

Improving Service Quality and Knowledge Sharing to Build Sustainable Learning Organizations

Alaa Abdulsalam Mustafa

College of Administration and Economics

University of Misan

E-mail: alaa@uomisan.edu.iq

Abstract

Knowledge sharing is one of the processes of knowledge management in organizations. Indeed, it is one of the fundamental processes that leads to the dissemination and transfer of knowledge among individuals working in organizations, and between organizations and other organizations in their environment. The importance of this process appears through the positive results it leads to that contribute in a significant way. Significant in future planning activities and addressing functional problems faced by the organization as it seeks to achieve its goals.

The primary goal of knowledge sharing in any organization is to facilitate the transfer of knowledge between some individuals and units in it, in order to absorb the knowledge available in it or existing in other organizations, and thus accelerate the knowledge adoption process. Therefore, it is necessary for employees in the organization to learn from the accumulated knowledge, experiences, and procedures, from their work colleagues, from other departments or units in the organization, and from its internal processes and routine procedures in the organization, and then benefit from the knowledge available in other organizations. The purpose of the research is to identify the factors of knowledge sharing and their role in building sustainable learning organizations in Iraqi universities. A questionnaire form was developed to ensure the existence of a relationship between the research variables, and based on the comprehensive inventory method, (307) questionnaire forms were distributed in Iraqi universities, and their data were analyzed using the (SPSSV.24) program.

The research results showed that there is a knowledge gap related to determining the nature of the relationship between employing knowledge sharing factors in building sustainable learning organizations, and it was confirmed that there is a statistical relationship between the research variables. Therefore, the investigated universities need to enhance knowledge sharing in building sustainable learning organizations.

The results of the research can be benefited by employing knowledge sharing factors in building sustainable learning organizations, thus increasing the opportunities for universities to achieve their goals and objectives. As a result, the organization should conduct training between units, and participate in training with other organizations.

It is the first research to combine current variables (knowledge sharing and sustainable learning organizations) into one hypothetical model in Iraqi universities. This means that there is no knowledge product that determines the relationship between these variables, whether at the level of Iraqi organizations or others, so the current research came to fill that gap.

Keywords: Service quality, knowledge sharing, sustainable learning organizations, leadership, systems thinking, Iraqi universities.

Introduction

Organizations are constantly trying to identify alternatives that will help them overcome the difficulties arising from improving service quality and disseminating knowledge in the organization. One of the most important of these alternatives is improving the quality of service and sharing knowledge, which is the mechanism that enables the benefit of organizational knowledge within the framework of the organizational structure, relationships, and compensation structures. In addition, organizations seek to develop their organizational capabilities to achieve a competitive advantage that enables them to be leaders among similar organizations in light of the current challenges of scientific and technical development, conditions of globalization, factors of intense competition, multiple alternatives, declining opportunities, and the difficulty of obtaining expertise and skills, and maintaining them in light of temptations. awarded by competing organizations. According to these challenges, organizations seek to obtain knowledge and expertise from the processes of knowledge creation, acquisition, ownership, development, dissemination and sharing, and improving working conditions, in addition to the behavioral factor of the rational individual, who plays an essential role in the process of knowledge management and sharing through his tendency to develop his mental and physical capabilities and then encourage... The collective spirit, teamwork and harmony that facilitate the processes of knowledge sharing and knowledge dissemination among work team members, and thus the cognitive exchange of explicit and implicit knowledge is achieved through communications between these individuals.

The topics of improving service quality and knowledge sharing in contemporary organizations have gained great importance, given their effective and significant role in providing the foundations for achieving the organization's competitive advantage, as knowledge in the organization is an important resource that cannot be overlooked, and today's organizations are built on knowledge and learning, and in order to make this Knowledge is available and available, so it requires adopting participating factors in their correct form in order to build a sustainable learning organization to achieve its goals through improving quality. In order to determine the requirements for improving the quality of service and knowledge sharing in its theoretical and field aspects, the researcher decided to address this within two axes. The first axis represents the research methodology, the second the theoretical aspect, and the third represents the field aspect.

Methodology

Research problem:

The research problem is summarized in the difficulty that organizations face in adopting factors to improve service quality and knowledge sharing. Therefore, the current research attempts to reveal the relationship between its variables and their dimensions, and to determine the extent to which Iraqi universities have appropriate strategies for improving service quality and employing knowledge sharing factors in building sustainable learning organizations, as there are no discussions about the extent to which service quality and knowledge sharing factors contribute to building sustainable learning organizations, and this It indicates a knowledge need for how to bridge the gap between the variables of

current research. To achieve this goal, a survey was conducted in some Iraqi universities based on a checklist, which included specific items regarding service quality and knowledge sharing factors for building sustainable learning organizations. A simple random sampling method (27) individuals was adopted. The research's use of the simple random sampling method comes from their assumption that the characteristics of the sample members are similar compared to the overall population, in order to achieve a practical answer to the research paragraphs and questions.

Research questions:

Based on the research problem mentioned above, the current research seeks to answer the following cognitive and practical questions:

1. What are the conceptual considerations for service quality, knowledge sharing, and building sustainable learning organizations?
2. Can the factors of service quality and knowledge sharing contribute to building sustainable learning organizations?
3. Is there a relationship between service quality factors and knowledge sharing in building sustainable learning organizations?

Research aims:

Based on the research problem and questions, its objectives can be determined as follows:

1. Develop a conceptual model of service quality factors, knowledge sharing, and building sustainable learning organizations.
2. Determine the availability of service quality factors, knowledge sharing, and building sustainable learning organizations.
3. Identifying the relationship between service quality factors and knowledge sharing in building sustainable learning organizations.

Research hypotheses:

1. There is a positive, statistically significant correlation between improving the quality of service and sharing knowledge with building sustainable learning organizations.
2. There is a statistically significant effect of improving the quality of service and knowledge sharing in building sustainable learning organizations.

Quality of service:

There are no major differences between researchers and writers regarding the concepts of service quality, as some of them focus on one or a number of aspects without the other. Therefore, those interested in coming up with a concept of service quality often find commonalities between the most common concepts, and are known (Russell and Taylor, 2000). :79) The set of service characteristics capable of satisfying certain needs, and (Lovelock and Wright, 2002:18) refers to the degree of satisfaction that the service can achieve for beneficiaries and customers by satisfying and meeting their needs, desires and expectations. Jouda (2017: 208) defines it as the performance of the product, which leads to achieving customer satisfaction with the product without any error to avoid feelings of dissatisfaction among customers. Jeyalakshmi and Meenakumari (2016: 23) define it as a comparison between customers' expectations of the level of service performance and perceived performance.

Service quality standards:

There is a set of dimensions for service quality, which were mentioned in several references, some of which agreed on specific points and some of which added to them, and both (Parasuraman, et al., 1985: 4) and (Lovell, et al., 1996: 465) agreed that Quality has ten main standards upon which the customer bases his expectations and perceptions and according to which he judges the quality of the service provided:

1. Reliability: The ability of the service supplier to fulfill and commit to providing the service with reliability, accuracy and consistency.
2. Safety: a feeling of security and confidence in the service provided and that transactions are free of doubt or risk.
3. Credibility: represented by the degree of trust in the service provider, honesty, and reputation.
4. Ease of access: accessibility to things, and ease of communication.
5. Communications: Accuracy in communication in order to ensure quality and inform the customer of information in the language he understands.
6. The degree of the service provider's understanding of the customer: The service provider's ability to understand the customer's needs, care, and take care of him.
7. Tangibility: the physical facilities, the type of technology used, the equipment, and the formal characteristics accompanying the service, such as (equipment, devices, means of communication.)
8. Competence: The skills, analytical and deductive abilities, and required knowledge that service providers possess.
9. Responsiveness: The service provider's ability to help customers, speed in performing the service, and quick response to their inquiries.
10. Courtesy and courtesies: the service provider's tact, courtesy, respect and friendly treatment towards the customer.

Measuring service quality:

There are many models for measuring and evaluating service quality, and one of these models is the SERVQUAL Measure, which is attributed to (Parasuraman et al., 1985). This measure is based on customers' expectations of the level of service and their perceptions of the level of performance of the service actually provided, and then determining the gap or correspondence between these expectations and perceptions. This model can be used to measure five important gaps related to both the service organization and the customer, and to both, and the gaps can be summarized (Slack et al., 2001:561): as follows:

The first gap: results from a difference between customers' expectations for the level of service and the organization's management's estimates of these expectations, i.e. management's inability to know the expected needs and desires of customers.

The second gap: It results from a difference between the organization's management's estimates of customers' expectations of the service and what the organization actually performs (the service actually provided), that is, the lack of commitment to applying the specifications for the quality of service performance by its providers.

The third gap: It results from a difference between the specific specifications of quality and the actual level of performance, and one of the most important reasons that leads to the occurrence of this gap is the low level of skill of service providers.

The fourth gap: It results from a defect in the organization's credibility, what is promised and what it actually provides in terms of levels of service performance. One of the most important reasons for this gap to occur is exaggeration in promising high levels of quality.

The fifth gap: It is the result of one or more of the previous four gaps and results from the difference between customers' perceived service and actual service.

Knowledge sharing:

Knowledge sharing has been increasingly used as a strategic tool for the purpose of enhancing or increasing customer service, reducing product development time, and sharing best practices among them (Skyrme, 1997, 6).

Davenport & Prusak (1998, 10) believe that knowledge sharing is activities that include the exchange of knowledge between individuals and organizational units in order to achieve current or future benefits.

Knowledge sharing can be described as providing opportunities for large numbers of employees to benefit from existing knowledge inside or outside the organization and with the support of senior management. Formal and informal deliberations and discussions often lead to expanding the knowledge base and spreading it among employees, which enables the organization to adapt directly to meet challenges. Journalism in the business environment (ESCWA, 2003: 13). Sharing knowledge by individuals is an urgent need for individuals to create, disseminate and manage knowledge at other levels in the organization (Ipe, 2003, 340). It is also described as interactions within an organization that contribute to the transfer, recombination, or creation of specialized knowledge (Kee & Wei, 2005, 187).

While (Lin, 2007, 457-460) pointed out that knowledge sharing is the systematic sharing of information and experiences by individuals with others.

Christensen (2007, 35) defined it as identifying existing and accessible knowledge in order to address specific tasks better, faster, and less expensive than addressing them in another way.

Knowledge sharing is also the process of continuous and mutual interaction of visible and invisible knowledge assets between individuals, work teams, and knowledge groups within the organization, between the organization and the beneficiaries, and between organizations operating in the market (Yassin, 2007, 109).

The researcher believes that knowledge sharing is a process of transferring and transforming knowledge assets to increase the skills and capabilities of individuals through continuous and mutual interaction, sharing and learning among them.

The importance of sharing knowledge

Some indicate that the ability to share knowledge between organizational units and their departments will undoubtedly contribute significantly to improving levels of organizational performance (Argote & Ingram, 2000, 150).

There are those who describe the significant effects of the knowledge sharing process on the development of organizational knowledge resulting from many reasons, including that the organizational structure acts as a driving force for knowledge sharing processes, as the positive cultural characteristics in any organization are the tool that emphasizes those projects that achieve large and intense participation in knowledge processes in That organization (UNDP, 2003, 15).

Knowledge sharing provides the possibility of increasing productivity as well as achieving a state of retaining intellectual capital, even after employees leave the organization. It will be necessary for an organization that creates added value in the same direction that knowledge sharing becomes important to it because it enables the organization to develop skills, core competencies and value and enhance competitive advantage. And its sustainability (Renzl, 2008, 206). Sharing knowledge contributes to achieving basic goals for the organization and facilitates the process of transferring or transferring knowledge between different individuals within the framework of different organizational units with the aim of absorbing knowledge from other

organizations and quickly adopting that knowledge (R.Yeh & DU. Hsu., 2007, 326). Sharing knowledge and using it more quickly and efficiently than competitors, according to a foundation built on sound and regular foundations in the use of knowledge, is one of the main factors that determine the success of organizational work (Al-Mutairan, 2008, 6).

Knowledge sharing processes

Knowledge sharing processes occur within the framework of two channels: the first: within the organization, and the second: between the organization and its environment. Participation processes can be explained according to three divisions, as follows:

1. Knowledge transfer processes from the organization to the individual: In this process, the organizational structure provides its services as a channel for sharing knowledge. Human capital uses organizational structure to distribute visible and formal knowledge (Daveuport & Prusak, 1998, 10).
2. Knowledge exchange processes between individuals: Individuals are viewed in theoretical frameworks as the main catalyst or stimulus for the processes of generating or creating knowledge (Takeuchi & Nonaka, 2004, 10). This process depends or is based on the exchange of information, ideas, assumptions, and experiences between individuals (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998, 242), and in each of the above-recorded processes there will be a role for human capital, and different forms of social cognitive transfer processes will occur: from tacit to tacit, external: from tacit to virtual, different: from virtual to virtual, and internal: From the virtual to the implicit (Nonaka, 2003, 2-10).
3. Processes of sharing knowledge with the environment: Appleyard described that the decision to share knowledge is based on two basic factors:
 - a) Access to knowledge sharing.
 - b) Use knowledge sharing.

These two factors reflect the ability of individuals to share with the environment some of their technical knowledge that has succeeded in the organization (Appleyard, 1996, 137). The process of exchanging knowledge between individuals and their environment can occur through the use of information technology applications, through which electronic distribution of information between individuals in different organizations, between individuals and external databases (Smith & Lyles, 2003, 110). One way to clarify the relationship between human capital and the environment is the emergence of what is known as virtual knowledge communities between organizations (Kristof, 1995, 229).

Sustainable learning organizations: a historical background

The sustainable learning organization is an advanced and new form or model of organizations that emerged in the last decade of the twentieth century due to what the modern world witnessed in the disappearance of barriers of time and space through the increasing speed of communication, electronic communication and advanced information networks, which calls for the responsibility of organizations to adapt to the developments of the contemporary world, which is full of change. Chaos and disorder, and achieving this responsibility requires organizations to transform into learning, teaching or teaching organizations (Senge, 1990, 12).

The roots of the sustainable learning organization extend to the scientific research method (Action Research Methodology), Organization Theory, and Organic Organization (Al-Hawajra, 2008, 2), which were first developed by (Stalker & Bums,

1961) during an era dating back to... Between the fifties and sixties to organize establishments that live in unstable and heterogeneous environments, as flexibility in organization contributes to adapting to circumstances, especially organizations that decided to change their structure and organizational activities (Hussein, 2006, 13).

The idea of a sustainable learning organization began in the seventies of the last century, as it emerged from the work of (Argyris & Schon, 1978) on organizational learning, and is also attributed to studies conducted by (Revans, 1983) on practical learning.

It was wrongly rumored in many administrative researches and studies that stated that the first person to invent and coin the term “sustainable learning organization” was the writer (Peter Senge) in the year (1990), but in fact this term appeared at the end of the eighties by many writers, researchers and thinkers, specifically in the year (1986). The writer (Bob Robert Garratt, 1986) is considered the first to coin and invent the term “sustainable learning organization” in his book entitled (The Sustainable Learning Organization: The Need for Thinking Leaders, 1986) (Garratt, 1999, 202) (Örtenblad, 2004, 129).

Garratt points out that most senior management managers do not address the problems facing their organizations at that time, and that in most organizations there are no mechanisms for open discussion between senior management, individuals, and other parties to influence the organization’s policy and strategy, as well as the lack of effective feedback from Business projects and the external environment, and senior management managers were responsible for the so-called “brainless organizations,” which were considered like a thoughtless machine that had been subjected to destruction and decay for a long time, as it had moved away and separated from its environment and from the knowledge, excellence, ingenuity, and lack of commitment of the individuals working in it. Managers did not assume their prominent and real role in these organizations and did not concern themselves with continuous learning (Morage, 2006, 1).

Both (Drew & Smith, 1995, 4) and (Dilworth, 1996, 405) agree that the idea of a sustainable learning organization has not been taken into consideration by practitioners and professionals, even though it has received the attention of many researchers and thinkers in the field of administrative studies and research. This interest was also not at the level required for this type of organization, but academic interest in it increased when Peter Senge (1990) addressed it in his pioneering book (The Five Rules: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization).

In the middle of the century, Peter Druker (1964) introduced the concept of a performance-based organization that is committed to achieving results as well as achieving effectiveness. Upon reaching the end of the twentieth century, Peter Sange (1990) helped spread the concept of the sustainable learning organization that was mentioned previously, as it focused on continuous adaptation to the ever-changing environment. The features emphasized by the different organizational models varied, as the bureaucratic organization emphasized efficiency. While the performance-based organization focused on effectiveness, the sustainable learning organization emphasized learning (Hitt, 1995, 18).

The sustainable learning organization maintains basic features and characteristics that distinguish it from the two previous organizational models (the bureaucratic organization and the performance-based organization), but the line will rise higher and it is expected that other organizational models will appear in the coming years (Hitt, 1995, 18), which is the virtual organization. Organization, Digital Organization, and others.

The concept of sustainable learning organizations

The concept of a sustainable learning organization is one of the concepts of contemporary administrative thought that has received recent interest and novelty. There is difficulty in arriving at a precise definition that outlines its comprehensive structural framework. The reason for this is that it contains a large number of concepts and issues related to multiple scientific fields such as economics, biology, and the arts. Sociology, political science, organizational behavior, and others (Thomas, 1996, 16). Based on the above, the concept of a sustainable learning organization can be defined within the framework of a number of viewpoints proposed in this regard. Senge (1990, 3) defined it as an organization in which individuals maximize and continually increase their capabilities in order to achieve the results they desire. It seeks to develop new patterns of thinking and sets for it a set of collective goals and ambitions. Its members also constantly learn how to learn. Collectively.

(Yeo, 2005, 3) refers to the sustainable learning organization as being considered an organic/social system concerned with the process of finding, acquiring, sharing, and using accumulated knowledge that individuals possess and work to transform in the organization to achieve its strategic goals. (Abu Khadra & Rawabdeh, 2006, 456) expressed it as the organization that has the ability to apply systems, techniques, mechanisms and processes that are used to continuously improve the ability of individuals and enable them to participate in achieving and achieving goals. (Barkur et al, 2007, 511) defined it as the organization that works to accelerate and facilitate the learning rate of individuals so that they can face tasks and achieve organizational goals. (Chang & Lee, 2007, 158) mention that it is an organization that learns from procedures and methods and works to create knowledge to improve patterns and methods of behavior. Although the concepts presented by researchers for the sustainable learning organization vary according to their different philosophies, the diversity of their experiences, and the multiplicity of their specializations, they agree in essence and are complementary to each other.

In conclusion of the concepts presented, the researcher believes that sustainable learning organizations are interested and focused on facilitating and accelerating the learning process at the individual, collective and organizational levels as a whole on an ongoing basis, and also focus on the process of adapting to changes, transformation, acquiring knowledge, transferring it and using it to modify their behavior and values to continue survival and continuity.

Foundations for measuring a sustainable learning organization

The study relied on specific dimensions chosen based on the scale designed by the American Society for Training and Development in 1998, which was re-updated in 2002, as the goal of the scale was to provide a lateral diagnosis of the sustainable learning organization. Based on this, the scale consists of five dimensions:

1. Learning movement

The willingness of working individuals and the organization to learn and their ability to manage the areas of learning and development, as individuals in a sustainable learning organization have the ability to solve their own problems within the organization, and the leadership is far from a negative view towards the individual or group that sees them as incapable of managing knowledge and implementing tasks in the organization. (Starkey, 1998, 547). Among the reasons that may push individuals to transform their organizations into a learning organization are their need for

outstanding performance and excellence, the desire to achieve a competitive advantage, to improve the quality of products and services provided to customers, their need to manage change efficiently, and to enhance the organization's ability to solve problems and confront risks and to rely on each other to do so and to be... More creative and innovative in the long term (Cahill, 1997, 157).

2. Organization transformation

It is considered a series of continuous and long-term efforts aimed at improving the organization's capabilities to introduce modernization and keep pace with development and enable it to solve its problems and face its challenges by employing contemporary behavioral theories and techniques that call for mobilizing collective efforts and achieving differential participation. The process of organizational transformation is considered a sudden or revolutionary transformational strategy or method. In the scale, speed and centrality of change. The transformation of an organization depends on a collaborative effort involving all working individuals (Marquardt, 2002, 56).

3. Empowering employees

Many researches have focused on studying empowerment because it represents the participation of employees at the executive levels with information and knowledge related to the organization's performance. Empowerment represents a practice concerned with expanding the responsibilities, powers, and resources of individual workers. It is a broader practice than delegation because its effect is to extract the creative energy of individuals and employ it. well in order to maximize their capabilities (McKenna & Beech, 2002, 65). Daft (2001, 501) indicates that empowerment means giving working individuals the power, freedom, and information to make and participate in decisions.

4. Knowledge management

Knowledge management means that it is the creation of methods and methods to create and configure the organization's knowledge, identify it, acquire it, and distribute it to individuals and those seeking it (Newman, 2000, 17), and (Rastogi, 2000, 40) refers to it as the complete systematic process that works to coordinate the organization's activities in light of its acquisition of knowledge. It is created, stored, shared and developed by individuals and groups wishing to achieve basic organizational goals. Montana (2000, 54) defines it as a branch of knowledge that focuses on systematic creative methods and methods, practices and methods of managing and creating knowledge, acquiring it, exchanging it, protecting it and distributing it, and thus working to use and apply knowledge. Intellectual capital and intangible assets.

5. Use of technology

Technology includes devices and equipment, including computers, workstations, computer networks, and means of storing and transforming data (Turban, 2002, 22). The use of information technologies of various types and classifications (hardware and equipment technologies, software technologies, communications technologies, human resources) represents a major need for all organizations in light of the many developments taking place in various aspects of life in general and in the field of the business sector in particular, and the necessity of use is increasing from Through the possibility of benefiting from the capabilities of these technologies in various activities

carried out by economic units, leading to the possibility of contributing efficiently and effectively to collecting data and providing information in the appropriate place and time (Krajewski & Ritzman, 2005, 197).

Study Results

1. Description of the independent variable (service quality)

Table (2) shows the arithmetic mean (Mean), standard deviation (Std. D.), and coefficient of variation (C.V.) for the service quality items.

Table (2) Description of the items for the independent variable (service quality)

No.	Paragraphs	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
1	The capabilities of service providers in the field of education are characterized by knowledge and management	3.1	1.2	1.3
2	Laboratories have sufficient numbers of modern computers and their accessories	3.3	1.2	1.4
3	Heating and cooling facilities are available in the classroom	3.0	1.2	1.5
4	Professors use innovative teaching methods	3.2	1.1	1.2
5	Service providers appear in an appearance commensurate with their academic and social status	3.3	1.1	1.1
6	The style of dealing between the service provider and students is characterized by mutual respect	3.3	1.1	1.2
7	The location of the service provision is compatible with the possibility of future expansion	3.3	1.1	1.2
8	The physical equipment is convenient and modern	3.6	0.9	0.8
9	There are clear instructions and instructions to ensure that the service is provided on the expected dates	3.6	1.1	1.2
10	Commitment to creating an educational environment safe from risks	3.5	1.0	1.0
11	The university's ability to fulfill its obligations and pledges towards beneficiaries	3.5	0.9	0.8
12	The university provides mutual communication between itself and the beneficiaries	3.4	1.0	1.1
Overall average of the independent variable (service quality)		3.3	1.1	1.2

It is clear from the results of Table (2) regarding the descriptive statistics for the items of the independent variable (service quality), that there is consistency in the respondents' answers to some of the items, and this is evident from the arithmetic means that ranged between (3 - 3.6), and the standard deviations that ranged between (0.9 - 1.2), and the coefficient of variation ranged between (0.8-1.5). The general arithmetic mean of the independent variable of (3.3) indicates the presence of acceptance and importance among respondents towards improving service quality, which is higher than the value of the hypothesized mean of (3). This reflects the actual reality in Iraqi universities regarding the high sharing of knowledge among the individuals working in them, and the value of the deviation indicates The general standard of (1.1) and the general coefficient of variation of (1.2) indicate that the respondents' answers are not dispersed from the arithmetic mean, and that there is harmony between the answers and the understanding and understanding of the paragraphs.

2. Description of the independent variable (knowledge sharing)

Table (3) shows the arithmetic mean (Mean), standard deviation (Std. D.), and coefficient of variation (C.V.) for the knowledge sharing items.

Table (3) Description of the items for the independent variable (sharing knowledge)

No.	Paragraphs	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
13	The university provides an environment that encourages the exchange of knowledge between working individuals	4.1	0.9	0.01
14	University employees are keen to exchange knowledge among themselves	4.0	0.9	0.01
15	The university provides employees with the requirements to carry out their duties in the field of knowledge exchange (such as libraries, devices, etc.)	4.0	1.0	0.02
16	The University places importance on sharing knowledge through written instructions, procedures and policies	4.0	1.0	0.02
17	The university organizes scientific forums and seminars to improve the knowledge of staff and students and increase their research skills	4.1	0.9	0.01
18	The university provides an email for employees to exchange and share knowledge	4.1	1.0	0.02
19	The university encourages the use of social media to exchange and share knowledge among staff, students and the community	4.1	1.0	0.02
20	The university publishes and distributes knowledge and scientific research to employees	4.1	0.9	0.01
21	The university provides sufficient financial resources allocated to programs to improve the level of knowledge	3.9	1.0	0.02
22	The university grants rewards and financial incentives to employees for their participation in international and national forums	3.8	1.0	0.02
23	The university sets a standard for knowledge sharing to evaluate employee performance	3.8	1.0	0.02
24	The university seeks to conclude agreements with institutions and universities in the field of knowledge exchange	4.1	0.9	0.01
Overall rate of the independent variable (knowledge sharing)		4	1	0.02

It is clear from the results of Table (3) regarding the descriptive statistics for the items of the independent variable (sharing knowledge), that there is consistency in the respondents' answers to some of the items, and this is evident from the arithmetic means that ranged between (3.8 - 4.1), and the standard deviations that ranged between (0.9 - 1), and the coefficient of variation ranged between (0.01-0.02). The general arithmetic mean of the independent variable of (4) indicates the presence of positive acceptance and great importance from respondents towards knowledge sharing practices, which is higher than the value of the hypothesized mean of (3). This reflects the actual reality in Iraqi universities regarding the high knowledge sharing among individuals working in them, and indicates The value of the general standard deviation of (1) and the general coefficient of variation of (0.02) ensure that the answers of the respondents are not dispersed from the arithmetic mean, and that there is harmony between the answers and the understanding and understanding of the paragraphs.

3. Description of the dependent variable (building sustainable learning organizations)

Table (4) shows the arithmetic mean (Mean), standard deviation (Std. D.), and coefficient of variation (C.V.) for the items on building sustainable learning organizations.

Table (4) Description of items for the dependent variable (building sustainable learning organizations)

No.	Paragraphs	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
25	The university encourages its employees to search for new ways to improve work methods	4.1	0.9	0.01
26	The university encourages its employees to adopt structured thinking in solving problems	4.0	1.0	0.02
27	The university motivates its employees to learn everything related to work and the organization	4.0	0.9	0.01
28	The university adopts a culture of encouraging self-reliance in carrying out work.	4.0	0.9	0.01
29	The university is trying to build a clear vision that most of its individuals participate in building	4.0	1.0	0.02
30	The university adopts the language of dialogue to enhance understanding between the administration and other individuals	4.1	0.9	0.01
31	Creating mutual trust between management and workers is the responsibility of everyone at the university	3.9	1.1	0.06
32	The university seeks to achieve integration between the capabilities and skills of working individuals by adopting team work	4.0	0.9	0.01
33	The university is keen to adopt the principle of diversity in specializations when forming work teams	4.1	0.9	0.01
34	The university administration gives the work teams full powers to carry out the work assigned to them	4.0	1.0	0.02
35	The university administration helps the individuals working there to abandon traditional methods of doing work	3.9	1.0	0.02
36	The university relies on the educational approach in implementing its strategies	4.0	0.9	0.01

The general rate of the dependent variable (building sustainable learning organizations)	4.1	1.1	0.06
--	-----	-----	------

It is clear from the results of Table (4) regarding the descriptive statistics for the items of the dependent variable (building sustainable learning organizations), that there is consistency in the answers of the respondents regarding the items, and this is evident from the arithmetic means that ranged between (3.9 - 4.1), and the standard deviations that ranged between (0.9 - 1), and the coefficient of variation ranged between (0.01 - 0.02). The general arithmetic mean of the dependent variable of (4.1) indicates the presence of positive acceptance and great importance from respondents towards building sustainable learning organizations, which is higher than the value of the hypothesized mean of (3). This reflects the actual reality in Iraqi universities that are purposefully designed to build their structure, culture and strategies to improve the capabilities of... Organizational learning and maximizing it to take its place among international universities. The value of the general standard deviation of (1.1) and the general coefficient of variation of (0.06) indicates that the answers of the respondents are not dispersed from the arithmetic mean, and that there is harmony between the answers and understanding and awareness of the paragraphs.

Hypothesis testing

Table (5) indicates the results of the correlations between the research variables, and it shows that there is a positive correlation with a statistical significance at (0.05) for improving the quality of service and knowledge sharing while building sustainable learning organizations. This result indicates that improving the quality of service and knowledge sharing is one of the pillars. The basic principles that the researched universities should adopt to enhance their orientation towards the practices of building sustainable learning organizations.

Thus, the first hypothesis of the research will be accepted, which states (there is a positive, statistically significant correlation to improving the quality of service and sharing knowledge with building sustainable learning organizations).

Table (5) Results of correlations between the research variables

Independent variable \ Dependent variable	Service quality	Knowledge sharing
Building sustainable learning organizations	0.61*	0.68*

Table (6) indicates the results of analyzing the impact of improving service quality and sharing knowledge in building sustainable learning organizations. It is clear that there is a significant effect of the variable of improving service quality and the variable of sharing knowledge in building sustainable learning organizations, and this is evident from the calculated (F) value, the level of significance (0.05), and the value of (R²)

Thus, the second hypothesis of the research will be accepted, which states (there is a statistically significant effect of improving the quality of service and knowledge sharing in building sustainable learning organizations.)

Table (6) Results of the impact of knowledge sharing in building sustainable learning organizations

Independent variable \ Dependent variable	Building sustainable learning organizations		
	R ²	F	Sig.
Service quality	0.37	350.6	0.000
Knowledge sharing	0.46	199.32	0.000

Conclusions

The factors for improving service quality and knowledge sharing are widely integrated with building sustainable learning organizations in the intellectual and cognitive aspects, as they largely agree in achieving a basic goal, which directs them towards achieving their strategic goals. The results of the descriptive statistical analysis showed that the Iraqi universities surveyed tended towards improving the quality of service and adopting knowledge sharing. The results of the descriptive statistical analysis revealed the interest of the investigated universities in the requirements and practices of building sustainable learning organizations. The results of hypothesis testing showed that improving service quality and knowledge sharing have a positive and significant correlation with building sustainable learning organizations. It became clear from the results of hypothesis testing that improving service quality and knowledge sharing have a significant impact on building sustainable learning organizations.

The need to establish clear mechanisms to improve the quality of service and knowledge sharing in Iraqi universities by providing the necessary and supportive tools. Providing the necessary infrastructure to build sustainable learning organizations in various Iraqi universities. Increase administrative leadership support for the organizational learning process by adopting the concept of sustainable learning organizations and disseminating its culture among working individuals. Providing continuous learning opportunities for individuals working in Iraqi universities and raising their efficiency in line with progress and developments in the technical environment. Empowering individuals working in universities to present a common collective vision. The need for Iraqi universities to pay attention to the various dimensions of building sustainable learning organizations, which include learning dynamism, organization transformation, employee empowerment, knowledge management, and the use of technology.

References

1. Abu Khadra, Marah F. and Rawabdeh, Ibrahim A., 2006, Assessment of development of the learning organization concept in Jordanian industrial companies, *Journal of The Learning Organization* , Vol. 13, No. 5.
2. Al-Hawajra, Kamel Muhammad, 2008, The extent to which the concept of a sustainable learning organization can be applied in private Jordanian universities



- from the point of view of faculty members, the Eighth Annual International Scientific Conference, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan.
3. Al-Mutairan, Mtairan Abdullah, (2007), Management of Knowledge Systems and Intellectual Capital, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.
 4. Appleyard M., How Does Knowledge Flow? Interfirm Patterns in The Semiconductor Industry, Strategic Management Journal 17, 10, winter 1996, pp137-154.
 5. Argote, L. & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82 (1), 150-269.
 6. Barkur, Gopalakrishna, Varambally, K.V.M. & Rodrigues, Lewlyn L.R., 2007, Insurance sector dynamics: towards transformation into learning organization, *Journal of The Learning Organization*, Vol. 14, No. 6.
 7. Cahill, Dennis J., 1995, The managerial implications of the learning organization: a new tool for internal marketing, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 9, No. 4.
 8. Chang , Su-Chao & Lee, Ming-Shing, 2007, A study on relationship among leadership, organizational culture, the operation of learning organization and employees' job satisfaction, *Journal of The Learning Organization* , Vol. 14, No. 2.
 9. Christensen, B. & Fountaine, C. (2007, August). Functional Training: Paradigm, Philosophy, and Exercises. Presentation at the first ever North Dakota National Strength and Conditioning Clinic, Grand Forks, ND.p:35.
 10. Daft, Richard L., 2001, *Organization Theory and Design*, South – Western, Inc., Florida, USA.
 11. Davenport & Prusak,(1998), *Working Knowledge*. Executive Excellence, p: 10.
 12. Escwa, UN, Repots, Network, 2003, P: 13.
 13. Hitt , William D., 1995, The learning organization: some reflections on organizational renewal , *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 8.
 14. Hussein, Laith Saadallah, 2006, The role of the human resource in building a responsive learning organization: An analytical theoretical study, *Future Research Journal*, No. 13, Center for Future Studies, Al-Hadba University College, Mosul.
 15. Ipe, M. (2003). Knowledge sharing in organizations: A conceptual framework, *Human Resource Development Review*, pp.: 322-360.
 16. Jeyalakshmi, S., & Meenakumari, D.S., 2016, *Service Quality Management: A Literature Review*.
 17. Joudeh, J. (2017). The impact of service quality dimensions upon customers' satisfaction: an empirical study applied in the Jordanian mobile telecommunication sector. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 6(1), 184.
 18. Kee. Welling & Wei. Kowk. Kee. (2005), " Critical Factors Affecting the Firm to share knowledge with Trading Partners: A comparative Exploratory Case Study", ICEC'05 August China, P 177-187.
 19. Krajewski, Lee, J. & Ritzman, Larry, P., 2005, *Operations Management: Processes and Value Chains*, 7th. ed., Prentice Hall, U.S.A.
 20. Kristof, A.L., Brown, K.G., Sims, H.P., & Smith, K.A. (1995). The virtual team: A case study and inductive model .In M.M. Beverley, M.M., D.A. Johnson, & S.T. Beyerlein (Eds). *Advances in interdisciplinary studies of work teams 2: Knowledge work in teams*.Greenwich, CT: JAI press pp.229-254.
 21. Lin, C.H., Tu, H. H., & Huang, F. H., July 11-13, 2007, pp.: 457,460.the 2007 International Conference on Business and Information, Tokyo, Japan.

22. Lovelock, Ch., and Vandermerwe, S., and Lewis, B., "Service Marketing – A European Perspective", 3rd ed., Prentice-Hall, Europe, 1996.
23. Lovelock, Ch., and Wright, L., "Principles of service marketing and management", Prentice-Hall International, New Jersey, 2002.
24. Marquardt, M. J., 2002, Building the learning organization: Mastering the five elements for corporate learning, Palo Alto, USA: Davies Black, Inc. publishing.
25. McKenna, E. & Beech, N., 2002, Human Resource Management, Pearson education, Essex, England.
26. Montana, J.C., 2000, The Legal System and Knowledge Management, Information Management Journal, Vol. 34, Issue. 3.
27. Morage, Eva, 2006, The Learning Organization, Cultural Learning Organizations: A Model, University of Madrid.
28. Nahapiet, Janine and Ghoshal, Sumantra 1998. Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage. Academy of Management Review, 23(2), 242-266.
29. Newman, Amy, 2000, Are you Ready for Knowledge Management, Journal of Training & Development, Vol.54, Issue.9.
30. Nonaka, I. (1994) .A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. Organization Science, 5, 14-37.
31. Örténblad, Anders, 2004, The learning organization: towards an integrated model, Journal of The Learning Organization, Vol. 11, No.2.
32. Parasuraman, A., & Zeithmal, V.A. & Berry, L. L., "A Conceptual Model of Service Quality & Its Implications Journal of marketing management ", Vol. 49, 1985.
33. R. Yeh & DU.Hsu, et al "Fostering the Determinants of Knowledge Transfer: A Team-Level Analysis." Journal of Information Science 33, no. 3 (2007).p:326-354.
34. Rastogi, P.N., 2000, Knowledge Management and Intellectual Capital the New Virtuous Reality of Competitiveness, Journal of Human System Management, Vol. 19.
35. Renzl, B. (2008). Trust in management and knowledge sharing: the mediating effects fear and knowledge documentation .Omega ,36,p:206-220.
36. Russell, R. R. ,and Taylor, B. B., "Operations Management: Multimedia Version", 3rd ed., Prentice-Hall ,New Jersey, Inc,2000.
37. Senge, Peter, 1990, The Fifth Discipline – The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization, Double Day, New York.
38. Skyrme, D. (1997). Knowledge Management: making sense of an oxymoron. Management Insight No. 22.p:6.
39. Slack, N., Chambers, S. and Johnston, R. (2001) Operations Management. 3rd Edition, Prentice-Hall, Harlow.
40. Smith, M.E., & Lyles, M.A. (2003) .The Blackwell handbook of organization learning and knowledge management, p: 110, UK: Blackwell .
41. Starkey, Ken, 1998, What Can We Learn from the Learning Organization? , Journal of Human Relations, Vol. 51, No. 4.
42. Takeuchi, H. & Nonaka, I. (1995). The knowledge creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation, Oxford, UK Oxford University Press, p.56.
43. Thomas, Colin J. Coulson, 1996, BPR and the learning organization, Journal of The Learning Organization, Vol. 3, No.1.
44. Turban, Efraim, & etal, 2002, Information Technology for Management: Transforming Business in The Digital Economy, 3rd. Edition, John Wily & Sons, Inc.
45. UNDP, (2003), UNDP, United Nation Development Program, Human Development report, new York & oxford press, p: 15.

-
46. Yassin, Saad Ghaleb, (2008), Knowledge Management and Arab Intellectual Capital, Al-Zaytoonah University, the eighth annual scientific conference of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences.
47. Yeo, Roland K., 2005, Revisiting the roots of learning organization, Journal of The Learning Organization, Vol. 12, No. 4.