Compare motivations and barriers to the use of electronic discussion groups Between members of the discussion group e-Library (LIS & PUBLIB)

Soraya ziaei[1], Shabnam danaaii[2*]

[1.] PhD in Information science, and knowledge science. Iran
[2.] MA in Information science, and knowledge science. Iran
Corresponding author Email: acceptpaper@yahoo.com

Abstract: Nowadays, with the increasing use of the Internet, using electronic discussion groups as a tool for knowledge sharing is considered. The population of librarians who are members of a LIS discussion group e-Library and a PUBLIB discussion group e-Library. This study explored the motivations and barriers to the use of electronic discussion groups are among the research population. The research method used in this study is descriptive and analytical. Collected data using SPSS software and descriptive statistics And Inferential statistical tests were analyzed. After analyzing the data it became clear that most members of the LIS Women in the age group of 20-30 years and Bachelor of Education And Most members of PUBLIB Women in the age group over 50 years old and are Bachelor of Education. After evaluating the data, a significant difference was found between The barriers to the use of electronic discussion groups, in electronic discussion groups. Check Restrictions on the use of discussion groups between Show Internet problems (easy access, speed and cost), false news and rumors, and do not expect a significant performance Electronic discussion group LIS More PUBLIB electronic discussion group is. Informed of special events each discipline Between members of LIS electronic discussion group And use the knowledge and expertise of group members Between members of PUBLIB electronic discussion group Topics are the most motivated to use e-form discussion groups.
[Soraya ziaei, Shabnam danaai. **Compare motivations and barriers to the use of electronic discussion groups Between members of the discussion group e-Library (LIS & PUBLIB).** *Researcher* 2019;11(4):1-11]. ISSN 1553-9865 (print); ISSN 2163-8950 (online). http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher. 1. doi:10.7537/marsrsj110419.01.

Key words: LIS electronic discussion group, PUBLIB electronic discussion group, Group discussion Ferdowsi University, Email, Knowledge Sharing, Electronic discussion group incentives, Barriers to electronic discussion groups

1. Introduction

Today, tremendous speed data network as a phenomenon is widespread and universal. Email is the most widely used tools. And robust Internet applications, and in fact one of the cheapest means of communication at all times is considered. One application is an electronic discussion groups. This working group will discuss each message sent to all members who subscribe to the discussion group, where they are sent. When a person becomes a member of the discussion group's name and email address will be added to the mailing list address And Subscribe to receive the standard message that often includes some helpful information on group discussions, as well as information about how to share the list of subscribers to the e-mail is sent. Since then, he has received mail messages and will start sending messages to others. He may be all the people on the list, or to a person or group of persons to respond. Discussion groups to enable their subscribers to share their knowledge, Questions for group, In response to questions raised by others, Ads conferences, Call for Papers, Exchange Nzrdrbarh specific issues of common interests, Opportunity job and etc.

So many discussion groups on all topics imaginable academic field, specific areas of research, particularly manufacturers of products or services and corporate entertainment etc are available.

Today, several discussion groups on topics related to library and information science, there is an example in Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran E-LIS is a discussion group which started its activity in 1377. Other examples abroad, PUBLIB electronic discussion group is to engage a group of English-speaking librarians and began its activity in 1992.

More research in this area in terms of content and topics discussed are electronic discussion groups And No research comparing the motivations and barriers to knowledge sharing in electronic discussion groups librarians has been done so far.

Due to the important topic of knowledge sharing and increasing use of the Internet and Forums, email, electronic discussion between the two groups That We have different motivations and barriers to the use of electronic discussion groups about topics of interest will be considered.

The importance of incentives, and restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups in LIS and

PUBLIB electronic discussion group can be mentioned the following:

- Identify deficiencies, failures in electronic discussion groups, library and attempt to resolve the shortcomings and obstacles.
- Identify factors affecting motivation to improve knowledge sharing in electronic discussion groups, library and trying to keep these factors.
-Communicate with librarians in various countries due to familiarity with electronic discussion group PUBLIB.

2. Theoretical fundamentation

Knowledge and its variants

Hara (2007), three types of knowledge, book knowledge, practical knowledge and cultural knowledge is divided. Researchers classify ¬ subject knowledge as knowledge that book. Book knowledge to actual knowledge of facts, information, and that the Encyclopaedia refer. For the reasons Requires knowledge of the book. The formation of the dialectical relationship (dialectic) between a community and its members rely on. The community of writers is part of the theological tradition (the speech) are And Common interests and common knowledge in the field and are accountable to the same degree. Survival depends on the dynamics of the scientific field of activity is the amount of effort that scholars. (Hara, 2007)

Capital (in the collective) power indicator is a field within each of the different Investors are in circulation. Bordeaux cultural capital and social capital to economic capital to distinguish And However, the symbolic capital of cognitive and diagnostic aspects of these three types of capital as. He claimed to have three types of cultural capital:

1. Cultural capital within the building (training) means ability and innate desires are permanent (such as scientific knowledge and skills related to the concept of tacit knowledge).

2. Objectified cultural capital (eg, books, cars, etc) that require the use of cultural capital is endogenous.

3. Institutionalized cultural capital in the form of educational topics.

Social capital consists of all the resources that can be obtained through membership in groups and networks link is. Production and reproduction of capital and the collective need to maintain such a link (s, positive criticism, short talks at conferences, trade papers). Symbolic capital based on social setting, and is distinctive because it was the highest level of social capital.

Communication components And the need to relate

Claude Shannon writes: Communication consists of all the ways by which the other mind may influence the body. Aristotle defined relationship says: Search the following links to obtain all the equipment and facilities to encourage and persuade others. Of existing definitions can be reached the following conclusions:

1. The relationship between symbols and the production process.
2. Communication data processing, publishing and receiving messages.
3. double the current relationship between the message and the message receiver.
4. The relationship between influencing behavior and cognition and emotion is.
5. sometimes direct and sometimes indirect and mediated communication tools to interact.
6. Elements associated with the stimulation and control.

Fundamental element of progress in science is a combination of existing ideas.

Effective communication between scientists to achieve this combination is a very important scientific activities (Gray, 2004).

Menzel for scientific work on seven counts:

1. Providing answers to questions specific.
2. Helping scientists to keep pace with new developments in the field.
3. Help scientists to identify and understand a new.
4. Understanding the main ¬ stream and realize the importance of their work.
5. Further evidence to support the validity of the information.
6. Gain new insights or expanding the range of interest.
7. Receive feedback on their academic work.

Scientific communication channels can be divided into two categories: formal and informal.

Scientists and members of the scientific community of the relationship between formal and informal are of interest (Dube, 2003).

Formal scientific communication in the form of printed publications such as books and journals is done Audiences for a long time and is very accessible. (Ahmad N., Daghfous, 2010)

But much of the information within the scientific community through personal contact and verbal communication takes place, The informal channels are considered. Informal channels are less stable and is limited to a specific audience. Scientists discuss with colleagues and students, and also spoke at conferences, seminars, and conferences for information exchange. This eventually led to the formation of an invisible college is an information and communication network is hidden and not obvious.

Knowledge Sharing

Sharing of knowledge, but as a complex value, the foundation and basis of knowledge management

strategy, organizations There are different perspectives on knowledge-sharing behavior. That Some consider it normal And Some consider it abnormal. For example, Davenport argues that knowledge-sharing is often abnormal and people do not share their knowledge to because they think their knowledge is important and valuable. The researchers believe that sharing knowledge is a natural tendency of people to the holder (Ardichvili,2003).

priorities announced by one of the authors knowledge management, motivating people to share their knowledge.

Although some believe that knowledge is power, But it seems that knowledge itself is power But what is the people, it is part of their knowledge with others who share (Chennamaneni, 2006). The role of knowledge sharing in Knowledge Management is so important that some authors have suggested that knowledge management for supporting knowledge-sharing is.

Electronic discussion groups

Today, the Internet phenomenon and global epidemic intelligence pace is amazing. Email is the most widely used tools. And robust Internet applications and, in fact, is one of the cheapest means of communication at all times. One of the applications of electronic discussion groups.

Group discussion will be That Every message sent to all members who subscribe to the discussion group, where they are sent. When a person becomes a member of a discussion group, Her name and email address will be added to the mailing list And Subscribe to receive the standard message that often includes some useful information about the discussion group, Also not sharing information about how the list is sent to e-mail subscribers. Since then, he receives mail messages can And Will start sending messages to others; He may be all the people on the list, or to a person or group of persons to respond (Kim, 2007).

Subscribers discussion groups to Sharing of knowledge, Questions for the group, In response to questions raised by others, Advertisements Conferences And Call for papers Exchange Nzrdrbarh specific topics in the areas of common interests, Careers Etc. Enabling the formation. Discussion groups can be supervised or unsupervised. Moderated discussion groups, an observer, the author's message to all subscribers before re-post, to ensure its relevance and appropriateness to the group's interest to explore. To monitor the messages slander, defamatory or unrelated to remove from the list Cata LISt A useful list of discussion groups include 55823 lists "listserv" is a general academic interest. Anyone can browse through the list of names, a list of host names and host country or Browse to search alphabetically. The Reference to Internet Discussion and Information LISts Another useful resource in different subjects. Can lists alphabetical list name, description, or may be browsed areas. Each person in the group discussions covered a wide range of various topics From astronomy to medicine, Anthropology and Politics Models Directory Etc. To search. This guide will list name, account information, descriptor, and the manager notes provide additional to Mailing LISts The Directory of Publicly Accessible. A comprehensive, searchable directory of nearly 7,000 public discussion groups are available. LISzt Newsgroups and Mailing LISt another useful guide discussion groups, Usenet newsgroups and chat online. More than 9,000 listserv, or the exact topic of the search tree is easy to incorporate organic matter (Wasko,2000).

3. Materials AND Methods

3.1. Research Questions

- The use of electronic discussion groups among librarians in terms of sex, age and education look like?

- What discussion groups in the use of e-LIS members and PUBLIB discussion groups are affected?

- Restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups for members of the discussion groups and e-LIS PUBLIB What is?

3.2. Hypotheses

H1: The motivation and the use of electronic discussion groups, there are significant differences between librarians and out of the country.

H2: At Restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups between librarians and out of the country, there is a significant difference.

H3: At Motivation and the use of library electronic discussion groups based on variables such as gender, age and education, there are significant differences.

H4: Between Restrictions on the use of library electronic discussion group based on sex, age and education, there are significant differences.

3.3. Research Methodology

population Librarians are That LIS Library's electronic discussion group And Library PUBLIB electronic discussion group members are. LIS population group included 3000 people And PUBLIB population group included 3000 people. For data collection All electronic messages ranged from six months and also made online questionnaire was used. Questionnaire at 3 different intervals were shared among group members And In some Library Blog (14/04/91 - 17/04/91- 04/18/91 -24/04/91) and the data were collected.

The names of the participants ranged count showed a month That 211 people At Electronic discussion groups LIS And 235 people At PUBLIB electronic discussion group Have participated in group

discussions And Many emails sent Both groups belong to the electronic discussion.

So Given that members of both groups is much less than the total number And The amount of electronic messages sent in response to a variety of reasons, even in small groups is an active member The questionnaire return rate 80 people in LIS And PUBLIB is a group of 50 people.

According to The few active members of the population, Get more responses from groups of and Lack of time, The same data is used for statistical analysis. Electronic questionnaire designed In May Julay 2012 (Persian date Tir 1391) is sent to all members of electronic discussion groups (LIS and PUBLIB). The e-mail is sent from Iran and abroad and the location is not limited to a particular city or country.

Firstly Join conducted At Discussion group e-mail discussion group for librarians, librarians and LIS PUBLIB.

Send an email message to a member's membership interest, send e-mail discussion group was responsible And After the confirmation e-mail discussion group discussion groups e received. In the second phase, a questionnaire was sent electronically to all members of the group. Based on demographical information (Sex, age, level of education) And It also surveys the goals, motivations and obstacles of using electronic discussion groups on the moon Julay 2012 (Persian date Tir 1391).

To illustrate the impact of barriers and electronic discussion groups LIS and PUBLIB The range features 5 point Likert scale was used. (Option 5 Very much, Option 4 high, Option 3, the average, Option 2 Low, Option 1 is too low) Then Average per component (incentive or prevent the use of discussion groups) were obtained and compared between these components.

Results in the form of tables and graphs display the frequency distributions.

To test the research hypotheses, Data collected at the two wards Descriptive Statistics And Inferential statistics Were analyzed by SPSS software.

First test data normality by Kolmogorov - Smirnov test was evaluated. The independent t test was used to determine significant differences. And Since the Prerequisite for comparison Equality of variance in the dependent variable in the two groups, The Levine test for equality of variance was performed to test.In this study, to enhance the credibility or validity of the questionnaire, After studying the subject and background check investigation, An electronic questionnaire was designed in consultation with the supervisor and was sent to a number of professors of library. Finally, after collecting the views of teachers, reform was necessary and the final questionnaire was designed. The questionnaire for LIS in Farsi And English for Group PUBLIB Was submitted. Questionnaire Cronbach's alpha coefficient equal to 0.849 Note that the alpha value is greater than 0.7, we conclude that the questionnaire has good reliability.

4. Results And Discussion

In response to the first research question regarding the usage of the library electronic discussion group based on sex, age and education were the following analysis:

- **Gender of respondents**

Table 1. Gender distribution of respondents

percent (PUBLIB)	Frequency (PUBLIB)	percent (LIS)	frequency (LIS)	Sex
66	33	61.3	49	Female
34	17	38.8	31	Male
100	50	100	80	Total

For the variable gender, frequency and percentage were calculated. As you can see, most of the respondents electronic discussion groups LIS and PUBLIB Were women. As (61.3)% of those in electronic discussion groups LIS And 66% of people on PUBLIB electronic discussion group The female form.

- **Age of respondents**

Table 2. Age distribution of respondents

percent (PUBLIB)	Frequency (PUBLIB)	percent (LIS)	frequency (LIS)	Age (years)
6	3	63.8	51	20-30 years
14	7	26.3	21	31-40 years
24	12	10	8	41-50 years
56	28	0	0	50 years old

For the variables age, frequency and percentage were calculated According to the data, most respondents Electronic discussion group LIS With ages between 20-30 years And PUBLIB electronic discussion group With ages over 50 years.

- **Education of respondents**

Table 3. Frequency distribution of respondents' education

percent (PUBLIB)	Frequency (PUBLIB)	percent (LIS)	frequency (LIS)	Education
0	0	20	16	Bachelor
98	49	70	56	MA
2	1	10	8	PhD

The results of the questionnaire show That At LIS discussion group 20 percent of undergraduate 70 percent graduate 10% of PhD Questions are answered. At PUBLIB discussion group 98% graduate 2% of PhD Questions are answered. In both groups, the majority of respondents are in graduate school.

In response to the second research question Factors that affect the use of discussion groups The members of electronic discussion groups (LIS and PUBLIB) Rating choices were based on a Likert type scale.

Table 4. Impact of incentives on the use of electronic discussion groups LIS and PUBLIB

Row	Components	Average (PUBLIB)	Average (LIS)
1	Taking advantage of the knowledge and professional members	4.2	3.9
2	Information Of News Discipline	4	4.4
3	Having the confidence to In response to the comments or send messages or articles To Members	3.4	3.3
4	Expertise and knowledge to produce valuable knowledge for members	3.6	3.2
5	Experience to generate valuable knowledge for members	3.7	3.7
6	Build capacity in solving problems related to knowledge	3.9	3.9
7	Improve their professional practice (work)	4	3.8
8	Helpful for my research and current needs	3.5	3.5
9	Right combination of members (of expertise)	3.6	4.1
10	Exchange information with Human Resources Specialist	4	4.2
11	Ease of electronic communication	3.8	4.2
12	Meet the teachers and stay in touch with their	2.8	4.2

Information from the news field, the members of the discussion group e-LIS and utilizing the knowledge and expertise of group members, between members of the discussion group e PUBLIB issues that most of the discussion groups e in the electronic discussion group formed. familiar with Teachers Among the top reasons for using electronic discussion groups with mean 2/4 discussion groups, e LIS members but average 8/2 PUBLIB discussion group is not considered among the top reasons.

In response to the third research question That Restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups for members of the two groups range Likert scores were used. Then Average earned for each component was compared between these factors.

Table 5. Restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups LIS and PUBLIB

Row	Components	Average (PUBLIB)	Average (LIS)
1	Lack of Internet access	1.8	2.3
2	Internet speed is slow	1.9	2.8
3	The cost of using the Internet	1.7	2.4
4	Lack of time	3.4	3.1
5	of confidence, possibility of saving interest in electronic discussion groups	2	2.3
6	Lack of expected performance (depending on there current digger)	2.3	2.9
7	In the present lack of knowledge and exchange ideas with group members	2.6	2.7
8	No experience needed to provide feedback and share knowledge with team members	2.4	2.7
9	Overcrowding and congestion messages	3.2	3.6
10	False news and rumors among members	2.1	2.9
11	Lack of interest in participating in electronic discussion groups	2.1	2.4
12	Felt no need to participate in electronic discussion groups	2	2.3
13	Feel no need to learn more about their specialty	2.1	2
14	Lack of self-confidence necessary to provide comments	2.4	2.5
15	The main language proficiency	2	2
16	There is insufficient information from electronic discussion groups	2.3	2.7

Overcrowding and congestion messages in electronic discussion group LIS And lack of time At PUBLIB electronic discussion group Is one of the greatest barriers to the use of electronic discussion group.

Comparison At Electronic discussion groups show That Median barriers on all items except for the lack of time and lack of need for more information about field At Electronic discussion groups LIS More than PUBLIB electronic discussion group.

The first hypothesis: The motivation and the use of electronic discussion groups, there are significant differences between librarians and out of the country.

First, normal data is checked. Null hypothesis in this test is normally distributed variables.

Table 6. Test results of the Kolmogorov – Smirnov for the normal distribution of scores

Variable	Significant	Kolmogorov - Smirnov Test statistic	Number
Motivated the use of LIS electronic discussion groups	0.556	0.793	80
Motivated the use of PUBLIB electronic discussion groups	0.546	0.799	50

The significance levels obtained null hypothesis is confirmed And We conclude that the motivation variables using LIS and PUBLIB electronic discussion groups have a normal distribution (significance level greater than 0.05)

To test the hypothesis that significant differences The motivation and the use of electronic discussion groups Between librarians and out of the country Levine's test and t-test was used.

Levine test the null hypothesis of equal variances is tested.

Table 7. Independent t-test for comparison Motivates the use of electronic discussion groups in the two groups

dependent variable	Group	Number	Mean	SD	T test.			Levine test	
					Significant	Degrees of freedom	t statistic	Significant	F statistic
Motivates the use of electronic discussion groups	PUBLIB	50	3.6792	0.56766	0.486	128	-0.699	-0.139	2.220
	LIS	80	3.7573	0.64944					

Levine test the significance level (0.139) more than 0.05 is the null hypothesis of equal variances is confirmed and approved.

The average incentive of using electronic discussion group At PUBLIB electronic discussion group versus 3.68 And The LIS electronic discussion group versus talk to 3.67 And a significance level equal to 0.486.

According to t-test with a significance level greater than 05/0 is the null hypothesis is not rejected. Thus motivating the use of electronic discussion groups, no significant differences in both LIS and PUBLIB.

The second hypothesis: At Restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups between librarians and out of the country, there is a significant difference.

First, normal data is checked. Null hypothesis in this test is normally distributed variables.

Table 8. Test results of the Kolmogorov – Smirnov for the normal distribution of scores

Variable	Significant	Kolmogorov - Smirnov Test statistic	Number
Barriers to use of LIS electronic discussion groups	0.480	0.840	80
Barriers to use of PUBLIB electronic discussion groups	0.930	0.543	50

The significance levels obtained null hypothesis is confirmed And We conclude that the Barriers variables to using LIS and PUBLIB electronic discussion groups have a normal distribution (significance level greater than 0.05)

Table 9. Independent t-test for comparison Barriers to ***use of electronic discussion groups in the two groups***

dependent variable	Group	Number	Mean	SD	T test.			Levine test	
					Significant	Degrees of freedom	t statistic	Significant	F statistic
Barriers to use of electronic discussion groups	PUBLIB	50	2.0723	0.57002	0.000	128	-4.005	0.316	1.015
	LIS	80	2.5219	0.65319					

Levine test the significance level (0.316) more than 0.05 is the null hypothesis of equal variances is confirmed and approved.

The average Barriers to use of electronic discussion groups At PUBLIB electronic discussion group versus 2.07 And The LIS electronic discussion group versus talk to 2.52 And a significance level equal to 0.000.

According to t-test with a significance level less than 0.05 is the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus Barriers to use of LIS electronic discussion groups Significant, is higher than PUBLIB.

As a result, Barriers to use of LIS electronic discussion groups Significant More than PUBLIB electronic discussion groups. In other words, the difference between barriers At There are two electronic discussion groups, and the second hypothesis is confirmed.

The third hypothesis: At Motivation and the use of library electronic discussion groups based on variables such as gender, age and education, there are significant differences.

- Sex

Independent t-tests are used. Null hypothesis of equal means of motivation In both women and men. Necessary to compare the mean, equal variance of the dependent variable in the two groups. The first test with equal variances Levine test is performed. Null hypothesis of equal variances in the two groups respectively.

Table 10. Independent t-test for comparison Motivates the use of electronic discussion groups between male and female

dependent variable	gender	Number	Mean	SD	T test.			Levine test	
					Significant	Degrees of freedom	t statistic	Significant	F statistic
Use impetus (LIS)	female	49	3.6684	0.64426	0.124	78	-1.554	0.496	0.468
	male	31	3.8978	0.64180					
Use impetus (PUBLIBS)	female	33	3.6981	0.58339	0.746	48	0.326	0.952	0.004
	male	17	3.6423	0.55135					

Levine test the significance level (0.496) in electronic discussion groups LIS And Levine test significance level (0.952) in PUBLIB electronic discussion group More than 0.05 is the null hypothesis of equal variances approved and will be confirmed.

Mean motivation and purpose of the library LIS electronic discussion group for woman 3.67 and the male librarian for 3.90 and a significance level equal to 0.124 and Mean motivation and purpose of the library PUBLIB electronic discussion group for women 3.70 and librarians to man 3.64 and a significance level equal to 0.746.

According to In both groups, the t-test significance level greater than 0.05 is the null hypothesis is not rejected. As a result, Motivation and objectives of the library electronic discussion group of men and women in both groups electronic discussion were not significantly different.

- Age

We use the Analysis of Variance technique. Null hypothesis in Analysis of Variance Mean of dependent variable is equal across all levels of the independent variable. If the test significance level of less than 05/0, the null hypothesis will be rejected. Reject the null hypothesis that the means of communication variables.

Table 11. Results were analyzed to examine the relationship between age and motivation of using LIS electronic discussion group

Significant	Value	SD	mean	number	Age
0.747	0.292	0.61460	3.7712	51	20-30 years
		0.74175	3.6786	21	30-40 years
		0.66964	3.8750	8	40-50 years

Table 12. Results were analyzed to examine the relationship between age and motivation of using PUBLIB electronic discussion group

Significant	Value	SD	mean	number	Age
0.957	0.104	0.14434	3.5000	3	20-30 years
		0.46954	3.6792	7	30-40 years
		0.72777	3.6792	12	40-50 years
		0.56084	3.6983	28	Above 50 years

LIS electronic discussion group to test at a significance level of 0.747 And PUBLIB electronic discussion group to 0.957 Since the significance level is greater than 0.05 is the null hypothesis is confirmed And We conclude The motivation in both groups did not differ significantly by age librarians.

- Education

Electronic discussion group LIS We use Analysis of Variance technique. Null hypothesis in Analysis of Variance technique for dependent variables at all levels of the independent variable. If the test significance level of less than 05/0, the null hypothesis will be rejected. Reject the null hypothesis that the means of communication variables. Since the Educational respondents PUBLIB electronic discussion group All except one were graduate, Therefore the calculation motives and objectives in terms of education we have in this matter.

Table 13. Results were analyzed to examine the relationship between Relationship between education and incentives to use electronic discussion group

Significant	Value	SD	mean	number	Education
0.038	3.418	0.68345	3.4115	16	Bachelor
		0.61728	3.8705	56	MA
		0.60984	3.6563	8	PhD

Table 14. Results LSD post hoc test Incentives to use electronic discussion group

Significant	Standard error of the difference	mean difference (I-J)	Education (J)	Education (I)
0.012	0.17860	-0.45908	MA	Bachelor
0.372	0.272820	-0.24479	PhD	
0.371	0.23814	0.21429	PhD	MA

Significance level to test the 0.038. The significance level of less than 0.05 is the null hypothesis was rejected And We conclude that Motivated the use of electronic discussion groups LIS Librarians are significant differences in terms of education.

LSD post hoc test results indicate that the use of incentive-mail discussion group on the librarian is licensed under graduate librarians.

The fourth hypothesis: Between Restrictions on the use of library electronic discussion group based on sex, age and education, there are significant differences.

- Sex

Independent t-tests are used. The null hypothesis. The mean barrier of men and women are equal in the two groups. If the test significance level of less than 05/0, the null hypothesis will be rejected.

Table 15. Independent t-test for comparison Barriers to use of electronic discussion group of male and female

dependent variable	gender	Number	Mean	SD	T test.			Levine test	
					Significant	Degrees of freedom	t statistic	Significant	F statistic
Barriers to use (LIS)	female	49	2.4515	0.59433	0.239	78	-1.187	0.640	0.221
	male	31	2.6290	0.73437					
Barriers to use (PUBLIBS)	female	33	1.9610	0.50237	0.054	48	-1.979	0.419	0.665
	male	17	2.2882	0.64441					

Levine test the significance level (0.46) in electronic discussion groups LIS And Levine test significance level (0.419) in PUBLIB electronic discussion group More than 0.05 is the null hypothesis of equal variances approved and will be confirmed.

Mean Barriers to use of the library LIS electronic discussion group for woman 2.45 and the male librarian for 2.63 and a significance level equal to 0.239 and Mean Barriers to use of the library PUBLIB electronic discussion group for women 1.96 and librarians to man 2.29 and a significance level equal to 0.054.

According to In both groups, the t-test significance level greater than 0.05 is the null hypothesis is not rejected. As a result, Barriers to use of the library electronic discussion group of men and women in both groups electronic discussion were not significantly different.

- Age

We use the Analysis of Variance technique. Null hypothesis in Analysis of Variance Mean of dependent variable is equal across all levels of the independent variable. If the test significance level of less than 05/0, the null hypothesis will be rejected. Reject the null hypothesis that the means of communication variables.

Table 16. Results were Analysis of Variance to examine the relationship between Relationship between age and Barriers to use LIS electronic discussion group

Significant	Value F	SD	mean	number	age
0.153	1.927	0.70548	2.5907	51	20-30 years
		0.53906	2.5060	21	31-40 years
		0.45162	2.1094	8	41-50 years

Table 17. Results were Analysis of Variance to examine the relationship between Relationship between age and Barriers to use PUBLIB electronic discussion group

Significant	Value F	SD	mean	number	age
0.542	0.725	0.32476	2.1250	3	20-30 years
		0.53034	2.3625	7	31-40 years
		0.42459	2.0104	12	41-50 years
		0.64754	2.0206	28	Above 50 years

LIS electronic discussion group to test at a significance level of 0.153 And PUBLIB electronic discussion group to 0.542 Since the significance level is greater than 0.05 is the null hypothesis is confirmed And We conclude The Barriers to use in both groups did not differ significantly by age librarians.

- Education

Electronic discussion group LIS We use Analysis of Variance technique. Null hypothesis in Analysis of Variance technique for dependent variables at all levels of the independent variable. If the test significance level of less than 0.05, the null hypothesis will be rejected. Reject the null hypothesis that the means of communication variables. Since the Educational respondents PUBLIB electronic discussion group All except one were graduate, Therefore the calculation motives and objectives in terms of education we have in this matter.

Table 18. Results were Analysis of Variance to examine the relationship between Relationship between education and Barriers to use in electronic discussion group

Significant	Value F	SD	mean	number	Education
0.831	0.185	0.54748	2.6094	16	Bachelor
		0.69678	2.4955	56	MA
		0.58128	2.5156	8	PhD

Significance level to test the 0.831. Since the significance level is greater than 0.05 is the null hypothesis is confirmed And so we That Barriers to use of electronic discussion groups, no significant differences in terms of school librarians.

5. Conclusion And Suggestions

This study is the first research That Associated with sex, age and education in both LIS and PUBLIB electronic discussion groups have done. It also shows That Most members of the LIS electronic discussion groups are Women in the age group 20-30 years And postgraduate and That Most members of the PUBLIB electronic discussion groups are Women in the age group above 50 years And postgraduate. Use impetus LIS electronic discussion group are significant in terms of library education. Incentives to use electronic discussion group The library is licensed under the Library Master and PhD.

Research papers are done at the graduate level The main motivation is to study this point.

According to statistical analysis, the barriers to the use of discussion groups in terms of sex, age and education are not significantly different.

As a result, There were no significant differences in barriers to the use of electronic discussion groups between men and women, different age groups, and the Education BA, MA and Ph.D. And barriers to the use of electronic discussion groups in terms of sex, age and education are equally.

Information from field news with an average of 4/4 most And Lack of self-confidence necessary to respond to comments And Send a message to the team with an average of 3/3 And Lack of expertise and knowledge to produce a mean value of 2/3 of the minimum Of Incentives for the use of LIS electronic discussion groups form.

Taking advantage of the knowledge and professional activities with mean 4.2 most And Meet the teachers and their relation to average 2.8 the lowest, The use of incentives PUBLIB electronic discussion groups to form.

Increasing the density of messages with an average 3.6 in the LIS electronic discussion group And lack of time, with an average of 3.4 PUBLIB electronic discussion group, In both cases most of the restrictions on use of electronic discussion groups have formed.

Having dominate the main language And Felt no need For more technical information on average 2 in LIS Electronic discussion group and Internet usage costs Average 1.7 in PUBLIB electronic discussion group minimum of restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups to form. If the Mean component is higher than the number 3, showing a high degree of influence and If the Average number 3 below shows the components of effectiveness is low.

The findings show Barriers to use of electronic discussion groups in LIS and PUBLIB electronic discussion groups Except Compression options Message And Lack of time Is below average.

As a result, There are no restrictions on the use of electronic discussion groups among respondents there.

There are significant differences between barriers to electronic discussion groups. Comparison barriers And Restrictions on the use of discussion groups between LIS and PUBLIB electronic discussion shows that The most controversial issues in the Internet (access is easy, fast and cost), false news and rumors and is not expected efficiency So that means these components (application blocks) in electronic discussion groups LIS electronic discussion group was more PUBLIB And shows the impact of these barriers on the use of electronic discussion groups in LIS electronic discussion groups.

As a result, Entries must be sent to the group without specifying the source of the message and verify the authenticity of the message to prevent Until Electronic discussion group messages LIS confidence levels increase.

The elements of motivation and the average result will be a great motivation for use between members of both groups are discussion groups.

Information from field reports with an average of 4.4, Exchange information with human resources specialist with mean 4.2, Easy electronic communication with mean 4.2, Meet the teachers and their relationship with mean 4.2 And Right mix of members with an average of 4.1, The main motivation are in LIS electronic discussion group.

Taking advantage of the knowledge and professional activity, averaging 4.2, Information from field reports with an average of 4, Professional performance with a mean of 4 And Exchange information with human resources professionals with an average of 4, The main motivations are in PUBLIB electronic discussion group.

Most of the difference in motivation "Teachers Meet and stay in touch with them" is That LIS electronic discussion groups with mean 2.4 as high motivation, but In PUBLIB electronic discussion group, with mean 2.8 as low motivation for the use of their electronic discussion groups.

References

1. Ahmad N., Daghfous A. (2010). Knowledge Sharing through inter organizational Khnowledge Networks Challenges and Opportunities in the United Arab Emirates. Eur. Bus. Rev.,22(2),153-74.
2. Ardichvili, A., page, V., & Wentling, T. (2003). Motivation and barriers to participation in online knowledge-sharing communities of practice. Journal of knowledge Manegment,7(1),64-77.
3. Chennamaneni, A. (2006). Deeterminants of Knowledge Sharing Behaviops: Developing and esting an Integrated Theoretical Model (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at Arlington.
4. Dube, L., Bourhis, A., & Jacob, R. (2003). Towards a typology of online communities of practice. Retrieved on November 11, 2005 from http://gresi.hee.ca/cahier.asp
5. Gray, B. (2004). Informal learning in an online community-of-practice. Journal of Distance Education, 19(1), 20-35.
6. Hara, N. (2007). IT support for communities of practice: How public defenders learn about winning and losing in court. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 58(1),76-87.
7. Kim, T. L. S., WAH, W. K. & Lee, T. A. (2007). Asynchronous Electronic Discussion Group Analisis Postings and Perception of In-servise Teachers. Journal of Distance Education – Tojde,8(1).
8. Wasko, M. M., & Faraj, S. (2000). "It is what one does:" Why people participate and help others in electronic communities of practice. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 9, 155-173.

3/25/2019