practices among library staff at tertiary institutions in Northern Ghana. The study revealed that management of tertiary institution libraries play a significant role in the knowledge development of staff, while effective Knowledge Management (KM) could address inefficiencies in library service delivery. Similarly, Enakrire and Smuts (2023) examined the effectiveness of Knowledge Management Tools (KMTs) in support of university library operations in Nigeria and South Africa. The researchers conducted a survey among 132 librarians (77 from Nigeria and 55 from South Africa) and revealed that various KMTs such as search engines, semantic web, and information retrieval tools, were available and employed to support information service delivery and manage databases//institutional repositories in the selected university libraries in Nigeria and South Africa. To identify the factors influencing Knowledge Management (KM) practices in the libraries of Bangladesh, Mostofa, Othman, and Zulkifli (2023) conducted a study, and revealed that familiarity and perceptions with KM varied by gender and academic level across users.

Tripathy (2022) conducted a study to explore organizational knowledge management practices to enhance library and information services, and highlighted that the entire process of management of library goes parallel to the management of the parent organization, whereas, library receives information from the organization and contributes knowledge to the organization for its better services and products. Pankaj Kumar (2021) explored knowledge management practices in the university libraries of North India, and revealed that KM practices were adopted by all the university libraries that came under the study; however, the awareness level of librarians was greater about the knowledge management compared to other LIS professionals. Moreover, maximum LIS professionals opined that Seminars/ Webinars/ Workshops were the best way to acquire knowledge. A study on knowledge management skills required for 21st-century library professionals in India carried out by Subaveerapandiyan and Sindhu's (2021), found that Indian library professionals were updated and possessed both foundational and functional competencies acquired through self-directed learning and practical

experience. A case study was conducted on knowledge management practices at the National Technical University of Athens (NTUA) Central Library by Dimou (2018), and revealed that the library, and the Department of Information, and Users' Services were missing a Knowledge Management (KM) strategy that would contribute to the design of the KM procedures, whereas, the library faces the lack of financial funding, which influences the acquisition of appropriate tools, which would enhance the knowledge storage and preservation, and the dissemination among different stakeholders.

4.0 Scope of the study

The scope of the present study is limited to analyse the knowledge management practices currently adopted by the libraries of following two state universities in Haryana, India:

1. Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra
2. Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak

5.0 Statement of the Problem

A library is considered the heart of any institution particularly in a university system, which plays a pivotal role in supporting teaching, research, and extension activities by enabling access to print and digital information resources. In this rapidly changing technological advancement era, a university library not only performs traditional functions such as collection development, check-in and check-out, and other traditional services, rather, they indulge in Knowledge Management (KM) practices. Now, in this challenging digital era, a university library performs knowledge creation, storage, processing, and dissemination, which is the part and process of KM practice. By adopting KM practices, a university library can be helpful in enhancing teaching, learning, research, service quality, and image building of an organization. Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak are two renowned state universities in Haryana state of India. Both of the universities have well established library systems that serve different academic communities. However, there is a noticeable gap found in empirical studies that examine and compare the KM practices adopted by both the university libraries. Without a clear understanding of the existing KM practices, challenges, and opportunities, it becomes difficult to formulate strategies for improving knowledge sharing and utilization within these libraries. Therefore, the problem addressed in this study is the lack of systematic and comparative analysis of knowledge management practices in the university libraries of KU, Kurukshetra and MDU, Rohtak. The study seeks to examine the current status of KM practices, assess the awareness and perception of library professionals, identify barriers to effective KM implementation, and explore opportunities for strengthening KM initiatives.

6.0 Objectives

The main objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To evaluate the level of awareness and understanding of knowledge management among library professionals in the university libraries of Kurukshetra University (KU), Kurukshetra and Maharshi Dayanand University (MDU), Rohtak.
2. To examine the understanding of key concepts and principles related to knowledge management in university libraries.
3. To identify the key skills and expertise required for effective implementation of knowledge management practices in university libraries.
4. To analyze the application of knowledge management practices in the university libraries.
5. To determine the primary goals of implementing knowledge management practices in university libraries.
6. To identify the benefits of knowledge management practices for library operations and services.
7. To examine the challenges and barriers faced by university libraries while implementing knowledge management practices.
8. To suggest measures for improving the effective implementation of knowledge management practices in university libraries.

7.0 Methodology

To ensure fair evaluation of LIS professionals' perceptions of knowledge management, a survey-based approach has been implied. To collect the data and make the interpretations as per the objectives of the study, a structured questionnaire was employed and appended to the study. In addition, secondary data were collected from annual

reports of concerned libraries under study, official websites, prospectuses, and other relevant sources. A five-point scale has been used in the questionnaire for data collection and analysis purposes. The data were collected by personally visiting the university libraries under study during June-July, 2025. A total 77 questionnaires were distributed among the library professionals, out of which 66 questionnaires have been filled and received back for analysis purpose, thus overall response rate has been achieved @85.71%. The collected data were tabulated, analysed using simple percentage analysis statistical technique.

8.0 Data analysis and interpretation

Table 8.1: Gender wise distribution of respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	50	75.76
Female	16	24.24
Total	66	100

Table 8.1 shows the gender-wise distribution of respondents. The study reveals that out of 66 respondents, 50 (75.76%) were male and 16 (24.24) were female respondents, which shows that male respondents are dominant in the study.

Table 8.2: Age wise distribution of respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
<25 years	00	00
25-30 years	02	03.03
30-35 years	14	21.21
35-40 years	26	39.39
40-45 years	15	22.76
>45 years	09	13.64
Total	66	100

The age-wise distribution of respondents is reflected in table 8.2, which reveals that most of the respondents are between 30-40 years of age group category also known as middle-age category. Out of 66 respondents, 39.39% belonged to the age category of 35-40 years, while 22.76% respondents were identified between the age group of 40-45 years. On the other hand, 21.21% respondents were between 30-35 years of age group, followed by 13.64% between the age group of >45 years, and 03.03% respondents between the age group 25-30 years. There were no respondents <25 years.

Table 8.3: Designation/Status of respondents (Library Professionals)

Designation	Frequency	Percentage
Librarian	01	01.51
Incharge Library	01	01.51
Deputy Librarian	05	07.58
Assistant Librarian	01	01.51
Senior Library Assistant	03	04.54
Library Assistant	04	06.06
Junior Library Assistant	04	06.06
Professional Assistant	02	03.03
Semi Professional Assistant	17	25.76
Library Attendants	18	27.28
Other professionals	10	15.15
Total	66	100

The data presented in table 8.3 highlights the job profile/positions of all the 66 library and information science professionals who took part in the study positively. All the participants are qualified in library and information science discipline with Diploma to Degree level. Out of 66 respondents, Library Attendants constitute the largest group of study with the response rate of 27.28%, closely followed by Semi-Professional Assistants (25.76%). Similarly, other professionals, such as with the designation of Library Officer, Library

Executive, *etc*., also took part in the study with 15.15% response rate. From Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, and Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, a total five Deputy Librarians took part in the study, while four (06.06%) each were Library Assistants, and Junior Library Assistants, followed by one Senior Library Assistant. Only a very small number of respondents, *i.e*., one Librarian, and one Incharge Library hold the higher administrative positions of the concerned university library. Apart from this, two Professionals Assistants (03.03%) and one Assistant Librarian contributed in the study just over one percent to the total. Overall, the analysis reveals that most of the respondents belong to junior and support library professionals rather than top-level library faculty positions.

Table 8.4: Professional experience of library professionals

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage
<5 years	02	03.03
5-10 years	05	07.58
10-15 years	21	31.82
15-20 years	24	36.36
20-25 years	11	16.67
>25 years	03	04.54
Total	66	100

The distribution of library professionals, i.e., the respondents of the study, based on years of professional work experience is depicted in table 8.4. The study found that most of the respondents have significant experience in the field of library services. Out of a total 66 respondents, 36.36% respondents have 15 to 20 years of work experience, while 31.82% have 10 to 15 years of work experience. Those respondents have 20 to 25 years of service length, representing 16.67% of the total, whereas 7.58% of the respondents have work experience between 5 to 10 years. A few respondents, around 5%, have more than 25 years of work experience, while around 3% respondents have less than 5 years of work experience. Overall, the analysis explores that the majority of respondents are mid to highly experienced library professionals as both of the Universities are very old and have good infrastructural facilities particularly in their concerned libraries.

Table 8.5: Level of awareness and understanding of term and concept of knowledge management

Level of awareness	Frequency	Percentage
To a very great extent	08	12.12
To a great extent	28	42.42
To some extent	24	36.36
To a small extent	06	09.10
Not aware at all	00	00
Total	66	100

Table 8.5 shows the level of awareness and understanding of the term and concept of Knowledge Management (KM) among the respondents/library professionals of KUK and MDU. Out of the 66 respondents, 42.42% reported that they understand knowledge management to a great extent, while 36.36% indicated that they understand it to some extent. On the other hand, a smaller portion, *i.e.*, 12.12% respondents, stated that they understand it to a very great extent, whereas only 9.10% reported a small level of understanding of KM. Surprisingly, none of the respondents from both of the universities indicated that they were completely unaware of knowledge management. Overall, the study found that most of the respondents have at least a moderate level of awareness and understanding of concepts of knowledge management.

Table 8.6: Understanding about knowledge management

Sr. No.	**Knowledge management**		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total

1.	It is similar to Information Management (IM)	No.	18	41	04	03	00	66
		%	27.28	62.12	06.06	04.54	00	100
2.	It covers Information Management (IM) processes	No.	21	38	04	03	00	66
		%	31.82	57.58	06.06	04.54	00	100
3.	Sharing information can result in Knowledge Management (KM)	No.	18	41	07	00	00	66
		%	27.28	62.12	10.60	00	00	100
4.	It is a new term for the work that library professionals have been doing all along	No.	00	35	12	19	00	66
		%	00	53.03	18.18	28.79	00	100
5.	It is a field that has been around for decades, but only recently gained popularity	No.	00	06	26	31	03	66
		%	00	09.09	39.40	46.97	04.54	100
6.	It is more about sharing knowledge than storing it	No.	03	48	12	03	00	66
		%	04.54	72.74	18.18	04.54	00	100
7.	The establishment of institutional repositories is a form of KM	No.	21	41	04	00	00	66
		%	31.82	62.12	06.06	00	00	100
8.	The process of gathering, preserving, generating, and disseminating information sources is KM	No.	28	38	00	00	00	66
		%	42.42	57.58	00	00	00	100

The presented data in table 8.6 highlights how respondents understand different aspects of Knowledge Management (KM). The study reveals that the majority (90%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that knowledge management is closely related to information management and also includes information management processes. Similarly, around 90% of respondents believed that sharing information plays an important role in knowledge management. Around 77% of respondents also felt that knowledge management focuses more on sharing knowledge rather than only storing it, while 62.12% of the respondents agreed that the establishment of institutional repositories is an example of Knowledge Management (KM). The study also explores that all the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that activities such as collecting, preserving, creating, and sharing information are part of knowledge management. Another side, opinions were mixed on whether knowledge management is simply a new name for the work traditionally done by library professionals, with some agreeing and others disagreeing. However, 46.97% respondents disagreed with the statement that knowledge management is an old field that has only recently become popular.

Table 8.7: Key skills and expertise required for knowledge management

Sr. No.	**Key skills and expertise**		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1.	Technical skills (content management, data analytics, data management, technology skills, project management, *etc*.)	No.	59	03	04	00	00	66
		%	89.40	04.54	06.06	00	00	100
2.	Soft skills (change management, cross-functional communication, problem solving, relationship building, *etc*.)	No.	50	16	00	00	00	66
		%	75.76	24.24	00	00	00	100
3.	Foundational knowledge about KM principles (such as explicit and tacit knowledge, metadata strategies, and retrieval mechanisms, *etc*.)	No.	50	12	04	00	00	66
		%	75.76	18.18	06.06	00	00	100
4.	Leadership skills (motivation to team members, oversee KM programs, and ensure alignment with organizational objectives, *etc*.)	No.	55	11	00	00	00	66
		%	83.33	16.67	00	00	00	100

Table 8.7 shows the key skills and expertise considered necessary for effective Knowledge Management (KM)

in a university library or particularly in a higher educational institution. The study found that 89.40% of respondents strongly agreed on the importance of technical skills, such as content management, data handling, technology use, and project management. On the other hand, soft skills were also seen as essential, as all the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that abilities like communication, problem solving, and relationship building are important for knowledge management. Similarly, around 80% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that having a strong foundation in knowledge management principles such as understanding different types of knowledge, metadata, and retrieval methods is necessary. In addition, leadership skills were also rated as highly important, with all respondents agreeing that the ability to motivate teams, manage knowledge management initiatives, and align them with organizational goals is very essential. Overall, the analysis reflects that a balanced combination of technical expertise, soft skills, strong conceptual knowledge, and effective leadership is essentially required for successful Knowledge Management (KM).

Table 8.8: Application of Knowledge Management (KM) in university libraries

Sr. No.	Application of KM		Highly Significant	Significant	Somewhat Significant	Insignificant	Totally Insignificant	Total
1.	Implementing and utilization of advanced ICT tools	No.	31	28	07	00	00	66
		%	46.97	42.43	10.60	00	00	100
2.	Developing comprehensive KM frameworks according to the needs of the university library	No.	31	35	00	00	00	66
		%	46.97	53.03	00	00	00	100
3.	Providing professional training and education to library staff	No.	50	16	00	00	00	66
		%	75.76	24.24	00	00	00	100
4.	Developing user-centered information systems- Personalizing services	No.	44	22	00	00	00	66
		%	66.66	33.34	00	00	00	100
5.	Developing knowledge databases	No.	31	31	04	00	00	66
		%	46.97	46.97	06.06	00	00	100
6.	Promoting a culture of collaboration and knowledge sharing among library staff and users	No.	19	28	19	00	00	66
		%	28.78	42.42	28.78	00	00	100
7.	Identifying and addressing various barriers that hinder KM implementation	No.	28	32	06	00	00	66
		%	42.42	48.48	09.10	00	00	100

The respondents' opinions on the application of knowledge management in university libraries are depicted in the table 8.8. The study explored that most (89.40%) of the respondents consider the use of advanced ICT tools to be either highly significant or significant for effective knowledge management in a university library. In addition, all the respondents considered it very important to develop knowledge management frameworks according to the specific needs of the university library. On the other hand, all the respondents rated professional training and education for library staff as highly significant or significant. Similarly, developing user-centred information systems and personalized services was viewed as highly significant or significant by all the respondents. Another side, the creation of knowledge databases, was considered highly significant or significant nearly by all respondents. As far as the opinion on promoting a culture of collaboration and knowledge sharing, received mixed responses; however, mostly respondents rated it as significant to some degree. With regard to the respondents' opinion on the last statement, which denoted identifying and overcoming barriers to knowledge management implementation, majority of the respondents considered it as highly significant or significant.

Table 8.9: Primary goals of implementing Knowledge Management (KM) practices in the university library

Sr. No.	Primary goals of implementing KM		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1.	To preserve organizational knowledge	No.	21	45	00	00	00	66
		%	31.82	68.18	00	00	00	100
2.	Enhancing knowledge sharing	No.	34	32	00	00	00	66
		%	51.52	48.48	00	00	00	100
3.	To improve employee participation/collaboration in KM practices (acquiring, storing, and sharing)	No.	19	38	09	00	00	66
		%	28.79	57.57	13.64	00	00	100
4.	To improve library operations and services	No.	29	37	00	00	00	66
		%	43.94	56.06	00	00	00	100
5.	To support academic goals (research, teaching, and learning)	No.	24	39	03	00	00	66
		%	36.36	59.10	04.54	00	00	100
6.	To minimize knowledge development cost	No.	12	39	15	00	00	66
		%	18.18	59.10	22.72	00	00	100
7.	Database management	No	19	47	00	00	00	66
		%	28.79	71.21	00	00	00	100

The presented data in table 8.9 highlights the main goals of implementing knowledge management practices in university libraries in the opinion of respondents under study. The results show that preserving organizational knowledge is a key goal, with all respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing. Similarly, enhancing knowledge sharing was also considered very important, as more than half (51.57%) of the respondents strongly agreed with this goal. On the other hand, 57.57% respondents agreed that knowledge management helps improve collaboration and participation among library staff in activities such as acquiring, storing, and sharing knowledge, while another side a small number (13.64%) of respondents remained neutral on the statement. More than half (56.06%) of the respondents agreed that implementation of knowledge management in university libraries can improve library operations and services. On the other hand, supporting academic activities such as research, teaching, and learning was also widely recognized as an important purpose of knowledge management by 59.10% of respondents. Similarly, another goal, implementing knowledge management will minimize the cost of knowledge development was supported by 59.10% respondents, however, 22.72% respondents remained neutral on the statement, suggesting some uncertainty. Finally, implementing knowledge management in university libraries will support effective database management was backed by 71.21% respondents as an important goal. Overall, the findings indicate that knowledge management in university libraries is mainly aimed at preserving knowledge, improving sharing and collaboration, enhancing services, and supporting academic objectives.

Table 8.10: Benefits of Knowledge Management (KM)

Sr. No.	Benefits		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1.	Improved library operations and services	No.	19	47	00	00	00	66
		%	28.79	71.21	00	00	00	100
2.	Improved efficiency (reduces duplication of efforts, streamlines workflows)	No.	12	54	00	00	00	66
		%	18.18	81.82	00	00	00	100
3.	Enhanced collaboration among staff, faculty, and students (by providing centralized platforms for sharing	No.	13	36	10	00	07	66
		%	19.70	54.54	15.16	00	10.60	100

	knowledge)							
4.	Knowledge preservation for benefiting future staff and users	No.	09	57	00	00	00	66
		%	13.64	86.36	00	00	00	100
5.	Better decision-making (regarding services, acquisitions, and user support)	No.	03	60	03	00	00	66
		%	04.55	90.90	04.55	00	00	100
6.	Provide user-centric services (that enhance user satisfaction)	No.	22	44	00	00	00	66
		%	33.33	66.67	00	00	00	100

Table 8.10 describes the major benefits of implementing Knowledge Management (KM) in university libraries in view of respondents under study. The results show that all respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that knowledge management leads to improved library operations and better services, whereas a large majority (81.82%) of respondents also agreed that KM increases efficiency by reducing duplication of work and improving workflow processes. On the other hand, a big majority of respondents (86.36%) felt that knowledge management helps preserve knowledge so that it can benefit future staff as well as users. Similarly, more than half of respondents (54.54%) agreed that knowledge management improves collaboration among staff, faculty, and students, however, a small number (10.60%) of respondents disagreed with the statement, indicating some variation in opinion. A big majority of respondents (90.90%) agreed that knowledge management better decision-making related to library services, collections, and user support, while 66.67% respondents agreed that KM helps in providing user-centred services that improve user satisfaction. Overall, the results of the study shows that knowledge management is widely viewed as beneficial for improving efficiency, decision-making, service quality, and long-term knowledge preservation in university libraries.

Table 8.11: Challenges/barriers faced during implementing Knowledge Management (KM) practices

Sr. No.	**Challenges/barriers**		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1.	Misunderstanding of KM concept	No.	04	40	12	10	00	66
		%	06.06	60.61	18.18	15.15	00	100
2.	Lack of leadership support	No.	04	18	22	19	03	66
		%	06.06	27.27	33.33	28.80	04.54	100
3.	Employee resistance towards adopting new KM tools	No.	00	35	16	15	00	66
		%	00	53.03	24.24	22.73	00	100
4.	Insufficient human resources	No.	04	44	00	18	00	66
		%	06.06	66.67	00	27.27	00	100
5.	Lack of knowledge sharing culture	No.	04	19	12	28	03	66
		%	06.06	28.79	18.18	42.42	04.55	100
6.	Lack of training and exposure to KM tools and technologies	No.	06	54	00	03	03	66
		%	09.09	81.83	00	04.54	04.54	100
7.	Lack of financial resources to initiate KM	No.	04	28	16	15	03	66
		%	06.06	42.43	24.24	22.73	04.54	100
8.	Lack of time to learn	No.	04	09	22	31	00	66
		%	06.06	13.64	33.33	46.97	00	100
9.	Lack of rewards/recognition for knowledge creation and sharing	No.	06	54	03	03	00	66
		%	09.09	81.83	04.54	04.54	00	100
10.	Lack of ICT infrastructure	No.	00	09	30	27	00	66
		%	00	13.64	45.45	40.91	00	100
11.	Outdated technology, which fails to meet the demands of modern KM practices	No.	00	03	06	44	13	66
		%	00	04.54	09.09	66.67	19.70	100
12.	Lack of capability to identify knowledge resources within or outside the library	No.	00	03	21	29	13	66
		%	00	04.54	31.82	43.94	19.70	100

The data given in table 8.11 presents the major challenges or barriers faced while implementing Knowledge Management (KM) practices in university libraries. The results show that misunderstanding of the knowledge management concept was a common barrier for 60.61% respondents, while a lack of training and limited exposure to knowledge management tools and technologies was identified as one of the most serious challenges in view of a large majority of respondents (90.92%). 53.03% of respondents reported significant barrier employee resistance to adopting new knowledge management tools, and insufficient human resources as significant barriers viewed by 66.67% respondents, whereas the absence of rewards or recognition for creating and sharing knowledge was strongly viewed as a major challenge by 81.83% respondents. Another side, mixed opinions were recorded regarding leadership support and financial constraints, while 46.97% respondents disagreed with the statement that a lack of time to learn about KM was a major barrier. Similarly, a good proportion of respondents also disagreed that poor ICT infrastructure, outdated technology, or inability to identify knowledge resources were serious challenges, meaning that technological capability is not a major problem in both of the university libraries under study. Mixed responses were also recorded to the statements "lack of knowledge sharing culture" and "lack of financial resources to initiate KM". Overall, the findings show that human-related and organizational factors such as training, awareness, motivation, and staffing are the main obstacles to effective knowledge management implementation, rather than technological limitations.

9.0 Conclusion

This study examined the knowledge management practices in the university libraries of Kurukshetra University (KU), Kurukshetra and Maharshi Dayanand University (MDU), Rohtak. The findings show that library professionals in both universities have a good level of awareness and understanding of knowledge management concepts. Most respondents clearly recognized the importance of knowledge sharing, use of ICT tools, staff training, and leadership in successfully implementing knowledge management practices. Furthermore, the study revealed that knowledge management is actively applied in areas such as improving library services, supporting academic activities, preserving organizational knowledge, and enhancing decision-making. Besides, the benefits of knowledge management were widely acknowledged by the respondents, especially in terms of improved efficiency, better services, and long-term knowledge preservation. The study also identified several challenges as well, mainly related to human and organizational factors such as lack of training, limited awareness, resistance to change, and insufficient motivation or recognition for knowledge sharing. Overall, the study concludes that while knowledge management practices are positively perceived and partially implemented in the university libraries of KU and MDU, greater emphasis on training, awareness programs, and supportive policies is necessary to strengthen and sustain effective knowledge management practices in the future.

10.0 References

i. Awoyemi, R.A., & Ipadeola, D.A. (2024). Knowledge management in academic libraries in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Library and Information Perspectives and Research*, 6(1), 114-129.DOI: http://doi.org/10.47524/lipr.v6i1.115
ii. Awoyemi, R.A., & Okojie, V. (2024). Strategies and best practices of knowledge management in academic libraries in Nigeria. *Ghana Library Journal*, 29(1), 1-62. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/glj.v29i1.3
iii. Brijendra Kumar, & Malviya, R.N. (2022). Impact of knowledge management in academic libraries: An overview. *Asian Journal of Management*, 13(2), 151-154. doi: 10.52711/2321-5763.2022.00027
iv. Davenport, T.H. (1994). Saving IT's soul: Human centered information management. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 72 (2), 119-131.
v. Dawuda, I., Hardi, A.R.M. (2024). Knowledge enhancement and sharing practices of library staff of tertiary institutions in Northern Ghana: The role of management. Conference paper.
vi. Dimou, A. (2024). Knowledge management practices in academic libraries: The case of NTUA Central Library. Master thesis. Sweden: Linnaeus University, 66p.
vii. Enarkrire, R.T., & Smuts, H. (2023). Efficacy of knowledge management tools in support of university library operations. *International Journal of Information Science and Management*, 21(4), 215-233.DOI: https://doi.org/10.22034/ijism.2023.1977775.0
viii. Mostofa, S.K.M., Othman, R., & Zulfifli, Z. (2023). Knowledge management: Determine the influencing factors for practicing at the libraries in Bangladesh. *Journal of Education culture and Society*, 1, 672-695.

ix. Pankaj Kumar (2021). Knowledge management practices in the university libraries of North India. A Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Department of Library and Information Science, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab.
x. Santosus, M., & Surmacz, J. (2005). The ABCs of knowledge management. *Knowledge Management Research Center*. https://www.cio.com/in/
xi. Subaveerapandiyan, A., & Sindhu, D. (2021). Knowledge management skills for 21st century library professionals in India: A study. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, paper no. 5992. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5992
xii. Tripathy, P.K. (2022). Organizational knowledge management practices for better library and information services. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, paper no. 7445. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7445