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Abstract

Knowledge sharing is the process of transferring skills and experience. Iraqi Universities have experienced few problems that lead to a reduction in the sharing of knowledge. Therefore, this study contributes to find solutions for knowledge sharing with the review of factors that affect the knowledge sharing within the higher-education sector of Iraq. In the study, the data was collected from the faulty members (N = 312) of University of Mustansiriyah in Iraq. Useful recommendations and future research direction. It’s indicates that to improve the level of knowledge sharing between researchers and staff of the higher-education sector universities must handle independent factors (awareness, personality, technology capability, Intention to share knowledge, expected contribution, expected rewards and associations, Institutional culture, and end-user focus).

Keywords:
Personality, Technology Capability, Expected Contribution, End-User Focus.

1. Introduction

Iraq is in the Middle South-west of the Asia with a population of 30 million. In 2003, Iraqi Higher education has faced severe destruction due to war sixty-one universities and 101 college buildings were demolished and looted. Iraqi higher
education has faced great damage in terms of growth and expansion, strategy, rules and regulation's building and in the overall management of higher education. [1] examined the leadership styles in educational institutions, stated that transformational leadership styles played an important role in empowering employees, trust building and inculcate the values and preferences of institutional culture among employees in order to work up to mark and to achieve the targeted outcomes. Transformational leadership has played a vital role in institutional change. [1] [2]

The above highlighted are few of the issues that are confronted by the Iraqi HEIs. These issues are difficulties for the initiative of HEIs to overcome and make their institutions more focused and realize institutional innovation so much needed to redevelop the destroyed Iraqi higher-education system. [3] From 1950 till 1990, Iraq had one of the most progressive higher educational systems in the Arabic world. [4] Economic sanctions were forced by the United Nations Security Council on Iraq in 1991, after its occupation and ensuing arrival of Kuwait. These sanctions kept going from 1991 until the middle of 2003. These decade-long economic sanctions harmed the Iraqi higher-education sector badly leading to destruction of infrastructure, information technology and reduced support for the higher-education academic community. In addition to other things a hefty portion of the universities, for example, University of Mustansiriya was pillaged by the general population. These assents and the three many years of wars isolated Iraq from worldwide improvements, particularly in science and innovation and hampered the general development ability of the Iraqi HEIs. [5]

On the other hand, there is a growing attention in treating knowledge as a vital resource for institutes. Increasingly, knowledge recognized as an important asset, particularly, in a modern institute. The universities are knowledge-intensive environments, and it has played an important role in sharing knowledge. Several studies investigate and discussed the importance of the knowledge sharing. For instance, point out that the knowledge sharing is the most important matter should be considered within the knowledge management domain, hence, knowledge management effective strategies should emphasize the knowledge sharing role to maximize the benefit that could Institute gain. In addition, the knowledge sharing is an important factor for institutes to be survived and succeed includes academic institutions. [6] The success could be represented in gaining new advantages and improving performance. In several institutes, knowledge is an important because it enhances the quality of its workers as well as enhances the operational efficiency. In an academic environment, particularly, in universities, sharing of knowledge is the most important component, because all staffs often deal with the knowledge. According to (Fullwood) previous studies on the exchange of knowledge between universities are limited. However, knowledge is difficult to be shared because it is the outcome of understanding and analysis of information and therefore, there are many difficulties in the exchange of knowledge in the higher-education sector. The
level of quality among researchers as one of this issue, especially in public and private universities. [7] Institution of higher education in the United Kingdom (UK) is facing the challenge of sharing knowledge in the field of scientific research in order to create new knowledge. These institutions are designed to develop the knowledge, because they are affected by the barriers, individual perspectives and structures organizational barriers. This study focuses on the interaction between researchers which is known as the exchange of knowledge in order to promote scientific research in Iraq. There is a need to share knowledge to support the development of scientific research implementation in. [8]

In order to resolve the issues and improve the situation, there is a need for scientific research in the higher-education sector of Iraq. Especially, in Al-Mustansiriyah University. This study suggests that sharing of knowledge in educational institutions can increase the quality of scientific research. The University of Mustansiriyah is facing some problems whereby the sharing of knowledge can be a solution to these problems through the sharing of large numbers of information and knowledge between researchers at the University of Mustansiriyah to support new scientific researchers. [9]

2. Reviews on sharing knowledge

There is recognition among researchers in: the importance of the exchange of knowledge among employees in different government and the private Institute s, and their ability to raise the level of creativity, strengthen the regulatory and competitive advantage between researcher's performances. Many researchers have been conducted inside the universities on this subject. However, research has been conducted to study the combination of factors that affect the exchange of knowledge- for example, indicated that employees' work on the same issue in the evaluation of pros and cons of sharing knowledge. Advantages can be intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, enhance performance of the Institute and expand status. A significant disadvantage is that sharing can “conceivably give away a source of power and expertise to be other's”. The parts of knowledge sharing are investigated further by (Wang and Noe) showed that the benefits of social exchange are priceless, but require a "personal commitment, gratitude and confidence." Moreover, exchange of knowledge might allow the emergence of fraternal relationship, and lead to a further exchange of knowledge among employees within the Institute s. It can be the most essential part in the academic community because it supports the exchange of knowledge and leads to the dissemination of scientific research. [10]

3. Factors Affecting on Knowledge Sharing
It has been broadly studied and agreed that few covering factors affecting on knowledge sharing conduct existed. These factors have been studied from different perspectives, for instance, as individual's management practices fostering sharing knowledge, sharing knowledge challenge, as difficulties in knowledge diffusion, as factors motivating people to share and factors that influencing on human performance. [3] Regardless of the way that the fundamental anxiety of this study is on motivational variables, it is critical to consider into account different areas of interest in antecedent sharing knowledge research. Keeping in mind clarified the context of the research problem in question. Consequently, organizational, individual and technological factors influencing on sharing knowledge are secured in this part. As the literature is carefully studied it uncovers that there appear to be two sorts of ways to deal with the factors affecting on sharing knowledge; positive methodology studying factors facilitating knowledge sharing and more pessimistic approach studying factors complicating or preventing sharing knowledge.

(Cabrera and Cabrera) oblige the previous approach and propose seven unmistakable individual's management practices to foster knowledge sharing among organizational workers. Those are work staffing, designs, preparing and improvement, performance appraisal, compensation and rewards, technology and culture. perceives more than three dozen sharing knowledge barriers showing up in previous sharing knowledge literature. These factors can be divided into three subgroups of potential challenges: organizational, individual, and technological. Likewise, has studied hardness of knowledge sharing. She studies exclusively tacit knowledge and notes that tacit knowledge must be managed uniquely from explicit knowledge to unleash its power. [11] She introduces that troubles in tacit sharing knowledge are, for the most part, perception, time, language, distance and value. Perception and language are primarily individual factors complicating sharing knowledge, though time, distance and value can be worried as organizational problems. Value of tacit knowledge is defined by organizational culture; time and distance instead are reliant, for the most part, of organizational structure. In their review research, Small and Sage have been embraced the thought of Ives et al. that sharing knowledge is a human conduct that must be inspected in the context of performance of human. [7]

4. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)

The Study adopted theory of Planned Behavior (2002), which provided a framework to study the academics’ knowledge sharing. TPB has emerged as one of the most influential and popular conceptual frameworks to study individuals’ behavioral intentions and actual behaviors. [4] According to TPB (1985), human behavior is guided by three types of salient beliefs: behavioral beliefs about the likely attributes or consequences of the behavior, prescriptive beliefs about the prescriptive expectations of other individuals, and control beliefs about the presence
of factors that may hinder or facilitate performance of the behavior. In their respective aggregates, behavioral beliefs produce a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the behavior; normative beliefs result in perceived social pressure or subjective norms; and control beliefs give rise to sensed behavioral control, the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior. In combination, attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control lead to the formation of a behavioral intention. However, due to all the conceptual and methodological ambiguities in the concept of perceived behavioral control, stated that perceived behavioral control should be viewed as two interrelated components, which he identified as self-efficacy and controllability. According to (Ajzen), the more favorable the attitude and subjective norm, and the greater the self-efficacy and controllability, the stronger should be the individual’s intention to carry out the behavior. Intention itself is regarded as the immediate antecedent of behavior. The TPB has been used in previous research to explain seeking and supply of knowledge. The framework created by (Stewart and OseiBryson), is used as a basis to investigate how the TPB applies on knowledge sharing. This framework is recent and includes most relevant papers regarding this theory. [12]

5. Theoretical framework

The theory of planned behavior (TPB) is the most popular theory for predicting and explaining human behavior. [7] TPB is comprised with three categories of beliefs, which are personal beliefs, which result from conducive and unproductive attitude (beliefs) towards behavior; second is normative belief considered as social pressure, which produced subjective norms. They are beliefs around on other’s expectations about behavior; the last one is control beliefs, which enhance perceived behavioral control, the extent to which an individual perceives easiness or difficulty in executing behavior. These components (attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control) generate intention that results from the human behavior. The theory of planned has been intensively employed to predict human behavior, most studies on knowledge sharing intentions relying on information systems have utilized the TPB. However, there are few studies in knowledge sharing behavior that utilized the components of TPB. This study is going to focus on significance of the findings and measurement of the previous studies. According to Lin and Lee, on their study which focused on managers’ perceptions but the study relying on attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control and ignoring the intention to share knowledge of the component of the theory. [3]. [6]

Moreover, there are studies, portrayed attitude, subjective norms and did not focus on perceived behavioral control as one among components of the TPB. Another study was drawn by, Gagne, which provided conceptual expansion of the theory of planned behavior by illustrating human-resource management as one antecedent component of TPB model. (Minbaeva and Pedersen), conducted empirical studies
by introducing governance mechanisms as antecedents in the theory of planned behavior. Their studies indicated that positive feedback has a relationship with positive subjective norms, and internal interaction mechanisms have correlation with higher PBC.

On other hands, the external rewards on knowledge sharing have been revealed to mixed. [8]. [9] Thus, it paves the way for extending the studies. [11] portrayed relational and cultural considerations in investigating Chinese's knowledge sharing, but the study did not display expectations in social level on what real enhances knowledge sharing behavior. In fact, social norms are dominant for acknowledging attitudes and behavior in the cultures which relaying on collectivism, specifically, knowledge sharing behavior in China and Tanzania. Thus, there is the creation of limitation on the scope of the conceptualization of the subjective norm's element. This situation, it can be illustrated it is why revealed that subjective norms had no relationship with knowledge sharing intention, this is an encouragement for investigating subjective norms as components of TPB on knowledge sharing behavior in Tanzania administrative fields for achieving BRN and other reforms. There are weaknesses in the relationship between knowledge owners and knowledge hunters in the knowledge sharing studied utilizing TPB, it paves the lope hole to extend knowledge sharing theory by considering different cultural setting, as examined by. [5] [9], however, need comparative studies employing cross-cultural samples. There are few studies, which have been conducted on the knowledge sharing examples relying only on subjective norms and attitude as the TPB mechanisms for enhancing intention to share knowledge among US and Chinese employees. The findings were related to the study carried by. [4] whereby, reciprocal relationship to share knowledge related to positive attitudes on knowledge sharing among Chinese's people. Despite availability of the data from different cultural setting for examining the impact of norms in social level on the intentions to share knowledge, but we question on the validity of findings in the context of the developing countries like Tanzania whereby culture and environment are different to the well-developed countries. In the struggle to direct research on knowledge sharing behavior in Tanzania and expanding the probability of identifying similarities and differences between developed countries (USA, China, and Russia) and developing countries like Tanzania, we suggest revising the theory of planned behavior.

6. Research Methodology

Research methodology is a “structured set of guidelines or activities to assist in generating valid and reliable research results” . Even though it is always desirable to select a methodology that maximizes generalizability, realism, and precision, all research methodologies are inherently flawed in some respect. The limitations
of using one research perspective can be addressed by using an alternative approach that compensates for another’s weaknesses. State that no one approaches to research can provide the richness that information system as a discipline needs for further advancement. The research methodology process consists of five steps. The research process requires a sequence of steps used. Below Figure, 3.1 referred to the steps throughout this research process.

6.1 Sample, Unit of Analysis and Respondents

The sampling frame for this study consisted of the lectures in the University of Mustansiriyah. More specifically, randomly sampling technique was used. An important step in research design is to determine the unit of analysis or the unit about which statements has been made. In this, study proposed data collection and statistical analyses were conducted at the organizational level. Therefore, the unit of analysis for this study was the lecturers in the University of Mustansiriyah. The totally faculties in University AL- Mustansiriyah is 12 and number staffs are 3361. The sample for this study will be estimated by the technique given by (Krejcie and Morgan), that is 346 out of total academic staff. Table Population and sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total Lecturers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Dentistry Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Medicine Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Pharmacy Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Political Science Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Law Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Science Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty if Administration and Economics Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of physical Education Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Basic Education Lectures of faculty</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special emphasis was given to the penalization of the constructs in the research framework. The items were primarily derived from previously tested survey instruments to take advantage of well-tested psychometric measures. Most of the constructs were operationalized by modifying these previously validated scales, as direct use of previous instruments was not always possible. Moreover, each constructed were measured by using multiple indicators to capture the
underlying theoretical dimensions effectively. This study was used the previous inventory questionnaire items. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of the respondent's demographic questions that include gender, age, educational background, etc. The second part was divided into ten components. Pre-test was conducted to produce a questionnaire for a better and more reliable. Pre-test was made through presentation and discussion with an expert questionnaire. Their note was considered before the end of the distribution of a questionnaire. The questionnaire was used Likert scale 5-points starting from 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (agree) to 5 (strongly agree). Likert scale has the advantage of grounding every point in rating for something tangible to respondents, as compared to the scale of the figures. Because the word associations, Likert's scales tend to work better than a numeric scale. (Nunnally and Bernstein, Carmines and McIver) Discuss the reasons for using multiple measures of things rather than as one detail to measure psychological attributes.

6.2.1 Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing was measured with 6-item scale developed by (Noor and Salim), The 6-items were “The knowledge shared by team members in the discussion board is relevant to the topic,” “The knowledge shared by team members in the discussion board is accurate” and “The knowledge shared by team members in the discussion board is reliable.

6.2.2 Awareness

Awareness was measured with 3-item scale developed by (Yassin et al.). The 3-items were “Based on the definition given, I understand the meaning of knowledge management,” and “Based on the definition given, I understand the meaning of knowledge sharing.

6.2.3 Trust

Trust was measured with 3-item scale developed by (Yassin et al.). The 3-items were “I fully trust expertise that my colleagues have," and “I believe that my colleagues will not exploit for their own interest.

6.2.4 Personality

Personality was measured with 3-item scale developed by (Yassin et al.). The 3-items were “I am an extrovert type of person (like to know what is happening, socialize and open-minded),” and “I am always cautious (R).

6.2.5 Technology Capability

Technology capability was measured with 4-item scale developed by (Ryu et al.). The 4-items were “Information Technology facilitates Collaborative Knowledge Sharing through various tools in our organization," and “Effective cataloguing and archiving procedures are in place for document management in our organization.
6.2.6 Intention to Share Knowledge

Intention to Share Knowledge was measured with 3-item scale developed by (Ryu et al.). The 3-items were “I will try to share knowledge with my colleagues,” and “I will share knowledge with my colleagues.” Each item rated on a 5-point Likert scale “1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.”

6.2.7 Expected Contribution

Expected contribution was measured with 5-item scale developed by (Bock et al.). The 5-items were “KS would help other members in the firm to solve problems,” and “KS would create new business opportunities for the Institute.

6.2.8 Expected Rewards and Associations

Expected Rewards and Associations was measured with 8-item scale developed by (Bock, Gee-Woo, Kim, Young-Gul, Lee, Jae-Nam, and Zmud, Robert W.). The 8-items were “to get better work assignments,” and “to enhance my reputation.” Each item rated on a 5-point Likert scale “1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.”

6.2.9 Institutional Culture

Institutional Culture was measured with 4-item scale developed by (Zulu). The 4-items were “The institution vision is aligned with the desired level of competitiveness,” and “The institution has a successful knowledge management system.

6.2.10 End-User Focus

End-User Focus was measured with 3-item scale developed by (Aggelidis and Chatzoglou). The 3-items were “I can easily access the organization’s database,” and “Information systems and software are user-friendly.

6.3 Data Collection Procedures

The data was collected through survey technique using emails, postal mail and self-administrated.

6.4 Conceptual framework

This study has identified the knowledge sharing framework in order to improve the sharing of knowledge among researchers and Iraqi universities. This improvement can enhance scientific research in these universities to boost their knowledge and rank. Moreover, this improvement of scientific research in Iraqi universities can solve the social issues in Iraq. However, this framework consists of nine factors as follows. Iraqi universities can use this framework to enhance scientific research among them. Moreover, this framework can improve the collaboration, interactions, trust and information sharing between academic staffs and universities. Thus, this cooperation contributes to change the situations into better especially in higher education sectors and particularly in Iraqi government. Moreover, sharing knowledge among academic staffs can enhance the quality and increase the quantity of knowledge among them. So, the increment in knowledge
has the personal advantage on academic staff, university and students as well. Eventually, the result of this study will be to develop the society in Iraq.

6.5 Statistical Analysis

Virtually, all research involves some numerical data or contains data that usefully could be quantified to help answer thesis research questions and to meet objectives. There are numerous statistical techniques for analyzing data according to nature of study. After the surveys collected, the data was analyzed using several statistical methods. Statistical methods can be used to summarize or describe a collection of data. The statistical techniques that were used throughout this study; Demographic Analysis, Descriptive Analysis, Reliability Analysis and Regression Analysis through SPSS. Statistical analysis was done to test the relationship between factors assumed by who (variables) used in the proposed modules through multiple regression techniques, which examines the relationship between variables predict their behavior in the future. These techniques predict variables based on participant value at other variables. In addition, the technique of using "free" variables that will affect some other "dependent variables." This study will use statistical software SPSS to generate statistics and relationship. SPSS is a Windows-based program that is used for analysis of data through table and graphs. SPSS can handle the amount of data Discover statistics using SPSS.

6.6 Descriptive Analysis

The data of a given situation should be characterized by some statistical measures for estimation or comparison with similar data or making inference about sample population to which the data belong. Data analysis usually involves reducing accumulated data to a manageable size, developing summaries, looking for patterns and applying statistical techniques. Scaled responses on questionnaires and experimental instruments often require an analyst to derive various functions, as well as to explore relationships among variables. [2]

6.7 Reliability Analysis

In statistical terms, the usual way to look at reliability is based on the idea that individual items (or sets of items) should produce results consistent with the overall questionnaire. Reliability is simply the ability of the questionnaire to create the same results under the same conditions. Reliability can be estimated via different methods. Cronbach’s alpha is the most common method to measure scale reliability. Below Table shows the reliability of the measurement scales. Cronbach’s alpha reliability scores should be greater than 0.7 (minimum) (Cortina, 1993). An alpha of more than 0.7 would indicate that the items are homogeneous and measuring the same constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td>0.0700</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.8 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is a statistical tool for the investigation of relationships between variables where it controls for many alternative explanations and variables simultaneously (Neuman and Kreuger), this is the powerful statistical method for sorting out influences between variables. It allows the user to identify how several variables simultaneously influence the value of another variable. These influences can be assessed with statistically computed degrees of confidence, i.e., whether the results are due to some random occurrence or if the observed influences occur in a systematic, non-random fashion. Regression analysis as used here assesses how various member characteristics influence the participation activities. The regression procedure is found in SPSS in the “Analyze” menu, under “Regression,” then by selecting “Linear” in the Regression sub-menu. Then a dialog box will appear asking for the 2 variables that are part of the hypothesis.

6.9 Questionnaire for Data Collection

A quantitative research method was conducted in order to measure and test the relationship between different factors. Quantitative research is defined as ‘collecting numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods (in particular, particular statistics)’. For this, study distributed 346 questionnaires to total members of respondents. 334 filled questionnaires were received back. After checking the questionnaires, eliminated 22 questionnaires because of too many missing values and wrong data provided. The final number of valid responses was 312, which mean that the response rate is 90.2%.

7. Mean, Standard Deviation and Skewness

Table 4.5 shows the mean, standard deviation and skewness of independent and dependent variables. The mean and stander deviation are knowledge sharing (Mean = 2.8, S.D = 0.67), Awareness (Mean = 3.3, S.D = 0.66), Trust (Mean = 2.6, S.D = 0.67), Personality (Mean = 3.3, S.D = 0.66), Technology capability (Mean = 4.0, S.D = 0.49), Intention to share knowledge (Mean = 3.0, S.D = 0.59), Expected contribution (Mean = 5.1, S.D = 0.48), Expected rewards and associations (Mean = 8.3, S.D = 0.45), Institutional culture (Mean = 4.1, S.D = 0.49), End-User Focus (Mean = 3.3, S.D = 0.59).

Cronbach’s Alpha is a measurement tool to determine how closely a set of items is related. It is most commonly used when one has a scale of multiple Likert questions in a questionnaire, and the target is to determine if this scale is reliable. The theoretical value of alpha varies from zero to 1 and higher values of alpha are more desirable. (Nunnally and Bernstein), recommended the value of 0.70 or higher.
S.D = 0.84), Personality (Mean = 3.5, S.D = 0.94), Technology capability (Mean = 2.6, S.D = 0.79), Intention to share knowledge (Mean = 2.8, S.D = 0.97), Expected contribution (Mean = 2.5, S.D = 0.76), Expected rewards and associations (Mean = 2.5, S.D = 0.54), Institutional culture (Mean = 2.9, S.D = 1.02), and End-User Focus (Mean = 3.3, S.D = 0.69).

Table 4.6: Mean, Standard Deviation and Skewness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>2.4611</td>
<td>.54347</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.3397</td>
<td>.65583</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2.6026</td>
<td>.83563</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.5438</td>
<td>.93646</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>2.5378</td>
<td>.76186</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>2.7756</td>
<td>.97424</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUF</td>
<td>3.2810</td>
<td>.69328</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>2.6050</td>
<td>.78598</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>2.9191</td>
<td>1.02484</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>2.7596</td>
<td>.67393</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Correlations

The table 4.6 reveals the relationship between the variables used in the study. The correlations value ranges between -1 and +1, and the value of the dependent variable are generally one. The correlation results from table 6 showed Awareness (r = .449, p < 0.01), Trust (r = .298, p < 0.01), Personality (r = .330, p < 0.01), Technology capability (r = .579, p < 0.01), Intention to share knowledge (r = .888, p < 0.01), Expected contribution (r = .601, p < 0.01), Expected rewards and associations (r = .308, p < 0.01), Institutional culture (r = .113, p < 0.05), and EndUser Focus (r = .529, p < 0.01).

Table 4.7: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ERA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>ISK</th>
<th>EUF</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>KS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.414*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.118*</td>
<td>.666*</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Conclusion

This research makes a valuable contribution given the dearth of empirical studies on knowledge sharing in the Iraq. It has studied the influence of some factors on academics’ knowledge sharing behavior in Mustansiriyah University adopting the TPB. As such, it makes an essential contribution to the investigation of knowledge sharing behavior in a new context in the Iraq. This study identified nine important factors, which motivate academicians in public university to share their knowledge. These factors are Trust, Personality, Technology capability, Intention to share knowledge, expected contribution, Expected rewards and associations, Institutional culture, and End-User Focus. The results of this study showed that Awareness ($r = .449, p < 0.001$), Trust ($r = .298, p < 0.001$), Personality ($r = .330, p < 0.001$), Technology capability ($r = .579, p < 0.001$), Intention to share knowledge ($r = .888, p < 0.001$), Expected contribution ($r = .601, p < 0.001$), Expected rewards and associations ($r = .308, p < 0.001$), Institutional culture ($r = .113, p < 0.05$), and End User Focus ($r = .529, p < 0.001$) have significant support with knowledge sharing.

This research extends prior research on academic staff knowledge sharing motivations in higher learning institutions, particularly, public universities. The study findings might provide useful insights for the lecturers of universities to exploit and employed these important factors in order to encourage their academic staff to share their knowledge, and as a result, enhance their performance. This would promote, academicians themselves would feel encouraged to create and share knowledge by conducting more researchers and scientific studies and by publishing scholarly works as well as by exchanging their knowledge and expertise. A better understanding of the importance of knowledge sharing is quite fundamental for the workflow and workforce of all types of organizations regardless of the service they provide. The importance of knowledge sharing should be more obvious to
Mustansiriyah University since knowledge sharing is the core of their work and to their academics due to their deep-rooted role in higher education that views them as knowledge creators. Therefore, it is important for Mustansiriyah University to develop and harness an appropriate environment that facilitates knowledge sharing. If Iraq is to build a knowledge-based society in the region, then it must promote a culture of knowledge sharing.

10. Recommendations

A few recommendations based on the results to improve knowledge sharing among researchers. Firstly, student’s researchers should be willing to share their knowledge with other colleagues as a mean of attaining greater understanding on certain subject as well as assisting them in learning more effectively and efficiently. Besides that, academic institutions should play a role in encouraging researchers to build cordial relationship between their peers. This will serve as a medium to establish trust among each other in sharing information. Moreover, this study proposes a two ways communication, where researchers can discuss and share their opinions openly. By practicing this, lecturers may develop their personal confidence in sharing knowledge. As from the technology perspective, it is suggested that the existing technology should be improved in order to assist researchers in achieving their specific goals.
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