

Analyzing the Lived Experiences of University Managers in Iraq in the Context of Knowledge Management Implementation to Propose a Model

Ali. Doleh Khalifeh¹, Farhad. Shafiepour Motlagh^{2*}, Raed Rasem. Yunus Al Jabar³, Narges. Saeidian⁴

¹ Department of Educational Administration, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

² Associate professor, Department of Educational administration, Mahallat Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mahallat, Iran

³ Full Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Baghdad university, Baghdad, Iraq



⁴ Associate Professor, Department of Educational Administration, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: farhad_shafiepour@yahoo.com

Editor

Azar Kafashpoor¹
Professor, Department of
Educational Management and
Human Resource Development,
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad,
Mashhad, Iran
kafashpor@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Lourdes Atiaja Atiaja¹
Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, Ecuador.
Email: natiaja@espe.edu.ec
Reviewer 2: Marco Yamba-Yugsi¹
Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101,
Ecuador
Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Knowledge is considered the main factor distinguishing organizational success...” could be supported by a more recent reference to contextualize its importance in the Iraqi educational setting, enhancing its relevance to the study’s focus on Iraqi universities.

The method to validate interview codes through “expert consensus” is mentioned but not detailed. Describe how many experts were involved, their areas of expertise, and how consensus was achieved.

Throughout the findings, terms like “learning welfare” and “technological welfare” appear. Clarify or define these terms in a footnote or parenthesis for readers unfamiliar with this terminology.

In Table 4, “developing organizational trust” lacks specificity. Provide more detail on how organizational trust was assessed or improved, with examples drawn from Iraqi universities if possible.

Each axial code section, such as in Table 2, would benefit from a brief explanation of how codes were assigned to dimensions like “technological welfare.” This would improve clarity for readers unfamiliar with the data organization.

In the discussion, the statement “the research results align with the studies of Alipour and Hoseinpour (2018), and Nilipour Tabatabaei, Taghsimi, and Fatemi (2018)” could be expanded to detail how these studies align or differ from the current findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the description of the sampling method, it states “purposive sampling continued to the point of theoretical saturation.” This would benefit from more detailed criteria for theoretical saturation to clarify how many interviews or data points were necessary before achieving saturation.

The criteria for participant selection, such as requiring a Ph.D. in management, may limit generalizability. A justification of this requirement would strengthen the methodology section.

The phrase “in-depth and unstructured interviews” lacks detail on how interview questions were initially formulated and refined. Consider adding an explanation of the interview development process or providing examples.

The use of open, axial, and selective coding is noted, yet no details are provided about how these were applied specifically to the data. Examples of codes derived at each stage would enhance transparency.

In the findings, you mention “organizational structure reconstruction.” It would be beneficial to specify what practical or structural changes were implemented or recommended for Iraqi universities based on this.

In Table 1, the codes for “Organizational Structure Reconstruction” could be grouped more logically or have headings to clarify distinctions between delegation and knowledge processes.

In the conclusion, the claim that “knowledge management implementation improves organizational performance and service quality” is significant but would benefit from concrete examples from the findings to support this.

There is little mention of potential study limitations. Consider adding a section that addresses limitations, such as sample size constraints, geographic specificity, or interviewer bias, to enhance the rigor of the study.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.