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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The Research aims to identify the barriers that prevent sharing knowledge freely among academics.

Theoretical framework: The foundation for building a theoretical framework is knowledge sharing barriers quality of private university education performance.

Methods: The research sample, and the data contained in the form were analyzed by using the excel Program and the Program Statistical (SPSS) relying on arithmetic means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients, simple and multiple determinant regression analysis.

Results and conclusions: Most important recommendations were reached represented in the need to focus the attention of the universities studied in addressing weaknesses in teachers’ confidence in the information they share which requires encouraging them to share their knowledge and experiences from in order to increase the psychological and environmental stability of the teachers.

Finding implication: The findings will contribute to differences in knowledge sharing barriers and quality of private university education performance.

Uniqueness/value: The research results are to overcome the barriers to knowledge sharing in the private private education sector, which contributes to the development of this vital aspect and keeping pace with modern skills in education.
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RESUMO

Propósito: A pesquisa visa identificar as barreiras que impedem o compartilhamento livre de conhecimento entre acadêmicos.

Estrutura teórica: A base para a construção de uma estrutura teórica é a partilha de conhecimentos barreiras de qualidade do desempenho da educação universitária privada.
Métodos: A amostra de pesquisa e os dados contidos no formulário foram analisados utilizando o Programa Excel e o Programa Estatístico (SPSS) baseando-se em meios aritméticos, desvios padrão e coeficientes de correlação, análise de regressão determinante simples e múltipla.

Resultados e conclusões: As recomendações mais importantes foram alcançadas na necessidade de focar a atenção das universidades estudadas na abordagem de deficiências na confiança dos professores na informação que compartilham, o que requer incentivá-los a compartilhar seus conhecimentos e experiências a partir de a fim de aumentar a estabilidade psicológica e ambiental dos professores.

Encontrando implicações: As descobertas contribuirão para diferenças nas barreiras de compartilhamento de conhecimento e qualidade do desempenho do ensino universitário privado.

Exclusividade/valor: Os resultados da investigação são superar as barreiras à partilha de conhecimentos no setor privado da educação, o que contribui para o desenvolvimento deste aspecto vital e para acompanhar as competências modernas na educação.

Palavras-chave: Barreiras de Compartilhamento de Conhecimento, Qualidade do Desempenho do Ensino Universitário Privado.

RGSA adota a Licença de Atribuição CC BY do Creative Commons (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1 INTRODUCTION

All organizations have cultures, and culture, whether good or bad, reinforces values and behaviors that support or discourage the goals of any organization. Therefore, cultures that stand in the way of exchanging knowledge constitute great barriers to creating and benefiting from knowledge assets that have become a means of distinction in the knowledge age. From this point of view, this study came to show the barriers of knowledge sharing in organizations, and how they can be overcome and avoided to facilitate the process of knowledge sharing. In this context, it should be noted that private university education organizations are the most prominent knowledge-producing organizations and the largest storehouses and exporters of knowledge in society. Therefore, these organizations are supposed to develop and share knowledge and experiences among the faculty members themselves, especially as they are now facing many demands to achieve quality. Sharing resources and experiences. Faculty members, as knowledge makers, are considered the main element in influencing change in the knowledge society in the current era. As they play essential roles in the development of information technology and changes in work and production systems. Accordingly, the current research came to shed light on identifying the obstacles that prevent knowledge sharing freely between academics. However, the reality is that knowledge sharing is rarely found in private university education these days. As countries shift towards building a knowledge-based society, academic organizations are now faced with ever-increasing demands from faculty members to share high-quality resources and expertise. As a result, barriers to sharing knowledge in academia have become a major concern.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Concept of Barriers to Knowledge Sharing

In light of the increasing competitive pressures in addition to the changing market conditions, organizations have become interested in knowledge management. Knowledge
sharing, in particular, is an important part of knowledge management and an important means of increasing the competitiveness and performance of organizations (Yeşil & Hırlak, 2013). In response to this significant importance, researchers have begun to study barriers to knowledge sharing in various regulatory and industry settings. They discussed and identified many barriers that prevent knowledge sharing activities in organizations (Yeşil & Hırlak, 2019). Numerous studies have shown potential barriers to knowledge sharing in different situations, including virtual teams, virtual communities of application, and universities in general. Many researchers have also explored barriers in knowledge sharing from a cross-cultural perspective (Vajjhala & Vucetic, 2013). According to the studies conducted on the concept of knowledge management, researchers discovered that barriers to knowledge sharing begin at the individual level, then at the cultural and philosophical level, as well as at the organizational level. Loss of power, insecurity, disclosure, and motivation are responsible for the challenges at the individual level of knowledge sharing (Lartey et al., 2022). There are various factors identified by (Zawawi et al., Zawawi), including lack of self-efficacy for representation of individual factors, lack of information and communication technology for representation of technological factors, and lack of organizational rewards for representation of organizational factors. The existence of a culture of sharing Lack of confidence and unwillingness to share knowledge in the sense of the reason for the barriers to knowledge sharing Lack of personal relationships Competitiveness Fear of losing exclusivity Lack of time Lack of administrative support, a complete motivational system and language proficiency Lack of self-efficacy, lack of Information and communication technology, and lack of organizational rewards are all barriers to knowledge sharing (Rafique & Anwar, 2019). (Ipe, 2003) identified four main factors that affect knowledge sharing and cause barriers to knowledge sharing for individuals within organizations, and these factors also affect each other because they are all interconnected (Al Hawamdeh & Al-edenat, 2019): 1. The nature of knowledge 2 Motivation for participation 3. Opportunities for participation 4. Culture of the work environment In fact, there is a strong correlation between the psychological desire to possess that knowledge and to hide it. It is the strongest variable that predicts the probability of withholding and concealing knowledge. Often, the belief of working individuals that the knowledge they exchange during work is personal property, increases the odds of them refraining from sharing knowledge, which indicates the strength of the impact of personal barriers on limiting knowledge sharing (Al-Balawi, 2019). Finally, barriers to knowledge sharing can be defined as (barriers that prevent the flow of knowledge between colleagues) (Hubert & Lopez, 2013). As for (Blagov et al., 2017), he defined it as (factors of different nature that impede the processes of knowledge sharing). Knowledge sharing barriers are defined as everything that prevents knowledge sharing in private university education, which leads to barriers between knowledge sharing and the level of actual performance to be achieved. Which prevents making knowledge available for sharing between individuals working in private universities.

2.2 Dimensions of Barriers to Knowledge Sharing

The results of Szulanski (1996) show that the main barriers to internal knowledge sharing are knowledge-related factors such as the recipient's lack of absorptive capacity, causal ambiguity, and the arduous relationship between the source and the receiver (Yeşil & Hırlak, 2013). Therefore, understanding and sharing the barriers that make knowledge sharing difficult is the first step in identifying possible solutions to overcome them (Mercedes, 2016). Table (1) shows the dimensions of the barriers to knowledge sharing according to the needs of each researcher and their suitability with the study environment.
Our study adopts four different types of knowledge sharing barriers: individual, organizational, technological, and cultural identified by (Karagoz, 2017). Individual barriers are associated with a lack of time, confidence, and differences in age, education, and experience. Organizational barriers relate to lack of organizational vision, strategy, structure, hierarchy, and interdepartmental competition. Technology-related barriers include inadequate training and technical support in relation to information technology and various systems issues.

2.3 Individual

Chilton (2010) and Bloodgood (2010) highlight that organizations with solid knowledge capital will have a better chance of achieving competitive advantage than their competitors who do not. Researchers have suggested that one aspect that significantly influences the use of knowledge resources is the individuals who access those resources to fulfill organizational obligations as well as use them in decision-making and other functions (Nadason et al., 2017). Individual barriers include loss of cognitive ability, poor publicity of knowledge sharing (one of the causes of barriers to knowledge sharing), uncertainty about the value of knowledge to be shared, and lack of motivation (Igbinovia & Ikenwe, 2017).

(Von Krogh et al., 2000) argue that individual barriers to knowledge sharing entail the new relationships a person acquires when changes occur. A person's beliefs, location and identity are reflected in the knowledge he possesses. This means that every time someone shares the knowledge they possess they are revealing a little bit of themselves, and therefore it is necessary to build some kind of trust within the organization to enable knowledge sharing and move away from barriers to knowledge sharing.

2.4 Organizational

change required is regularly impeded by organizational conflicts, power dynamics, managerial applications, and evaluation as well as rewarding systems that cause a barrier to the knowledge sharing process (Nadason et al., 2017). The identity of the organization is reflected based on its exclusive values and culture. Organizational culture always refers to values, beliefs, and systems that either promote or inhibit knowledge creation and sharing within organizations (Michailova & Minbaeva, 2012). And organizational barriers, according to Bounfour (2003), is the organizational procedures and routine standards for sharing between working individuals, which then become barriers to knowledge sharing because they are not compatible with their own process (Engström & Kallberg, 2019).

2.5 Technological

In our current era, technology has become a major tool in overcoming barriers to knowledge sharing. Social media has become a platform for knowledge sharing. However, it will not be effective if the working individuals lack knowledge in the field of technology and do not know how to apply the technology in the environment of the organization. The authors also stress that it will be difficult to use systems if you do not know how to control and use them (Nadason et al., 2017). Bounfour (2003) states that technological infrastructure and processes within an organization can be barriers to knowledge sharing if they lack necessary parts or if they do not support certain activities or functions. The technological solutions used by the organization may also be incompatible with the dynamics of organizations.
2.6 Cultural

Many studies have identified cultural barriers as one of the main barriers that affect the successful implementation of knowledge sharing activities in organizations (Vucetic, 2013). Vajjhala, Bounfour, 2003: There are cultural barriers that can negatively affect organizational processes, such as communication, which in turn allow knowledge sharing. These cultural barriers are, for example, lack of trust, different cultures, vocabularies, different ideas about what productive work is, intolerance of making mistakes, and the culture of knowledge sharing in the organization depends on personal trust, communication between individual workers, information systems, rewards, and organizational structure. This plays a vital role in describing the relationships between working individuals as well as providing the potential to overcome barriers to knowledge sharing (Nadason et al., 2017).

2.7 The Concept of Quality of Performance of Private University Education

The concept of quality of performance has moved from the field of industry to the field of private university education and its concepts have multiplied (Asmaa 2016). The quality and performance of private university education has become a global trend that is highly relied upon in various activities and procedures related to the establishment of educational organizations or programs, given the close link between evaluation systems and quality systems in private university education, as this close link between them is one of the requirements for academic accreditation for private university education. Private universities that obtain accreditation can claim that they apply processes or standards for the quality of university education performance, and then the accredited or recognized organization is the one that meets the requirements for the quality of university education performance, based on the continuous evaluation system (Van Son et al., 2023; Roesminingsih & Khamidi, 2023; Andrade et al., 2023). (Nashmi and Hassoun, 2018). The term "quality of performance of private university education" has been defined by many scholars, such as "excellence in university education", "adding value in university education", "suitability of the educational result and experience for use", "specifications and requirements", "avoiding defects in university education process" and “meeting or exceeding customers’ expectations of university education” (Kwek et al., 2010). The quality of private university education performance is defined as an integrated system that deals with aspects of private university education systems with the aim of improving its products. The beneficiaries' desires and their different abilities. Because of the multiplicity of definitions of the quality of private university education performance, a group of these definitions have been clarified in the table below, according to the researchers’ opinions (Abbas et al., 2022; Ajyad et al., 2022).

| Table (1) Concept of quality of performance of private university education |
|---|---|
| N | researcher / year | Concept |
| 1 | Sharm, 2012 | A commonly used measure of success in community educational organizations is the extent to which a student completes his or her studies and related tasks. |
| 2 | Yusuf et al., 2016 | The quality of private university education performance can be understood as the measurable and clear behavior of the student during a specified period, which is a set of grades obtained by the student in various assessments through semester tests, mid-term and end-of-semester exams, etc |
| 3 | El Talla et al., 2018; 63 | The outcome of the various activities carried out by the organization, which is a reflection of the way in which tangible and intangible resources are invested in university education in order to achieve the goals and required performance |


<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ghaidan, 190:2020</td>
<td>The degree obtained by the respondent on the academic performance scale of faculty members in university education and its sub-dimensions, which was developed by the researcher for this purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kumar et al., 2021:3093</td>
<td>The acquisition of knowledge: Gaining skills and competencies, have high grades and similar academic achievement; career insurance; Perseverance towards private university education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on SPSS output (2023)

2.8 Dimensions of the Quality of Private University Education Performance

As a result of the diversity of views on the dimensions of the quality of private university education performance, the following dimensions were chosen: Crissien-Borrero et al., 2019); (Badarkhan, 2018, Rashid et al., 2005) (Colby et al., 2000)

1. Requirements for Scientific Research The adoption of scientific promotions for a faculty member is linked to the requirements of scientific research represented by participation in seminars, activities and scientific research, and the implementation of innovative scientific research in the field of specialization (Badarkhan, 2018). Today, educational organizations work as development organizations to achieve progress and development for society, through scientific research. Therefore, it is still one of the most important pillars of private university education organizations. (Mantikatan & Abdulgani, 2018).

2. Community Service Requirements Community service is understood as an organizational participation in the local community and its broader contribution to the development of local environments with related educational offerings (Lalić, 2017). The concept of community service crystallizes in educational activities that motivate faculty members, students, and all individuals working in the university to employ knowledge outside the walls of the university, to bring about developmental changes in society (Al-Ghamdi & El-Sisi, 2022). Therefore, community service is an activity to benefit from education and technology to enhance the welfare of society and educate working individuals (Wike & Cahyasari, 2018).

3. Scientific staff These are the backbone of any educational organization; The quality of private university education performance for faculty members adds one of the important dimensions to the quality of private university education performance (Crissien-Borrero et al., 2019). And expectations for a university professor to only do research- and teaching-related roles have changed permanently in recent years to include more responsibilities (Alkathiri Olson, 2019).

4. Study programs In order to achieve the objectives of the quality of private university education performance, there must be methods and tools that can be used to encourage and support the process of continuous improvement of the educational service (Rasheed et al., 2005). The program offered by the educational organization must properly provide instruction in science, core, technical subjects (including general and electives), various technologies and relevant experiential training/technical skills (Crissien-Borrero et al., 2019). Work and the requirements of society (Al-Adwani, 2005).

5. High-quality physical environments The importance of material resources criterion stems from the fact that it constitutes the incubating environment for all activities and tasks undertaken by the educational organization, such as university education, scientific research and community service. This environment and its quality is one of the foundations on which the university must develop efficient plans to ensure, monitor and continuously improve it, and implement procedures to implement these plans and monitor them periodically. Perhaps one of the main criteria for ensuring the safety and
quality of the private university education environment is ensuring the availability of material resources necessary for this environment and its good management, in terms of sound financial planning and setting clear budgets for the activities and tasks of the organization that are in line with its vision and mission, and developing plans to provide that, whether from academic sources or from outside the academic scope, developing plans to manage potential risks (Izfs, 2021).

6. Financial Aspects Good financial management is one of the keys to the success of an educational organization in upgrading or improving its quality. Funding for private university education organizations is intended not only for educational activities, but also for research and community service; Supporting student activities and the welfare of teachers and workers in private university education. (Permenristekdikti No. 44 of 2015) regarding private university education standards stipulates that the core of funding standards in all private university education organizations, at least, regulates or provides for financing private university education, which consists of investment costs, operating costs, and personal costs.

Ali et al., 2019) 7. Quality of Processes Until recently, much of the discussion about the quality of private university education performance has focused on systems inputs, such as infrastructure and student-faculty ratios, and on curricular content. However, in recent years, more attention has been paid to educational processes—how faculty and administrators use input to frame meaningful learning experiences for students. Their work is a major factor in ensuring the quality of private university education operations (Colby et al., 2000). The quality of the outputs of the educational process can be described as the strategy that aims to employ information, skills, and capabilities to achieve continuous improvement in a way that contributes to upgrading the value of community organizations. And between the mechanisms and processes performed by the various organizations and sectors according to their orientation (Haksen & others, 2000).

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Problem

- What is the level of availability of the dimensions of barriers to knowledge sharing in relation to individual barriers, organizational barriers, technological barriers, and cultural barriers in private universities, the research sample?
- What is the level of availability of the dimensions of the quality of university education performance with its dimensions in the private universities of the research sample?
- What are the barriers to knowledge sharing from the point of view of faculty members in private universities, the research sample?
- What is the relationship between the reality of the application of knowledge sharing and the quality of university education performance in private universities, the research sample?
- Is the quality of private university education performance affected by knowledge sharing barriers?

The importance of research

- Describe and analyze the relationship and influence between recent variables, namely the barriers to knowledge sharing and the quality of private university education performance.
- Identifying barriers to knowledge sharing and its impact on raising the level of performance of faculty members in private universities by enhancing skills.
- Identifying the barriers that prevent knowledge sharing allows the study to clarify...
opportunities to create an environment that stimulates and enables the active participation of knowledge, and thus improves the performance of academic leaders in private university education.

- Take the necessary measures to encourage the sharing of academic knowledge and improve the performance of private university education.
- The findings provide useful information about what the main barriers are and how they relate to each other in order to overcome barriers to knowledge sharing for academics.

3.2 Research Objectives

- Identify the theoretical foundations of barriers to knowledge sharing.
- Identifying the barriers that prevent knowledge sharing and identifying its role in influencing the quality of private university education performance, the study sample.
- Exposing the level of barriers to knowledge sharing in private university education.
- Determining the level of the relationship between barriers to knowledge sharing and the quality of private university education performance from the point of view of the study sample.
- Examining the relationship of the impact of individual, organizational, technological and cultural barriers on the quality of private university education performance.

Fourth: the hypothetical scheme of the research

3.3 Research Hypotheses

3.3.1 Correlation hypotheses

- The first main hypothesis: There is a statistically significant correlation between the dimensions of knowledge sharing barriers (individual barriers, organizational barriers, technological barriers, and cultural barriers) and the quality of private university education performance in its dimensions, from which sub-hypotheses branch out. the following:
  a. The first sub-hypothesis: There is a statistically significant correlation between individual barriers and the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.
  b. The second sub-hypothesis: There is a statistically significant correlation between organizational barriers and the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.
  c. The third sub-hypothesis: There is a statistically significant correlation between technological barriers and the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.
D. The fourth sub-hypothesis: There is a statistically significant correlation between cultural barriers and the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.

3.3.2 Influence hypotheses

- The second main hypothesis: There is a statistically significant effect of the dimensions of knowledge sharing barriers (individual barriers, organizational barriers, technological barriers, and cultural barriers) on the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions, and the following sub-hypotheses branch out from it:
  A- Hypothesis The first sub-section: There is a statistically significant effect of individual barriers on the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.
  B- The second sub-hypothesis: There is a statistically significant effect of organizational barriers on the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.
  C- The third sub-hypothesis: There is a statistically significant effect of technological barriers on the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.
  D- The fourth sub-hypothesis: There is a statistically significant effect of cultural barriers on the quality of private university education performance in all its dimensions.

4 RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis Of The Normal Distribution Of The Study Variables

The normal distribution represents one of the common tests that are used to measure the nature and type of distribution followed by the data drawn from the community. Therefore, the normal distribution test is one of the important postulates that gives freedom and independence to analyze the results by parametric methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Kolm– Smi- Z</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Kolm– Smi- Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing barriers</td>
<td>individuality</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technological</td>
<td>2.387</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of private university education performance</td>
<td>Scientific research requirements</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific body</td>
<td>3.091</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>2.402</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>financial aspects</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process quality</td>
<td>2.558</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on SPSS output (2023)

4.1 Measuring the Stability of the Study Tool

4.1.1 Apparent validity after collecting

The form, it was found that the percentage of the arbitrators agreed to reformulate the agreed upon paragraphs (83%).
4.1.2 Structural validity of the stability of the measurement tool

The structural validity of the questionnaire tool refers to the measurement of the stability of the dimensions and variables of the study through the use of the famous measure of stability Crow Nabach alpha coefficient aimed at measuring the stability and consistency of the measurement tool by measuring the moral value of the dimensions of the study and its variables.

| Table (3) Crowe Nabach alpha coefficients for the variables and dimensions of the study |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Dimension                        | Variable                        | Constancy | Reliability | Variable                                | Constancy | Reliability |
| Knowledge sharing barriers       | individuality                   | 0.815     | 0.903       | regulatory                              | 0.907     | 0.969       | 0.952 | 0.984 |
|                                  | technological                  | 0.893     | 0.945       | cultural                                | 0.858     | 0.926       |
| The quality of private university | Scientific research            | 0.820     | 0.906       | community service requirements          | 0.907     | 0.987       | 0.952 | 0.993 |
| education performance            | Scientific body                | 0.954     | 0.974       | study programmers                       | 0.938     | 0.969       |
|                                  | financial aspects              | 0.917     | 0.958       | High quality physical environments      | 0.853     | 0.924       |
| Process quality                  | 0.846                           | 0.920     |

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on SPSS output (2023)

It is noted from the results of table (3) the stability of the knowledge sharing barriers model, which is represented in four dimensions, with a total stability score of (0.969), which is equivalent to a constructive validity of (0.984). which is equivalent to a constructive validity of (0.993)

4.2 Descriptive Statistics of the Research Describing the Results of the Study

By reviewing the opinions and preferences of the faculty members of the study sample and determining the level of agreement and suitability of the paragraphs of the measurement tool towards faculty members in the universities of the Middle Euphrates by focusing on descriptive statistical analyzes represented by (arithmetic mean, standard deviation, relative importance, coefficient of difference, level and direction of the answer) for each A paragraph of the variables under study, represented in:

The first axis: It summarizes the independent variable (barriers to knowledge sharing) with four dimensions (individual, organizational, technological, and cultural) with (30) items.

The second transformer: Including the dependent variables (the quality of private university education performance) and centered on seven dimensions (requirements of scientific research, requirements of community service, academic staff, academic programs, financial aspects, high-quality physical environments, and quality of operations) with (42) paragraphs.

| Table (4) Descriptive analysis |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| N                             | mean                     | standard        | Relative         | N                         | mean                     | standard        | Relative         |
| Individually                  | 2.95                     | 0.681           | 59%              | organizational            | 2.98                     | 0.662           | 60%              |
| Technological                 | 2.98                     | 0.764           | 60%              | cultural                 | 2.90                     | 0.653           | 58%              |
| Scientific research           | 2.97                     | 0.817           | 58%              | community service         | 2.90                     | 0.831           | 58%              |
| requirements                  |                           |                 |                  | requirements             |                           |                 |                  |
| Scientific staff              | 2.95                     | 0.741           | 59%              | study programmers        | 2.98                     | 0.604           | 60%              |
4.3 Research Hypothesis

4.3.1 Correlation hypothesis

In order to measure the first main hypothesis and indicate its acceptance or non-acceptance, the researcher resorted to testing the value of the simple correlation coefficient to find out the significance and strength of the relationship between the barriers to knowledge sharing and the quality of private university education performance, as it is noted that the value of the correlation coefficient between the barriers to knowledge sharing and the quality of university education performance Al-Ahly reached (0.993), and this value shows the strength of a strong direct relationship, and what supports the significance of this relationship is the level of confidence by (99%) and a significant level (1%), and this indicates that faculty members in the studied private universities can through addressing barriers Knowledge sharing and improving the quality of private university education performance.

Table (5) correlation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual (1)</th>
<th>Organizational (2)</th>
<th>Technological (3)</th>
<th>Cultural (4)</th>
<th>Knowledge sharing barriers (5)</th>
<th>Scientific research requirements (6)</th>
<th>Community service (7)</th>
<th>Scientific staff (8)</th>
<th>Study programs (9)</th>
<th>Financial aspects (10)</th>
<th>Environment Quality (11)</th>
<th>Quality of education operations (12)</th>
<th>Quality of education performance (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.699**</td>
<td>.841**</td>
<td>.804**</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>.877**</td>
<td>.931**</td>
<td>.927**</td>
<td>.912**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.660**</td>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>.753**</td>
<td>.729**</td>
<td>.797**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.740**</td>
<td>.830**</td>
<td>.819**</td>
<td>.771**</td>
<td>.866**</td>
<td>.788**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.761**</td>
<td>.846**</td>
<td>.835**</td>
<td>.781**</td>
<td>.884**</td>
<td>.784**</td>
<td>.882**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.729**</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>.775**</td>
<td>.726**</td>
<td>.829**</td>
<td>.708**</td>
<td>.721**</td>
<td>.860**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.773**</td>
<td>.870**</td>
<td>.866**</td>
<td>.793**</td>
<td>.906**</td>
<td>.778**</td>
<td>.938**</td>
<td>.920**</td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.750**</td>
<td>.834**</td>
<td>.820**</td>
<td>.795**</td>
<td>.874**</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>.914**</td>
<td>.914**</td>
<td>.788**</td>
<td>.919**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.722**</td>
<td>.794**</td>
<td>.768**</td>
<td>.758**</td>
<td>.834**</td>
<td>.697**</td>
<td>.712**</td>
<td>.816**</td>
<td>.803**</td>
<td>.809**</td>
<td>.755**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.798**</td>
<td>.888**</td>
<td>.877**</td>
<td>.831**</td>
<td>.933**</td>
<td>.862**</td>
<td>.931**</td>
<td>.961**</td>
<td>.878**</td>
<td>.961**</td>
<td>.935**</td>
<td>.868**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig. (2-tailed)=0.000 N=345

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on SPSS output (2023)

4.3.2 Effect hypothesis

The results of Table (6) shown in Figure (2) indicate that there is a significant opposite effect of knowledge sharing barriers on the quality of private university education performance, as increasing the knowledge sharing barriers by one unit requires an improvement in the quality of private university education performance by (0.964-0.964), ) with a standard error of (0.021) and a critical value of (-45,905). This indicates the need for the interest of faculty members in the studied universities to improve the quality of private university education performance through the development of mechanisms to address the barriers to knowledge sharing.
**Table (6)** results of analyzing the impact of knowledge sharing barriers on the quality of private university education performance with its dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>path</th>
<th>Standard weights</th>
<th>standard error</th>
<th>critical value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>(P)</th>
<th>***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing barriers --- The quality of education performance</td>
<td>-0.964</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-45.905</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.001 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Prepared by the researcher based on SPSS output (2023)

## 5 CONCLUSION

The results of the study demonstrated the interest of faculty members in the universities studied in acquiring knowledge and appropriate evaluation through communication and tolerance for past mistakes, and individual and organizational learning in a way that reduces barriers to knowledge sharing.

Private universities, the study sample, undertook to achieve strategic integration in their departments by granting initiatives and participating in achieving the goals of the university.

The results of the study demonstrated the focus of private universities on addressing internal and external technical support through improving the capabilities of integrated information technology systems.

The results showed that the studied universities focus on supporting knowledge sharing among faculty members by encouraging and strengthening teamwork.

The results proved that the studied universities seek to pay attention to employing the results of scientific research in developing the educational process by focusing on investing the ideas of teachers in a realistic way to develop the requirements of community service.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The need to focus the attention of the universities under study in addressing weaknesses in the teachers' confidence in the information they share, which requires encouraging them to share their knowledge and experiences in order to increase the psychological and environmental stability of the teachers.

The need to address the causes of lag in the surveyed universities that suffer from weaknesses in the transparency and systems of awarding fair rewards and methods of recognizing the efforts of the teachers provided, which discourages their knowledge sharing processes, which requires improving procedures for documenting tacit knowledge, which makes these universities seek to improve knowledge and reduce barriers to sharing Cognitive.

The need to pay attention to the researched universities in addressing the lack of integration of information technology systems and processes in a way that limits the methods they adopt by addressing weaknesses and encouraging teachers to develop their expertise in the use of new technologies.

It is important for private universities to pay attention to building strength and appropriate social relations to improve their knowledge sharing, which requires eliminating job alienation from which new faculty members suffer.

The surveyed universities that suffer from a weakness in motivating the teachers should implement innovative scientific research in their field of specialization in order to improve the requirements of scientific research, which requires improving their ability to participate in conferences, seminars and training courses, which contributes to the development of the educational capabilities of the teaching staff.
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