

Research Article

The Reality of Knowledge Sharing Among Faculty Members at Amran University

Mutee Ali Ali Al-Guhali* 

Development and Quality Assurance Center, Amran University, Amran, Yemen

Abstract

This study aims at knowing the reality of knowledge-sharing from the perspective of the teaching staff at Amran University, in the fields of teaching, research, consulting and community service, and to know if there are statistically differences in the response of the participants (sample's responses) due to the variables (specialization, academic degree, and experience). The study followed the descriptive approach and data was collected based on a questionnaire which was distributed to a sample of (28) participants (members). It used the statistical packages (SPSS) to analyzed; The study revealed that; The rate to which the teaching staff practice knowledge-sharing from their perspective; in general, it was "medium." While in the field of "teaching" was "high", and in the field of "scientific research, community service" it was "medium". It also showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the averages of the study-sample members (participants) responses regarding the degree of practiced knowledge-sharing at the level of all fields due to the specialization variable, except for the field of "Research," which indicated the presence of differences in favor of the Humanities. When the academic degree variable is in the field of "Teaching" in favor of "professor" degree and the variable "Experience" in the field of "Teaching and Community Service" is in favor of experience (less than 5 years and more than 10 years).

Keywords

Knowledge Sharing, Teaching, Research, Community Service, Faculty Members

1. Introduction

The world today is living through many rapid changes, such as globalization, competition, and the digital revolution in all fields, which has led to a revolution in the world of knowledge, making knowledge holders and producers in universities a competitive advantage, which has led to the transformation of universities into knowledge universities that are based primarily on innovation, creative thinking, knowledge production, and excellence in performance that is necessary for survival and continuity. These are among the most important strategies that are based on knowledge management systems,

which work to discover, create, store, and then share knowledge to maximize the benefit from it, leading to its use as a basic wealth for sustainable development.

Knowledge-sharing is considered one of the most important activities and orientations of academic institutions, as many universities always strive to hold conferences, seminars, workshops, and increase their scientific publications to exchange knowledge between universities in general and develop and increase the knowledge of their human cadres in particular [31].

*Corresponding author: malguhali1978@gmail.com (Mutee Ali Ali Al-Guhali)

Received: 4 September 2025; **Accepted:** 17 September 2025; **Published:** 31 October 2025



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2025. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Knowledge-sharing plays an important role in the success of knowledge management initiatives, which is based on the size of the knowledge pool available to faculty members. Knowledge sharing among faculty members is also one of the factors that affect the improvement of teaching methods and techniques, the research capabilities of universities, and the raising of quality levels in university activities [24]. As the strength of institutions lies in their possession, sharing, and sharing of knowledge.

The results of some studies, such as [1]; as in [23], have revealed a set of benefits that institutions can reap in the event of their success in implementing knowledge sharing and promoting it, such as:

- 1) Protecting institutions from losing knowledge,
- 2) Improving their efficiency,
- 3) Developing their competitive capabilities,
- 4) Developing the skills of their members to reduce their mistakes and perform their job duties efficiently,
- 5) Creating an atmosphere of trust within work teams, and other benefits.

The process of knowledge sharing between faculty members at universities is the basis on which any transformation or development processes are built, or any trend towards quality and excellence in universities; as it supports their capabilities and contributes to achieving the efficiency and quality of work, and hence the problem that universities face is related to the issue of sharing knowledge with others, not only its acquisition, production, or innovation and organization, as sharing contributes to addressing limitations and determinants in the human soul, especially if it is associated with knowledge, experience, and individual skills acquired, and this enhances the motivation to exchange and share knowledge [10].

Universities are required to double their efforts to focus on research, especially with global rankings that focus on research citation rates, the number of international researchers at the university, and research impact. The fields of knowledge sharing at universities are directly related to their main functions, and the fields of knowledge sharing for faculty members at universities can be identified in three areas: (teaching, research and community service). The process of knowledge sharing contributes to the development of work in these areas in a way that achieves the university's goals.

2. Problem of the Study

Studies Al-Khalif [10] and Harb [23] recommended the need to promote a culture of knowledge sharing in the academic community represented by universities, and to encourage faculty members to benefit from the outstanding academic experiences at other universities, and even to prepare guides that include experiences and knowledge resources and make them available to all faculty members to benefit from them.

The results of some studies, such as Babalhavaeji [17],

Assefa [16], Buckley [18], Yi [35], and Ipe [26], have also revealed the importance of knowledge sharing for universities and the benefits they reap by promoting knowledge sharing practices. What some previous studies have indicated, such as the study by Alotaibi, Crowder, and Wells [13], indicated that there is no satisfaction among academics with the ways in which knowledge is shared among them.

The importance of knowledge sharing is highlighted in that it is included in the criteria for evaluating universities. Although the criteria for evaluating university performance are classified according to the three functions of the university, the most important evaluation lies in scientific publication and research projects [19].

With the reliance of global rankings on opinion surveys, universities must focus on what increases their reputation among the local and international academic community, which is represented by research partnerships. Through the effective investment of resources and building successful research partnerships, many universities, such as Oxford in England, Alberta in Canada, and Tohoku in Japan, have qualified to occupy advanced positions in the global rankings 2021, which are respectively (first 131, 201) globally. This has allowed them to achieve high percentages according to the economic income criterion (9687) (800) (9974) respectively [12].

Based on the strategy of Amran University, which, like other universities, seeks to excel and compete regionally and Arably in the field of higher education through its functions; which will not be achieved without the existence of knowledge sharing between faculty members in it, the current study seeks to know the reality of knowledge sharing among faculty members at the university. The problem can be formulated in the main question; *What is the reality of the practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members at Amran University?*

Which can be answered through the following sub-questions:

- 1) What is the degree of practice of knowledge sharing by faculty members at Amran University in the field of teaching from their point of view?
- 2) What is the degree of practice of knowledge sharing by faculty members at Amran University in the field of research from their point of view?
- 3) What is the degree of practice of knowledge sharing by faculty members at Amran University in the field of consulting and community service from their point of view?
- 4) Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance (0.05) in the responses of the sample regarding the degree of practice of knowledge sharing by faculty members in the field of teaching, research, consulting and community service due to the variables: academic degree - type of specialization - years of experience?*

3. Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to:

- 1) Know the degree of practice of knowledge sharing by faculty members at Amran University in the field of teaching, research, consulting and community service.
- 2) Reveal the extent to which there are statistically significant differences at the level of significance (0.05) in the responses of the sample regarding the degree of practice of knowledge sharing by faculty members in the field of teaching - research and consulting and community service due to the variables: specialization - years of experience - college.

4. The Importance of the Study

- 1) The importance of the study is evident from the importance of its topic, which deals with knowledge sharing, which is one of the basics of the success of university institutions, which helps to support creativity and facilitate knowledge processes and generation.
- 2) The current study may contribute to providing researchers and specialists with the literature of knowledge sharing in Yemeni universities, including Amran University.
- 3) The study will survey the leadership of the university and the officials responsible for Yemeni higher education about the reality of the practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members in the Republic of Yemen, which will make them hasten to promote knowledge sharing in universities, and direct the attention of decision-makers in higher education institutions to one of the supporting tributaries to achieve strategic goals.
- 4) The benefit from the results of the current study in guiding those in charge of managing university affairs and those interested in the educational process in designing scientific programs and platforms that contribute to the process of knowledge sharing and be a real reflection of the development of the knowledge society.

5. Scope of the Study

- 1) Subjective scope: The study was limited to the topic of knowledge sharing among faculty members at Yemeni universities, Amran University.
- 2) Human scope: Faculty members at Amran University.
- 3) Geographic scope: Amran University -Yemen.
- 4) Time scope: During the academic year 2022-2023.

6. Definition of Terms

- 1) Knowledge sharing: It is "the process of faculty members at the university exchanging ideas, information,

and implicit and explicit experiences, in the field of administrative, research, or academic work, and discussing them through direct or indirect interaction; in order to benefit from them scientifically or to obtain new ideas and knowledge that can be used to develop individual or organizational knowledge, and then solve problems and implement new policies and procedures that contribute to improving individual and organizational performance and achieving the goals and mission of the university" [23].

- 2) Operational definition: Knowledge sharing in this study is meant to be: a process of learning through the exchange of ideas, knowledge, experiences, and information, using various traditional and electronic methods, in the fields of teaching, research, and community service among faculty members at the university, which contributes to achieving its strategic goals.

7. Theoretical Framework of the Study

7.1. Concept of Knowledge Sharing

Before reviewing the concept of knowledge sharing, it is necessary to first refer to the concept of knowledge, which is a fundamental element of production and a key determinant of competitiveness, especially in high-value economic activities and university educational institutions, which are primarily based on the production and dissemination of knowledge.

Knowledge is a cumulative and integrated process that is formed and occurs over relatively long periods of time, in order to become available for application and use to address specific problems and conditions. Knowledge is used to interpret the information available about a particular situation, and to make a decision about how to manage this situation and address it [8], that is, a result of the combination and accumulation of all information, knowledge, and experience.

And knowledge is: the resulting understanding that enables individuals to share and use information to apply knowledge and make specific decisions to address problems.

As for the concept of knowledge sharing, there is no general agreement on the term knowledge sharing, and the reason is due to the fact that this term is related to several elements, the most important of which are the goals related to the type of knowledge shared, the way and level of sharing [15].

Therefore, knowledge sharing is defined as: a process through which individuals exchange their implicit and explicit knowledge and generate new knowledge together [32].

The research partnership is a "dynamic research relationship between two or more parties (individuals, institutions), based on shared research goals with a full understanding of all agreed research procedures and measures, and including a mutual impact while maintaining the independence of the participating parties, and it is done according to a specific work model that begins with the strategic evaluation of the institution's values, goals, and mission, followed by careful

planning of the areas of partnership, then effective communication with the concerned parties, then concluding and implementing the terms of the partnership, and then governance and management [22].

Therefore, knowledge sharing can be defined as: a dynamic learning process through continuous interaction, which is represented in the transfer, transformation, and exchange of knowledge and experiences between two or more parties through social interaction using effective communication means; resulting in the flow of knowledge and experiences as well as the creation of new knowledge in the field of work within the university institution in a way that achieves its strategic objectives.

7.2. Importance and Justification of Knowledge Sharing

The importance and justification of knowledge sharing lie in the following:

- 1) It is one of the pillars of increasing reputation among the local and international academic community.
- 2) It supports the institution's creative and competitive capabilities between individuals and institutions, both internally and externally.
- 3) It supports the development of relationships and human ties between colleagues, both at the individual and professional levels.
- 4) It achieves the concept of professional development and supports continuous learning.
- 5) It contributes to the achievement of individual and collective goals.
- 6) It is a necessary practice for achieving the university's mission and goals.
- 7) It contributes to the university's progress in global rankings.
- 8) It is considered one of the most important factors that help organizations and their employees to carry out their assigned tasks efficiently and effectively, and to save more time.
- 9) Knowledge sharing contributes to the formation of positive attitudes among professors and staff towards work at the university, and thus improves performance efficiency.
- 10) Knowledge sharing helps in acquiring knowledge and experiences, or both.
- 11) Knowledge sharing helps to reduce stress caused by lack of knowledge or experience, or both.

7.3. Factors that Enhance Knowledge Sharing in Universities

There are a number of factors that contribute to enhancing knowledge sharing among university employees, that what was mentioned by Karomi, [28], which are:

- 1) Some individuals share their knowledge with others,

believing that it is a way to preserve their material and immaterial gains.

- 2) The university lacks an appropriate infrastructure to facilitate knowledge sharing, especially information systems, which are considered a goal-oriented and effective means of increasing knowledge sharing.
- 3) Weak leadership in activating knowledge sharing within the university, and the lack of necessary skills for knowledge management, in addition to the absence of a clear vision for it.
- 4) The rigidity of universities and their unwillingness to change their culture to adapt to knowledge sharing strategies.
- 5) Lack of communication skills, cultural differences, weak trust between individuals, and the existence of organizational conflicts.
- 6) Getting rid of some of the individual characteristics of individuals, such as introversion, isolation, neglect, and unwillingness to share knowledge, and sometimes there is competition between individuals.

Al-Mutajalli [12] has classified the components of knowledge sharing as follows:

- 1) *Leadership*: Effective leadership can provide and allocate available resources, inspire motivation, and promote transparency and participation in decision-making. This positively impacts the success of knowledge sharing partnerships. Conscious leadership practices enhance the level of trust among the stakeholders and improve communication channels. There is also a correlation between leadership style and the level of cooperation between employees [20].
- 2) *Trust*: Trust is an important element in building research partnerships, especially during the forming stage, when each party is trying to determine the other's merits and reliability. Trust gradually increases as the partnership progresses. Here, the leadership plays a key role in supporting and promoting trust between the partners, and reducing the causes of its loss that can threaten the partnership with failure [25].
- 3) *Communication*: Communication has a strong impact on the shape and effectiveness of research partnerships. Partnerships are groups of individuals who interact with each other in defined roles and tasks through communication methods and tools. These methods and tools must be clear from the beginning of the partnership to clarify the goals and define the roles and tasks [30]. The communication process includes all the channels through which information is transmitted within and outside the scope of the partnership. The quality of communication is positively correlated with the quality of relationships, the level of participation and satisfaction of the partners, and their successful execution of tasks [20].
- 4) *Partnership Structures*: This factor includes the processes on which the research partnership is based, such

as governance, authority, general values, standards, goals, mission, and partnership facilitating relationships. This structure defines the shape, organization, and direction of the research partnership [35], as well as the organizational hierarchy, means of joint work achievement, in addition to means of sharing resources and ways of activating communication and documenting mutual trust [5].

7.4. Knowledge Sharing in Universities

Knowledge sharing between faculty members is classified according to the three functions of the university, that is, sharing of teaching, research, and related materials to the role of faculty members in serving the community.

7.4.1. Teaching

Knowledge sharing in the field of teaching is represented by the production of faculty members of materials related to the courses, through what is innovated and organized for use in lectures, seminars, meetings, lessons, training courses, laboratories, curriculum development, effective teaching segments, and others, which are often organized and maintained individually and not shared efficiently between colleagues who teach the same courses in the same semester or the next. However, these materials are not collected and organized, due to the lack of a permanent and regular channel for sharing. Over time, the same materials are often formulated, and this repetition comes at the expense of time, money, and effort. However, if these valuable information, experiences, and knowledge are shared between faculty members, it can save a lot of time and effort for research, interacting with students, finding a constructive dialogue with colleagues, providing quality control in courses and teaching methods, and benefiting from the exchange of resources, practices, and effective teaching methods.

7.4.2. Research

Research occupies a large part of the time and effort of university professors, because the scientific status of the university professor has become closely linked to research, publication, and authorship. This is in addition to the role of research in providing the university professor with a variety of information and knowledge, improving the level of his performance and professional advancement, and it also represents an important source of funding for universities for their research projects in favor of different labor sectors. Therefore, we find that one of the standards and requirements for promotions in academic degrees from one rank to a higher one depends primarily on his ability as a researcher who is able to produce knowledge, through what he presents of published studies and research, and on the originality of the research work he does. This shows the need for integration between the teaching mission and the research mission. Knowledge sharing between faculty members in the field of research has a

great impact on raising the efficiency of scientific productivity among faculty members, and takes several forms, including what has mentioned by Al-Balawi [4]: conducting joint scientific research, writing scientific books through which faculty members share their knowledge, integrate and merge their different experiences and cultures, share research sites, and exchange ideas about the requirements of scientific research and modern scientific trends in the fields of scientific research in developed countries.

7.4.3. Community Service

Community service represents one of the most important roles and functions that the university performs in the knowledge society, where it works to apply knowledge and employ it in the service of the community and its development. The university professor is the link between the university and the community. Through the social activities he undertakes, he contributes to raising awareness of the community, which plays a positive role in the success of educational and social programs. Faculty members can also share in this field by sharing the different ways to solve community problems related to their specializations, as well as by sharing the results of their research with the community and working to apply them in solving community problems.

Knowledge sharing in the community service field is a way for faculty members to share their knowledge and expertise with the community. This can be done through a variety of activities, such as:

- 1) Providing educational programs and workshops: Faculty members can share their knowledge and expertise by developing and delivering educational programs and workshops to community members.
- 2) Conducting research on community issues: Faculty members can use their research skills to conduct research on community issues and share the results of their research with the community.
- 3) Serving on community boards and committees: Faculty members can share their expertise by serving on community boards and committees.

8. Previous Related Studies

8.1. Previous Studies

Abdelhafiz and Al-Mahdi [1]

This study aimed to identify the reality of the practice of knowledge sharing and the factors affecting it among faculty members in the faculties of education in some Arab universities. The study used the descriptive approach. The results included: the overall percentage of knowledge sharing among faculty members in the faculties of education at the four universities is generally low. The organizational factor and the personal factor range from high to medium in terms of their impact on knowledge sharing in universities.

Al-Hadrami [6]

This study aimed to identify the obstacles to knowledge sharing between faculty members at Tabuk University and ways to overcome them. To achieve the goal of the study, the researcher used the descriptive analytical approach, through a questionnaire designed for this purpose. The study population consisted of faculty members at Tabuk University. A random sample of 300 faculty members was selected to represent the university. The researcher reached many results, the most prominent of which are: the existence of obstacles to knowledge sharing between faculty members at Tabuk University to a large extent, where the overall average of all the phrases in the first field was (3.77) with a standard deviation of (0.502), which indicates the weakness of the practice of knowledge sharing between faculty members in the university.

The ranking of obstacles to knowledge sharing at Tabuk University according to the degree of approval in a descending order is as follows: material obstacles, followed by organizational obstacles, then personal. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean responses of the sample members about the obstacles to knowledge sharing at Tabuk University and ways to overcome them according to the study variables (gender, nationality, academic degree, type of college). The study recommended limiting the obstacles to knowledge sharing at Tabuk University through a set of procedures.

Al-Muhammad and Derah [11]

This study aimed to identify the reality and trends of knowledge sharing among students at Mardin University, in addition to identifying the knowledge sharing channels that students prefer and the motivations that guide students to share knowledge, and the most important obstacles that hinder the knowledge sharing process. The study focused on colleges that use Arabic as the basic language of instruction. The descriptive analytical approach was adopted, where a questionnaire was designed based on previous studies in this field, covering the paragraphs of the respondents' attitudes about the knowledge sharing process. It was distributed to (235) students.

The results showed that the most important sources of student information are their course instructors, with an average of (3.95). The research process was generally low. Most students' goal of knowledge sharing is to clarify and discuss exam issues, at a rate of (3.78). It was found that the most used tools they have are the books provided to them by their course instructors, which came at the top of interest with an average of (3.72). It was found that students are inclined to exchange their knowledge face-to-face in a high percentage (4.14).

As for the trends of university students, most of them realize the value of knowledge and the benefit of sharing it, and they considered that this helps to improve the education process with an average of (4.16). Most of them encourage the knowledge sharing process and consider it good with an average of (4.36).

In light of the results, the study presented a set of recommendations that could contribute to improving the process of sharing and sharing knowledge between students in the university institution.

Al-Balawi, Salma [4]

The study aimed to reveal the degree of practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members at Tabuk and King Saud universities, and to reveal the relationship between the degree of practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members and the organizational culture at Tabuk and King Saud universities. To achieve the objectives of the study, the descriptive associative approach was adopted, and the study used the questionnaire as a tool for collecting data. The study population consisted of all faculty members in the Faculty of Education and Arts and the Faculty of Sciences at Tabuk University, as well as faculty members in the Faculty of Education, the Faculty of Arts, and the Faculty of Sciences at King Saud University, to become the final sample on which the study tool was applied (300). The study concluded with several results, the most prominent of which are:

The degree of practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members at Tabuk and King Saud universities in the field of (teaching) was high, and in the field of (research, and community service) it was moderate.

The dimensions of the organizational culture that affect knowledge sharing among faculty members at Tabuk and King Saud universities in the field of (leadership, structure and internal systems, working conditions) were high.

There is an impact of organizational culture on knowledge sharing, as well as a direct relationship between organizational culture and knowledge sharing, which means that with the availability of an efficient and supportive organizational culture for knowledge sharing, the degree of practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members increases, and with the decline in the level of organizational culture, the degree of practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members decreases.

There are statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members in the (research, leadership, and structure and internal systems) dimensions according to the university, in favor of King Saud University.

There are statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members in the (research) dimension according to gender, in favor of males.

There are statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members in the (leadership) dimension according to gender, in favor of females.

There are statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members in the (research) dimension according to the nature of the college, in favor of the (scientific).

Jarrah and Alkhazaleh [27]

The study aimed to identify the behavior of knowledge sharing between universities in the United Arab Emirates and its educational institutions, and the factors that affect the

exchange and sharing of knowledge. The study used the descriptive approach, and the questionnaire was used as a tool for the study. The sample of the study amounted to (365) university professors. The results showed that the evaluation of faculty members of the nature of knowledge sharing came with a moderate degree, and that the factors affecting knowledge sharing between educational institutions are the lack of planning to enrich the curriculum, and the lack of trust between participants in the knowledge sharing process.

Samina and Others [34]

The study aimed to identify the extent of the readiness of faculty members to practice knowledge sharing within Pakistani universities, and to identify the role of work culture and organizational commitment in the desire of faculty members to share knowledge. The study was based on the descriptive survey approach, and the questionnaire was used as a tool for collecting information. The sample of the study amounted to (1130) faculty members from (13) universities. The sample of the study was selected through the simple random sampling technique. The study reached a set of results, the most important of which are:

Faculty members are willing to share knowledge with each other, and their readiness has been affected by work culture and organizational commitment.

A friendly, cooperative, and stimulating work environment can facilitate the promotion of organizational commitment and the culture of knowledge sharing for faculty members at the university level.

Ahmed [3]

The study aimed to define the conceptual framework of knowledge sharing in universities in terms of presenting the concept of knowledge sharing, its objectives and importance, and identifying the most important means and methods of achieving it, reaching the most important obstacles that hinder the process of knowledge sharing among faculty members, then moving to the theoretical foundations of competitive advantage by presenting its concept, strategies for achieving it, objectives of competitive advantage for universities, its importance, and requirements for achieving it within universities, and then identifying the role of universities in activating knowledge sharing between faculty members to achieve competitive advantage in universities. The study used the descriptive approach, and it reached a set of recommendations and procedural proposals to activate knowledge sharing between faculty members to achieve competitive advantage in universities, the most important of which are:

Building a supportive organizational culture within universities that encourages faculty members to share knowledge.

Building trust between them in order to achieve excellence for universities and raise their local and international ranking.

The need to adopt the philosophy of excellence in Egyptian universities and work to achieve it.

Al-Yami and Al-Dowaan [14]

The study aimed to clarify the impact of knowledge sharing

behaviors in achieving professional development for faculty members at Najran University; This was done by identifying the impact of the demographic characteristics of faculty members, represented in (teamwork management-continuous training and development-meeting management-delegation). The focus was primarily on a set of dimensions of knowledge sharing, represented in (behavior-organizational culture-information and communication technology), while the focus was on dimensions (teamwork management-continuous training and development-meeting management-delegation) for professional development. To achieve this goal, the descriptive approach was adopted, by applying the study tool (questionnaire) to a random sample of (317) members of the faculty of Najran University, male and female, numbering (1464), and the statistical analysis methods (SPSS) were used to analyze the study data. A set of results were reached, the most important of which are: There is an effect at the significance level ($0.05 \geq \alpha$) of knowledge sharing in its dimensions represented in (behavior, organizational culture, information and communication technology) on professional development from the point of view of faculty members at Najran University. In light of the results that were reached, the study recommended a number of recommendations.

Al-Khalaf [10]

The research aimed to know the relationship between the reality of knowledge sharing and the extent of the impact of individual factors in it. The researcher used the descriptive analytical approach, as well as the questionnaire as a tool applied to a sample of faculty members of (100) members in the Faculty of Education at the University of Damascus. The research reached several results, the most important of which are:

There is no correlation between knowledge sharing and the individual factors affecting it.

There are differences according to the gender variable in favor of females.

There are no differences according to the experience and scientific rank variables.

Al-Harbi [7]

The study aimed to identify the reality of the practice of knowledge sharing and the factors affecting it among members of the scientific educational associations in Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The study used the descriptive survey approach, and a questionnaire was prepared for the reality of practicing knowledge sharing consisting of (15) phrases, and another for the factors affecting it consisting of (20) phrases, and it was applied to a sample of (357) members of the scientific educational associations in Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The study reached a set of results, including:

The general percentage of the reality of practicing knowledge sharing among members of the scientific educational associations in Egypt and Saudi Arabia falls within the low practice range.

The impact of personal factors and institutional factors in general on the practice of knowledge sharing among members

of the scientific educational associations in Egypt and Saudi Arabia falls within the high impact range.

Dalal and Khouni [21]

The study aimed to investigate the impact of knowledge sharing on the efficiency of a higher education professor at the Faculty of Economics at Batna University 1. A questionnaire was distributed to a sample of faculty members, and the retrieved data was processed using the SPSS statistical package. The results of the study proved that there is a positive and statistically significant impact of knowledge sharing on the efficiency of a higher education professor at the faculty, and that the application of knowledge sharing achieves 65% of its efficiency.

Al-Mutajalli [12]

The study aimed to analyze the reality of research partnerships at Al-Azhar University, by identifying the reality of its social and institutional pillars. The study used the descriptive analytical approach as an appropriate method for the study goal. The study also relied on the SWOT analysis model to analyze the reality of the internal and external pillars of the university's research partnership; the study adopted the McKinsey 7S Model to analyze the internal environment, and the PEST model to analyze the external environment for research partnerships at the university. The results indicated the weakness of the community pillars supporting research partnerships at the university. Where supporting the economic, technological, political, and cultural pillars of research partnerships is below global rates. As for the reality of the internal environment, the results of the analysis indicated the weakness of the mechanisms supporting university research partnerships in terms of strategy, systems, organizational structure, shared values, employees, and skills. The study concluded the most influential environmental analysis elements in research partnerships according to the opinions of the study sample. The study recommended the need to:

- Identify the research priorities that the scientific disciplines at the university revolve around.

- Enact policies that incentivize researchers to engage in research partnerships.

- Include the university's organizational structure with environmental support units to document research relations.

- Spread the culture of research partnerships among faculty members at the university by adopting an administrative model that supports it.

- Formulate university values (human relations, knowledge sharing, interpersonal cooperation, open communication, appreciation of the opposite opinion) that are embraced by university members to support research partnerships at the university.

Al-Khemim [9]

The study aimed to determine the impact of shared knowledge on the efficiency of academic performance at Ibb University, from the perspective of faculty members. The descriptive analytical approach was used. The study population consisted of faculty members and their assistants. The

questionnaire was used as the main tool for collecting information, and the distribution process was limited to the stratified random sampling method; the study sample consisted of (112) individuals, and the data contained in the questionnaire was analyzed using the SPSS statistical package. The study concluded that there is a high level of knowledge sharing among faculty members at Ibb University, and that the correlation between knowledge sharing as an independent variable and the performance of a university professor as a dependent variable is a strong positive relationship. The study recommended the need to provide research and scientific contributions on the university's website to increase sharing.

Khamqani [29]

The study aims to identify the impact of knowledge sharing on the performance of a university professor at Qassimi Merbah University in Borj Bou Arreridj. The questionnaire was used as the main tool for collecting information, and the data contained in the questionnaires was analyzed using the SPSS statistical package. The study concluded that there is a high level of knowledge sharing among professors at Qassimi Merbah University in Borj Bou Arreridj, and that the correlation between knowledge sharing as an independent variable and the performance of a university professor as a dependent variable is a strong positive relationship. The study recommended the need to provide research and scientific contributions on the university's website to increase sharing.

Abdel Naeem [2]

The research aimed to provide a proposed concept for the role of knowledge sharing in enhancing organizational loyalty among faculty members at Aswan University. The research used both descriptive correlational and case study methods, and a questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. The study sample consisted of 130 faculty members and supporting staff at Aswan University. The research reached a number of findings, the most important of which are:

- The level of availability of knowledge sharing at Aswan University, from the perspective of the sample members, was moderate in terms of its five dimensions (university leadership, organizational culture, trust between members of the university community, information and communication technology, and teamwork).

- The level of availability of organizational loyalty among faculty members and supporting staff at Aswan University, in terms of its three dimensions (emotional organizational loyalty, continuous organizational loyalty, and ethical organizational loyalty), was also moderate.

- There is a positive correlation with statistical significance between the level of knowledge sharing and the enhancement of organizational loyalty among faculty members and supporting staff at Aswan University.

- There were no statistically significant differences between the sample members' responses to knowledge sharing at Aswan University according to the gender variable (male-female), or according to the college type variable (theoretical-practical).

There were statistically significant differences according to the academic rank variable (professor-assistant professor-lecturer-assistant lecturer-instructor) in favor of the job category (assistant professor), and according to the number of years of experience in favor of those with (10-15 years).

Quora, Al-Arabi [33]

The study aimed to identify the reality of the practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members at Tanta University in terms of the means used in the sharing process, the factors affecting knowledge sharing from the perspective of faculty members, as well as the motivations that encourage the knowledge sharing process, and the obstacles that hinder that process, and with the proposal to enhance the benefit of the knowledge sharing process between faculty members inside and outside the university to improve their levels and increase their efficiency and competence.

The study sample consisted of 240 individuals, distributed equally among the four colleges that represented the university, namely (medicine, engineering, science, and arts), with 60 individuals for each college, and the sample was distributed randomly.

The study relied on the descriptive analytical approach, which depends on describing the problem by collecting data, analyzing it, and interpreting it to extract its implications.

The study reached several results, the most important of which are: 158 faculty members, with a percentage of 65.8%, are aware of the topic of knowledge sharing. In contrast, we find that there are 82 faculty members, with a percentage of 34.2%, who are not aware of the topic of knowledge sharing.

100 faculty members at Tanta University confirm that there is support from the deans' offices for the process of knowledge sharing, reaching a percentage of these members to 41.7%, while some other members thought that the administration of their college supports the process of knowledge sharing, reaching 131 faculty members, with a percentage of 54.6%, and there is not many members who confirmed that their college administration does not support that process, reaching 9 members only, with a percentage that does not exceed 4%.

The main and main motivation for Tanta University faculty members is (achieving creativity and innovation), at a percentage of 75.8% of the total sample.

(Lack of sufficient university support for knowledge sharing) ranked first in the category of obstacles that hinder the process of knowledge sharing between faculty members at Tanta University, with a percentage of 39.5% of the total study sample.

8.2. Comment on Previous Studies

8.2.1. Similarities

The current study agreed with some previous studies such as the studies of Abdelhafeez and Al-Mahdi, Al-Balawi, Salma, Jarrah & Alkhazaleh, and Qorrah and Al-Arabi, in

terms of the objective, which was to identify the reality of the practice of knowledge sharing. The current study also agreed with most previous studies in the use of the descriptive approach, the reliance of the study on the questionnaire as a data collection tool, and the agreement with all previous studies in the application in higher education institutions.

8.2.2. Differences

The current study differed from the goal of the Hadrami study, which aimed to identify the obstacles to knowledge sharing, Samina & Others, which aimed to know the extent of readiness for practice, Ahmed, which only addressed the conceptual framework of knowledge sharing, Al-Yami and Al-Dowa'an, which aimed to clarify the impact of knowledge sharing behaviors in achieving professional development, Al-Khalaf and Al-Harbi, which aimed to know the relationship between reality and the factors affecting it, Dalal and Khouni which aimed to study the impact of knowledge sharing on the efficiency of a higher education professor, Al-Motajel, Mohamed, and others where the study aimed to analyze the reality of research partnership at Al-Azhar University, and the reliance on the SWOT analysis model to analyze the components, Al-Kemim, and Khamqani, where they aimed to identify the impact of knowledge sharing on academic performance, and Abdel-Naeem, which aimed to provide a proposed concept for the role of knowledge sharing in enhancing organizational loyalty, and differs from the methodology with the study of Al-Harbi, and the study of Samina & Others, where it relied on the descriptive survey approach, and with the study of Al-Balawi, and Abdel-Naem in the descriptive correlational approach. The current study also differed from the study of Al-Mohammad and Dera in terms of the community and sample of the study, which was applied to a sample of students, while the current study differs from previous studies in terms of the targeted study limits, which was limited to the reality of the practice of knowledge sharing among faculty members at Amran University - Yemen.

8.2.3. Benefits

The current study benefited greatly from previous studies in formulating the problem and questions of the study, in building the theoretical and methodological framework of the study, in addition to developing the study tool, and using appropriate statistical treatments.

9. Field Study Methodology and Procedures

9.1. Study Methodology

The study used the descriptive approach to identify the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University to

share knowledge in the fields of teaching, research, consulting and community service, from their point of view. This approach is based on describing reality by collecting data and information about the subject of the study, and then analyzing these data and information, interpreting them, and reaching conclusions and generalizations that help to understand and develop the reality that is being studied.

9.2. Study Community and Sample

The study community, represented by faculty members at

Amran University, which numbered (133) individuals, were permanent, according to the statistics issued by the Academic Affairs Department at the University for the year 2022/2021 AD. Most of the study community was targeted, and an electronic questionnaire was made, and the link was circulated randomly through social media to faculty members at the university, and the questionnaire was filled out by (28) individuals, with a percentage of (21.05%) of the total study community. The following table shows the distribution of the study sample according to its variables:

Table 1. Description of the study sample according to the variables.

Variables		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Educational degree	Professor	2	7.14%
	Associate professor	2	7.14%
	Assistant professor	24	85.71%
Field of specialization	Humanities	22	78.57%
	Applied	6	21.43%
Years of experience	Less than (5) years	8	28.57%
	From (5 - 10) years	16	57.14%
	More than (10) years	4	14.29%

9.3. Data Collection Tool

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher prepared the data collection tool, which is a questionnaire to fit the research methodology (descriptive approach). The tool was designed in its initial form, as follows:

- 1) Part 1: It includes personal data consisting of (educational degree, field of specialization, years of experience).
- 2) Part 2: It measures the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University to share knowledge in the fields of teaching, research, consulting and community service, from their point of view, in three main areas: (teaching, research, and consulting and community service). Each item of the questionnaire was given a graded weight according to the Likert five-point scale (very large, large, medium, weak, very weak), which is represented numerically by (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) respectively.

9.3.1. Reliability

- 1) Face validity: The face validity of the tool was verified by presenting it to a group of experts and competent people with PhDs in the fields of educational management and planning, curriculum and teaching methods, and measurement and evaluation. They were asked to express their opinion on the items of the questionnaire in terms of their clarity, safety, and accuracy of their linguistic formulation, in addition to their suitability for the standard it falls under. The questionnaire was prepared in its final form based on the observations of the judges.
- 2) Construct validity: To find the construct validity, the correlation between the fields and the total score of the tool was measured. All coefficients were at an acceptable level and statistically significant at the level of (0.01), which indicates the construct validity between each field of the questionnaire and the tool as a whole.

Table 2. Shows the Pearson correlation coefficient between each field of the questionnaire and the tool as a whole.

Field	Field name	Number of items	Correlation coefficient
First	Teaching field	17	0.779
Second	Research field	19	0.836

Field	Field name	Number of items	Correlation coefficient
Third	Consulting and community service field	14	0.896
Tool as a whole		50	0.912

9.3.2. Internal Consistency Validity of the Questionnaire Items

To find the internal consistency validity, the correlation between the items of each field was measured with the total

score of the field. All coefficients were at an acceptable level and statistically significant at the level of (0.01), which indicates the internal consistency validity between each item of the fields and all of its items.

Table 3. Shows the Pearson correlation coefficient between each item of the questionnaire and the field as a whole.

Field First		Field Second		Field Third	
Item number	Correlation coefficient	Item number	Correlation coefficient	Item number	Correlation coefficient
1	.666**	1	.512**	1	.512**
2	.405*	2	.377*	2	.432*
3	.582**	3	.523**	3	.465*
4	0.064	4	.508**	4	.903**
5	.559**	5	.696**	5	.821**
6	.844**	6	.463*	6	.826**
7	.638**	7	0.372	7	.492**
8	.544**	8	.684**	8	.736**
9	0.006	9	.434*	9	.793**
10	.554**	10	0.351	10	.857**
11	.510**	11	0.217	11	.771**
12	.510**	12	.502**	12	.570**
13	.645**	13	.774**	13	0.300
14	.769**	14	0.240	14	.433*
15	0.349	15	.660**		
16	-0.051	16	.550**		
17	0.325	17	.649**		
		18	.765**		
		19	.406*		

The results in the table above show that the Pearson correlation coefficient between each item of the questionnaire and the field as a whole ranged between (0.405** - 0.844**). The correlation coefficient for the total tool was (0.969), which indicates that the reliability coefficient is very high and can be relied upon.

9.3.3. Stability of the Tool

The stability of the tool was verified using the Cronbach's alpha method, and the results were as shown in the following table:

Table 4. Cronbach's alpha coefficient to measure the stability of the study tool.

Field	Field name	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha coefficient
First	Teaching field	17	0.779
Second	Research field	19	0.836
Third	Consulting and community service field	14	0.896
Total tool		50	0.969

It is clear from the results shown in the previous table that the value of Cronbach's alpha ranged between (0.779 - 0.896). Also, the value of the alpha coefficient for the total tool was (0.969), which means that the coefficient of stability is very high and can be relied upon.

9.4. Statistical Treatments

To achieve the objectives of the study and analyze its data, the following statistical treatments were used:

- 1) Frequencies (Frequencies) and percentages (Valid Percent), to describe the study sample.
- 2) Pearson correlation coefficient (Pearson), to verify the structural and internal validity of the items and fields of the study tool.
- 3) Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha), to measure the stability of the study tool.
- 4) Arithmetic Mean, to know the average responses of the study sample individuals.
- 5) Standard deviation (Standard Deviation), to identify the extent of deviation and dispersion of the responses of the study individuals for each of the main areas from their arithmetic mean, and for each item of these areas.
- 6) Independent-Samples T-test, to determine the significance of the differences according to the variable (type of specialization).
- 7) One-Way ANOVA test, to determine the significance of the differences between the responses of the study sample individuals for the variables (academic degree, and years of experience).

Study benchmark: To determine the response criterion, the range between the grades was calculated as follows:

Range = Difference between the highest and lowest grades = $5 - 1 = 4$, and the range was divided into the five-point scale in the following way:

Category length = Range ÷ number of categories = $4 \div 5 =$

0.80, and then this value was added to the lowest value in the scale (the correct one), and thus the length of the cells/levels (the real limits for measuring the arithmetic mean) became as shown in the following table:

Table 5. Shows the real limits for measuring the arithmetic mean for the tool fields.

Grade	Real limits	Verbal estimate
1	1.80 :1	Very weak
2	2.60 :1.81	Weak
3	3.40 :2.61	Medium
4	4.20 :3.41	Large
5	5 :4.21	Very Large

10. Results of the Study and Their Discussion

10.1. First: Presentation and Discussion of the Results of the First Question

To answer the first question, which was "What is the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University of knowledge sharing in the field of teaching from their point of view?", the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the estimates of the study sample individuals were calculated, as well as the ranking of the fields at the level of the tool as a whole, and the ranking of the items at the level of each skill.

The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the estimates of the study sample individuals at the level of the tool's fields as a whole are as shown in the following table:

Table 6. Shows the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the tool's fields as a whole.

No.	Field	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal significance
1	Teaching field	1	3.46	0.316	Large

No.	Field	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal significance
3	Research field	2	3.05	0.378	Medium
2	Consulting and community service field	3	2.89	0.485	Medium
Total tool			3.14	0.315	Medium

The results shown in the previous table indicate that the total arithmetic means of the respondents' responses to the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University of knowledge sharing, in all fields, ranged between (3.46 – 2.89), while the general arithmetic mean of the estimates of the study sample individuals for the tool as a whole was (3.14) with a standard deviation of (0.315), and with a rating of "medium" at the level of the tool as a whole. By analyzing the results of the fields, it is clear that:

- 1) Two fields received the approval of the study sample individuals with a rating of "medium", namely fields number (2, 3). And one field received the approval of the study sample individuals with a high rating of "large", which is field number (1).
- 2) Field number (1), which talks about "knowledge sharing in the field of teaching", ranked first with an arithmetic mean of (3.46) and a standard deviation of (0.316). The researcher attributes this to the fact that participation in the field of teaching is the most practiced field

for faculty members and their assistants, as well as its connection to the general work field.

- 3) Field number (3), which talks about "knowledge sharing in the field of consulting and community service", ranked last with an arithmetic mean of (2.89) and a standard deviation of (0.485). The researcher attributes this to the weak engagement of the sample with the community or the population dispersion of the sample.

10.2. Discussion of the Fields in Detail as Follows

10.2.1. Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviations of the Items of the First Field (Teaching Field Items)

The results of the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the items of the first field (teaching field items) are shown in the following table:

Table 7. Shows the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the teaching field items.

No.	Item	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal significance
9	I am always ready to share my knowledge with my students.	1	4.43	0.634	Very large
16	Knowledge sharing contributes to the development of the teaching skills and abilities of faculty members.	2	3.93	0.604	Large
15	Knowledge sharing between faculty members produces creative ideas.	3	3.79	0.686	Large
17	I am confident in obtaining the correct information through knowledge sharing.	4	3.79	0.568	Large
10	I am keen to attend scientific meetings and discussions to share knowledge and experience.	5	3.64	0.621	Large
11	I exchange knowledge and experiences with my colleagues through social media.	6	3.64	0.621	Large
3	I am interested in diversifying the methods and techniques that stimulate learning and knowledge sharing.	7	3.57	0.634	Large
12	I benefit from the accumulated experience of older faculty members than me.	8	3.50	0.745	Large
14	I record the knowledge and experiences I gain from knowledge sharing.	9	3.50	0.745	Large
7	I use the new knowledge and experiences I gained through sharing with my colleagues in the teaching process.	10	3.43	0.634	Large
2	I help new colleagues gain experience in the field of teaching and training.	11	3.21	0.568	Medium
4	I collaborate with my colleagues and communicate with them as a team to exchange knowledge and experiences.	12	3.21	0.787	Medium

No.	Item	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal significance
1	I exchange knowledge and information with my colleagues at the university automatically.	13	3.07	0.813	Medium
8	I strive to provide my colleagues with new information about the courses.	14	3.07	0.716	Medium
13	I receive feedback as a result of knowledge sharing with colleagues.	15	3.07	0.604	Medium
5	I work to exchange scientific expertise about the courses with my colleagues.	16	3.00	0.667	Medium
6	I share with colleagues the knowledge related to the courses that I prepare for my lectures.	17	2.93	0.716	Medium
Total field average			3.46	0.316	Large

The results shown in the previous table indicate that the arithmetic means of the responses of the sample members on the field of teaching ranged between (4.43 – 2.93), while the general arithmetic mean of the estimates of the study sample members of the items of knowledge sharing in the field of teaching as a whole (3.46) with a standard deviation of (0.316), and with a high estimation grade of "large", at the level of the field as a whole. By analyzing the results of the first field items, it is clear that:

- 1) One item from the first field items was approved by the sample members with a grade of "very large", which is item number (9).
- 2) Nine items from the first field items were approved by the sample members with a grade of "large", which are the items numbered (3, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17).
- 3) Seven items were approved by the sample members with a grade of "medium", which are the items num-

bered (1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13).

Specifically, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- 1) Item number (9), which states "I am always ready to share my knowledge with my students", received the highest rating, with an average of 4.43 and a standard deviation of 0.634. The researcher attributes this to the fact that faculty members have strong relationships with their students and are the ones who interact with them the most.
- 2) Item number (6), which states "I share with colleagues the knowledge related to the courses that I prepare for my lectures", received the lowest rating, with an average of 2.93 and a standard deviation of 0.716. The researcher attributes this to the fact that there is a lack of communication between faculty members within the university due to the current situation in the country.

10.2.2. Statistical Analysis of the Second Field (Research)

Table 8. Shows the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the items of the second field (research).

No.	Item	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal significance
2	I direct my students to conduct joint research and projects.	1	4.07	0.466	Large
4	The research productivity of faculty members increases through knowledge sharing.	2	3.64	0.731	Large
5	I share with my colleagues new ideas about research.	3	3.57	0.504	Large
18	I propose research ideas to my colleagues and students.	4	3.57	0.634	Large
7	I share with my colleagues the most important research sites through social media.	5	3.50	0.638	Large
8	Faculty members participate in the supervision and discussion of scientific theses.	6	3.43	0.920	Large
12	I participate in scientific and research forums related to my specialization.	7	3.43	1.069	Large
10	I have a clear strategy for research processes and share it with others.	8	3.36	0.911	Medium
14	I am keen to belong to collaborative knowledge groups that enable interaction and knowledge exchange.	9	3.36	0.731	Medium

No.	Item	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal significance
6	I provide my new colleagues with the skills and requirements of scientific research.	10	3.29	0.713	Medium
15	I share with my colleagues in publishing scientific research in academic journals.	11	3.07	0.813	Medium
3	I have participated with my colleagues in preparing joint research.	12	3.00	0.770	Medium
19	I get support from my colleagues in research issues.	13	2.79	0.787	Medium
9	I strive with my colleagues to establish a joint research database.	14	2.71	0.713	Medium
16	I share with my colleagues in the peer review process in scientific journals.	15	2.64	0.731	Medium
17	I share with my colleagues in writing and publishing scientific books.	16	2.36	0.826	Weak
11	I have a website (page, blog) where I post my research interests that is available to everyone.	17	2.29	0.713	Weak
1	There are research teams at the university that offer opportunities to renew knowledge, ideas, and deepen research.	18	2.00	0.544	Weak
13	The university supports teamwork in internal and external research activities.	19	1.93	0.813	Weak
Total mean for the field			3.05	0.378	Medium

The results shown in the previous table indicate that the arithmetic means of the responses of the sample members on the field of (research), ranged between (1.93 – 0.813), while the general arithmetic mean of the estimates of the study sample members about the sharing in the field of (research) as a whole (3.05) with a standard deviation of (0.378), and with a medium estimation grade on the level of the field as a whole. By analyzing the results of the second field criteria, it is clear that:

- 1) Seven items from the second field criteria were approved by the sample members with a grade of "large" approval, which are the items numbered (2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 18).
- 2) Eight items were approved by the sample members with a medium approval grade, which are the items numbered (3, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19).
- 3) Four items were approved by the sample members with a weak approval grade, which are the items numbered (1, 11, 13, 17).

Specifically, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- 1) Item number (2), which states "I direct my students to conduct joint research and projects", ranked first with an arithmetic mean of (4.07) and a standard deviation of (0.466) and a grade of estimation large, and the re-

searcher attributes this to the fact that faculty members encourage their students to participate in research and projects.

- 2) Item number (13) which states "The university supports teamwork in internal and external research activities." received the last rank with an average of (1.93) and a standard deviation of (0.813) and a weak degree. The researcher attributes this to the weakness of the university's capabilities in conducting group research due to the weak relationship between the university leadership and faculty members.

In more detail, the item states that the university supports teamwork in research activities, both internal and external. The researcher found that this item received the lowest rating, with an average of 1.93, which is considered weak. The researcher attributes this to the following factors:

- 1) The university's lack of capacity to conduct group research. This could be due to a lack of resources, such as funding or facilities, or a lack of training for faculty members in group research methods.
- 2) The weak relationship between the university leadership and faculty members. This could make it difficult for faculty members to collaborate on research projects.

10.2.3. Statistical Analysis of the Third Field (Consultancy and Community Service)

Table 9. Shows the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the items of the third field (consultancy and community service).

No.	Item	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Descriptive significance
14	I consider community service to be part of my duties as a faculty member.	1	4.14	0.356	Large

No.	Item	Rank	Mean	Standard deviation	Descriptive significance
9	I contribute to providing consultations related to my specialization.	2	3.43	0.997	Large
13	The contribution of knowledge sharing to the success of the university is the responsibility of all university employees.	3	3.43	0.634	Large
10	I contribute to providing scientific and practical solutions to the problems we face at the university.	4	3.14	0.932	Medium
4	I share with my colleagues in disseminating science and knowledge among members of the local community through lectures and seminars.	5	2.93	0.900	Medium
11	I participate in committees and working groups related to my specialization with my colleagues at the university.	6	2.93	0.813	Medium
12	I share with my colleagues the taking of local community issues as topics for research and knowledge production.	7	2.93	0.813	Medium
5	I exchange scientific materials with my colleagues to benefit from them in seminars and conferences to serve the community.	8	2.86	0.756	Medium
6	I seek to exchange ideas with my colleagues on providing consultancy services to all community institutions.	9	2.79	0.876	Medium
7	I exchange scientific materials with my colleagues from presentation slides and training bags to benefit from them in training courses to serve the community.	10	2.71	0.460	Medium
3	I share with my colleagues the knowledge and experiences about our activity in community service.	11	2.64	0.731	Medium
8	I share with my colleagues in conducting applied research that addresses community problems and contributes to their solution.	12	2.50	0.638	Weak
1	The university forms volunteer teams of professors for scientific consultations.	13	2.07	0.716	Weak
2	Faculty members participate in translating world knowledge into Arabic to serve the community.	14	1.93	0.466	Weak
Total mean for the field			2.89	0.485	Medium

The results of the table above indicate that the average scores of the sample members on the field of knowledge sharing in the field of (consultancy and community service) ranged from (4.14 - 1.93), while the overall average of the sample members' estimates of the knowledge sharing paragraphs in the field of consultancy and community service as a whole was (2.89) with a standard deviation of (0.485), and with an average rating of medium on the level of the field as a whole.

By analyzing the results of the paragraphs of the third field, the following is clear:

- 1) Three paragraphs of the third field received the approval of the sample members with a high approval rate, which are paragraphs number (9, 13, 14). And 8 paragraphs received the approval of the sample members with a medium rating, which are paragraphs number (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12).
- 2) Paragraph number (14), which states "I consider community service to be part of my duties as a faculty member," ranked first with an average of (4.14) and a

standard deviation of (0.356) and a high rating, and the researcher attributes this to the fact that community service is part of the culture of all members of society, including faculty members.

- 3) Paragraph number (2), which states "Faculty members participate in translating global knowledge into Arabic for community service," ranked last with an average of (1.93) and a standard deviation of (0.466) and a weak rating, and the researcher attributes this to the weakness of faculty members in the field of foreign languages.

10.3. The Results of the Second Question and Their Discussion

To answer the second question, which states "Are there statistically significant differences at the level (0.05) between the average responses of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variables (academic degree, specialization type, years of experience)?"

To calculate the differences between the estimates of the study sample on the differences between the average responses of the study sample, a (T-test) for two independent samples (Independent-Samples T-test) was performed to

determine the significance of the differences according to the variable (specialization type). The one-way ANOVA test was also used for the variables (academic degree, and years of experience). This can be explained as follows:

10.3.1. Variable (Specialization)

Table 10. Shows the results of the (T.TEST) to examine the significance of the difference between the estimates of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variable (specialization).

Fields	Type of college/ department	Number	Mean	Standard deviation	Calculated T value	Significant at	Verbal significance
First field	Humanities	22	3.44	0.303	0.991	0.329	Not significant
	Applied	6	3.53	0.379			
Second field	Humanities	22	2.97	0.385	6.117	0.020	significant
	Applied	6	3.35	0.118			
Third field	Humanities	22	2.86	0.457	1.797	0.192	Not significant
	Applied	6	3.00	0.609			
Tool as a whole	Humanities	22	3.10	0.298	0.371	0.548	Not significant
	Applied	6	3.31	0.341			

The results of the table above indicate that the calculated (T) value is not statistically significant at the significance level (0.05) between the estimates of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variables (type of specialization), as the values of the statistical significance levels were greater than (0.05), which means that there are no statistically significant differences between the average responses of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing, at the level of all

fields due to the variable of specialization, except for the second field, which the values of the statistical significance levels were less than (0.05), which means that there are statistically significant differences between the average responses of the study sample and in favor of the humanities at the expense of the applied sciences. The researcher attributes this to the sample ratio in the humanities as well as the ease of research in the humanities compared to research in the applied sciences.

10.3.2. Variable (Academic Degree)

Table 11. Shows the results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test to examine the significance of the difference between the estimates of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variable of academic degree.

Fields		Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F value	Significance level	Verbal significance
First	Between groups	0.593	2	0.297	3.539	0.044	Significant
	Within groups	2.095	25	0.084			
	Total variance	2.688	27				
Second	Between groups	0.383	2	0.191	1.377	0.271	Not significant
	Within groups	3.473	25	0.139			

Fields		Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F value	Significance level	Verbal significance
Third	Total variance	3.856	27				
	Between groups	0.862	2	0.431			
	Within groups	5.479	25	0.219	1.968	0.161	Not significant
Tool as a whole	Total variance	6.341	27				
	Between groups	0.133	2	0.066			
	Within groups	2.538	25	0.102	0.653	0.529	Not significant
	Total variance	2.671	27				

The results of the table above indicate that the calculated (F) value is not statistically significant at the significance level (0.05), between the estimates of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variable of academic degree, as the values of the statistical significance levels were greater than (0.05), which means that there are no statistically significant differences between the average responses of the study sample on the level of the second and third fields and the tool as a whole due to the variable of academic degree, and

this is attributed to the convergence of the views of the members of the study sample according to the variable of academic degree towards the fields of scientific research and community service. However, the results indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the average responses of the study sample on the level of the first field "teaching". To determine the significance of the differences, the Scheffe's test for post-hoc comparisons was performed according to the variable "academic degree" and the following table shows this:

Table 12. Shows the results of the Scheffe's test for post-hoc comparisons according to the variable "academic degree".

Fields	Academic degree" (a)	Academic degree" (b)	Difference between means	Significance level	Significance
First: Teaching	Assistant professor	Associate professor	-0.09804	0.900	Not significant
		Professor	0.54902	0.053	Not significant
	Associate professor	Assistant professor	0.09804	0.900	Not significant
		Professor	0.64706	0.103	Not significant
	Professor	Assistant professor	-0.54902	0.053	Not significant
		Associate professor	-0.64706	0.103	Not significant

The results of the table above indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the average responses of the study sample at the significance level of (0.05) on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing in the field of teaching due to the variable of academic degree. This is because the significance levels were greater than (0.05) for all levels of academic degree.

However, the differences between the means indicate that the results are in favor of the academic degree level of "professor" at the expense of the rest of the levels. This is attributed to the fact that members of the sample who hold the highest academic degree are more involved in the field of teaching, as they have advanced knowledge and teaching methods.

10.3.3. Variable (Years of Experience)

Table 13. Shows the results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA ONE WAY) test to examine the significance of the difference between the estimates of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variable of years of experience.

Fields		Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	F value	Significance level	Verbal significance
First	Between groups	1.083	2	0.541	8.436	0.002	Significant
	Within groups	1.605	25	0.064			
	Total variance	2.688	27				
Second	Between groups	0.523	2	0.261	1.961	0.162	Not significant
	Within groups	3.333	25	0.133			
	Total variance	3.856	27				
Third	Between groups	2.165	2	1.083	6.481	0.005	Significant
	Within groups	4.176	25	0.167			
	Total variance	6.341	27				
Tool as a whole	Between groups	0.928	2	0.464	6.660	0.005	Significant
	Within groups	1.742	25	0.070			
	Total variance	2.671	27				

The results of the table above indicate that the calculated (F) value is significant statistically at the significance level of (0.05), between the estimates of the members of the study sample on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variable of years of experience, at the level of the first and third fields and the tool as a whole, where the values of the statistical significance levels were less than (0.05), which means that there are significant statistically differences between the average responses of the members of the study sample on the first and third fields and the tool as a whole due to the variable of years of experience. This is attributed to the weak practice of faculty

members at Amran University for knowledge sharing in general and in the fields of teaching, community consultations, and community service in particular, regardless of the number of years of experience in the workplace.

While the results of the table above indicate no statistically significant differences between the average responses of the members of the study sample at the significance level of (0.05) on the practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing at the level of the second field, where the level of significance was greater than (0.05). To determine the significance of the differences, the Scheffe's test for post-hoc comparisons was performed as follows:

Table 14. Shows the results of the Scheffe's test for post-hoc comparisons according to the variable "years of experience".

Fields	"Years of experience" (a)	"Years of experience" (b)	Difference between means	Significance level	Significance
First: Teaching	Less than 5 years	5-10 years	0.21324	0.172	Not significant
		More than 10 years	-0.35294	0.095	Not significant
	5-10 years	Less than 5 years	-0.21324	0.172	Not significant
		More than 10 years	-.56618*	0.002	significant
	More than 10 years	Less than 5 years	0.35294	0.095	Not significant
		5-10 years	.56618*	0.002	significant

Fields	"Years of experience" (a)	"Years of experience" (b)	Difference between means	Significance level	Significance
Third: community service	Less than 5 years	5-10 years	0.33929	0.180	Not significant
		More than 10 years	-0.44643	0.224	Not significant
	5-10 years	Less than 5 years	-0.33929	0.180	Not significant
		More than 10 years	-.78571*	0.008	significant
	More than 10 years	Less than 5 years	0.44643	0.224	Not significant
		5-10 years	.78571*	0.008	significant
	Less than 5 years	5-10 years	0.28500	0.062	Not significant
		More than 10 years	-0.19000	0.511	Not significant
Tool as a whole	5-10 years	Less than 5 years	-0.28500	0.062	Not significant
		More than 10 years	-.47500*	0.013	significant
	More than 10 years	Less than 5 years	0.19000	0.511	Not significant
		5-10 years	.47500*	0.013	significant

The results shown in the table above indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the average responses of the members of the study sample at the significance level of (0.05) on the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing at the level of the first and third fields and the tool as a whole, where the level of significance was less than (0.05) at the level of years of experience (5 – 10 years), and in favor of years of experience (less than 5 years, and more than 10 years) at the expense of the level of experience (5- 10 years). This is attributed to the fact that the sample members who have intermediate experience have a reluctance to share knowledge in general and in the field of teaching and community service in particular. In other words, the degree of enthusiasm for knowledge sharing decreased over time and then increased as experience increased.

11. Summary, Recommendations, and Suggestions

11.1. Summary

The study concluded with the following results:

- 1) The overall mean scores of the participants' responses to the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing from their perspective were generally moderate. The overall mean score of the participant's estimates of the degree of agreement for the tool as a whole was (3.14) with a standard deviation of (0.315).
- 2) The results revealed that the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge

sharing in the field of "Teaching" from the perspective of the faculty members themselves was generally moderate and "high" at the overall level of the field. The overall mean score of the participant's estimates of the degree of agreement for the field as a whole was (3.46) with a standard deviation of (0.315).

- 3) The results showed that the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing in the field of "Scientific Research" from the perspective of faculty members and their assistants was generally moderate and it was also moderate at the overall level of the field. The overall mean score of the participant's estimates of the degree of agreement for the field as a whole was (3.05) with a standard deviation of (0.378).
- 4) The results explained that the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing in the field of "Consultations and Community Service" from the perspective of faculty members and their assistants was generally moderate and "moderate" at the overall level of the field. The overall mean score of the study participants of the degree of agreement for the field as a whole was (2.89) with a standard deviation of (0.485).
- 5) The results demonstrated that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the participant's responses to the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing at the level of all fields due to the variable of specialization type, except for the second field, which indicated that there were differences in favor of the humanities at the expense of the applied sciences.
- 6) The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the

participant's responses to the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing from the perspective of faculty members at Amran University at the level of all the second, third, and the tool as a whole due to the variable of academic degree. However, the results pointed out that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the study sample's responses to the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing due to the variable of academic degree, at the level of the first field "Teaching" and the academic degree "Professor" at the expense of the rest of the levels.

- 7) The results revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the study sample's responses to the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing from the perspective of faculty members and their assistants at Amran University at the level of the second field due to the variable of (years of experience). However, the results showed that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the study sample's responses to the degree of practice of faculty members at Amran University for knowledge sharing from the perspective of faculty members and their assistants at Amran University at the level of the first and third fields and the tool as a whole due to the variable of (years of experience), at the level of years of experience (5 – 10 years), and in favor of years of experience (less than 5 years, and more than 10 years) based on the level of experience (5- 10 years).

11.2. Recommendations

In light of the results of the study, the researcher presents the following important recommendations:

- 1) The Yemeni universities should strive to provide the requirements for knowledge sharing among the academic staff, as this has positive effects on knowledge-sharing and its implications of efficiency on them.
- 2) It is necessary for decision-makers at Yemeni universities to identify the reasons for the weakness of the knowledge sharing process among faculty members and the obstacles that challenge the implementation of effective knowledge-sharing and work to reduce them in a way that achieves its goals and enhances its competitive position.
- 3) Conducting studies on the role of universities and their leaders in promoting knowledge sharing.
- 4) Holding scientific seminars, conferences, and workshops on the importance of knowledge sharing and its role in achieving the goals of universities.
- 5) Establishing a clear known system of rewards that incentivizes knowledge-sharing while preserving the

rights of all participants from confusion or loss.

- 6) The academic leadership should be keen to encourage cooperation and knowledge-sharing to conduct joint scientific research between faculty members and support it, and to include it in the requirements for job promotion in a way that encourages knowledge sharing in universities, through the holding of workshops, the formation of research communities and their support; for faculty members to exchange research materials and ideas about scientific research.
- 7) Utilizing social media to raise awareness of the importance of knowledge sharing among faculty members.
- 8) Establishing a database that makes knowledge accessible to all faculty members and their assistants in Yemeni universities and in a way that allows for the exploitation of intellectual capital.
- 9) Encouraging faculty members in the academic departments of universities to participate in visiting developed universities to learn about the reality of knowledge-sharing practices in those universities to benefit from them in a way that serves their practice in their universities.
- 10) Ensuring the exchange of research and scientific production of faculty members with other universities through the signing of understanding-agreements for joint cooperation with other universities, whether inside or outside Yemen.

Abbreviations

SPSS	Statistical Packages for Social Sciences
AD	Anno Domini
SWOT	Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats

Author Contributions

Mutee Ali Ali Al-Guhali is the sole author. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

I haven't any financial, commercial, or other affiliations that may be perceived as potential conflicts of interest by the academic community. So "I have no conflicts of interest".

References

- [1] Abdel-Hafiz, T., & Al-Mahdi, Y. (2015). The reality of knowledge sharing practice among faculty members: An applied study on faculties of education in some Arab universities. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, University of Bahrain*, 16(4), 479-517.
<http://search.mandumah.com/Record/784668>

- [2] Abdel-Naeem, E. M. (2023). A proposed vision for the role of knowledge sharing in enhancing organizational loyalty among faculty members at Aswan University, *Journal of Educational and Social Studies*, Helwan University, Volume 29, Issue 2.1 - Serial Number of Issue 2, February.
https://jsu.journals.ekb.eg/article_286803.html
- [3] Ahmed, E. A. (2021). Activating knowledge sharing among faculty members to achieve the competitive advantage of Egyptian universities. *Journal of Research, Faculty of Arts, Sciences, and Education*, Ain Shams University, 2(2), February 2021. <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1152253>
- [4] Al-Blawi, S. M. M. (2019). The degree of knowledge sharing practice among faculty members and its relationship to organizational culture at the Universities of Tabuk and King Saud. *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, Al-Azhar University, No. (183), Part (Second), July.
<http://search.shamaa.org/fullrecord?ID=276546>
- [5] Alcorn, N. (2010). Knowledge through a collaborative network: a cross - cultural partnership. *Educational Action Research*, 18(4), p. 455-489.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2010.524783>
- [6] Al-Hadrami, N. (2017). Barriers to knowledge sharing among faculty members at Tabuk University and ways to overcome them. *The International Specialized Educational Journal*, Volume (6), (9), September, p. 1-15.
<http://search.mandumah.com/Record/879911>
- [7] Al-Harbi, A. B. M. (2021). Knowledge sharing among members of educational scientific societies in Egypt and Saudi Arabia: A cross-cultural study, *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, University of Qassim, Volume (14), Issue (3), pp. 1283-1324.
<http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1261124>
- [8] Aliyan, R. M. (2008). Knowledge management, 1st ed., Dar Safaa for Publishing and Distribution, Jordan.
<https://library.ppfi.ps/records/index/1/458>
- [9] Al-Kemim, M. N. (2022). The impact of knowledge sharing on the efficiency of academic performance, a case study of University of Sabaa Region, *Scientific Journal of the University of Sabaa Region*, Volume (4), Issue (2). Marib, Yemen.
<https://sj.usr.ac/index.php/files/article/view/69>
- [10] Al-Khalaf, G. (2021). The reality of knowledge sharing practice and the individual factors affecting it among faculty members at the Faculty of Education in Damascus, *Journal of the University of Damascus for Educational and Psychological Sciences*, Volume -33, Issue 2.
<https://journal.damascusuniversity.edu.sy/index.php/edu/article/view/2102/1067>
- [11] Al-Mohammad, D. S., & Al-Dhura, O. M. (2019). The reality and trends of knowledge sharing among students of Mardin University, Turkey. *Journal of Economic, Administrative, and Legal Sciences-The Arab Journal of Science and Research Publishing*, Volume 3, Issue 3.
<https://journals.ajsrp.com/index.php/jeals/ar/article/view/699/658>
- [12] Al-Mutajalli, M., et al. (2022). The reality of research collaboration at Al-Azhar University: A field study. (Ph.D. thesis abstract). Al-Azhar University, Faculty of Education, Cairo, Egypt. *Journal of Education*, No. (194), Part (4), April.
https://jsrep.journals.ekb.eg/article_261434_defe7a2ec2848ba93f4ee90515ea32ad.pdf
- [13] Alotaibi, H., Crowder, R. & Wills, G. (2017). Adoption of Web based Knowledge Sharing system amongst Academic Staff. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 5 (1), 57-63.
<https://scispace.com/pdf/adoption-of-web-based-knowledge-sharing-system-amongst-505zzrtipr.pdf>
- [14] Al-Yami, A., & Al-Duwan, M. (2021). The impact of knowledge sharing on achieving professional development: A field study of faculty members at Najran University. *Global Journal of Economics and Business*, Volume 10, Issue 2, April 2021, pp. 341-365.
<https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-1273607>
- [15] Aqti, J. (2014). The impact of strategic leadership on knowledge sharing: A case study of a group of Algerian hotels-PhD thesis in Business Administration-Department of Business Administration-College of Economics, Business and Management-University of Mohamed Khider-Biskra, Algeria.
<http://thesis.univ-biskra.dz/id/eprint/118>
- [16] Assefa, T. (2010). "Enabling Knowledge Sharing to Promote Innovative Organizations in Africa", In A Paper to Be Presented at Expert Group Meeting on Harnessing Knowledge to Achieve Mdgs, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
<https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=9552988867388027202&hl=en&oi=scholar>
- [17] Babalhavaeji, F.; Kermani, J. (2011). "Knowledge Sharing Behavior Influences: A Case of Library and information Science Faculties in Iran", *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 16 (1), 124-146.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288556069_Knowledge_sharing_behaviour_influences_A_case_of_Library_and_Information_Science_faculties_in_Iran
- [18] Buckley, S.; Giannakopoulos, P. (2009). "Challenges in knowledge sharing in higher education", *The European Conference on Knowledge Management (ECKM)*, 133-142.
<https://hdl.handle.net/10210/5307>
- [19] Chen, C. Y. (2015). A study showing research has been valued over teaching in higher education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 15(3). P. 18.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1064434.pdf>
- [20] Corbin JH, Jones J, Barry MM. What makes intersectoral partnerships for health promotion work? A review of the international literature. *Health Promot Int*. 2018 Feb 1; 33(1): 4-26. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daw061>
- [21] Dalal, Kh., & Khouni, R. (2021). The impact of knowledge sharing on the efficiency of a higher education professor: A field study in the Faculty of Economics, Business and Management at Batna University -1-, *Journal of Economic and Administrative Research*, Volume 15, Issue: 2, p. 115-136.
<https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/166091>

- [22] Gole, W. (2014). Strategic Partnership: Overview, Canada: Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada. p. 2. <https://www.cpacanada.ca/-/media/site/operational/rg-research-guidance-and-support/docs/mags/01683-rg-strategic-partnerships-overview-may-2018.pdf?rev=5cea4fe28f854e55af61ecc03b1fb3fc>
- [23] Harb, M. K. (2021). The role of academic leadership in promoting knowledge sharing practices at Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University: A field study, *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 25(2), 2, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia <https://imamjournals.org/index.php/joes/article/view/1496>
- [24] Hassan, M. I. (2016). Knowledge sharing in the academic environment: A survey study on universities in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Library and Information Sciences*, Vol. 3, (2), p. 159-209. <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/802568>
- [25] Hora, M. T., & Millar, S. B. (2012). A guide to building education partnerships: Navigating diverse cultural contexts to turn challenge into promise. Stylus Publishing, LLC Virginia. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003442790>
- [26] Ipe, M. (2003). "Knowledge sharing in organizations: A conceptual framework", *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 337-359. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492196.pdf>
- [27] Jarrah, H. Y. & Alkhazaleh, M. S. (2020). «Knowledge Sharing Behavior in the Curricula of United Arab Emirates Universities and Educational Organizations» *International Journal of Instruction* «Vol. 13 «No. 3 «July. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1331a>
- [28] Karumi, Said. (2022). Impact of Cognitive Behavior on the Quality of Education at the University of Algeria, Bashar University, *Journal of Strategy and Development*, Faculty of Economics and Commercial Science, Abdelhamid Ben Badis University Mostaganem, Vol. 12, No 1.
- [29] Khamqani, A. (2022). The impact of knowledge sharing on the performance of the university professor - a case study of a sample of professors of Ouargla University - Economic and Administrative Research, Faculty of Economics, Business and Management, Mohamed Khider University, Biskra, Vol. 16, No. 1, Algeria. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/176877>
- [30] Muijs, D, Ainscow, M, Chapman, C., & West, M. (2011). Collaboration and networking in education. Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0283-7>
- [31] Nassuora, A., Hasan, S. (2010). Knowledge Sharing among Academics in Institutions of Higher, Knowledge Management International Conference, University Utara Malaysia, pp. 164-173. <https://repo.uum.edu.my/id/eprint/11129>
- [32] Oyemomi, O. (2017) The Impact Of Organizational Factors On Knowledge Sharing Performance. Thesis. University of Plymouth. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24382/1013>
- [33] Qura, M., & Al-Arabi, A. (2023). Knowledge sharing: Its importance, forms, and requirements for faculty members of Tanta University, *The Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Arts*, No. 52 <http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1428098>
- [34] Samina, K., Mohsin, N. & Saadi, A. M. (2020). "Willingness to Knowledge Sharing, Intervention of work Culture and Organizational Commitment» *Pakistan Journal of Distance & Online Learning* «Vol. I «Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.30971/pjdl.v6i1.347>
- [35] Yi, J. (2009). "A measure of Knowledge sharing behavior: scale development and validation", *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 7(1), 65-81. <https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2008.36>