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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between Total Quality Management (TQM); Knowledge Management (KM) and Organizational Performance (OP) in Iraqi higher-education institutions (HEIs). TQM core elements included leadership commitment, strategic planning, continuous improvement, customer focus, process focus, employee involvement, training and learning, rewards and recognition, and management by fact. KM processes included knowledge identification, knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing, and knowledge application. Meanwhile, measures of organizational performance included students related academic achievement and non-students related academic achievement. Based on the theoretical framework, four main hypotheses were developed, and statistically tested. The study used cross-sectional survey methodology. The samples were drawn from Iraqi HEIs (public universities) using a stratified random sampling procedure based on the directory provided by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research in Iraq (MHESR-I). The final number of respondents, involved in this study, was 174 colleges (faculties) within 24 public universities. The hypotheses of the study were tested by applying multivariate statistical data analyses. This study reported a significant relationship between TQM core elements and KM processes, between TQM core elements and OP measures, and between KM processes and OP measures. In brief, the results supported all the four main hypotheses, and provided evidence that both TQM core elements and KM processes should be implemented holistically, rather than piecemeal. In addition, the study found that the KM fully mediates the relationship between TQM and OP. The current study provided insight regarding the relationship between TQM, KM and OP. Hence, this study was able to expand the boundary of existing literature. Finally, the findings from this study provided empirical evidence that TQM has a significant and positive impact on KM, which in turn, significantly affect organizational performance.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Throughout the world, organizations are now facing a common challenge resulting from rapid changes in the business environment. Organizations need to improve their performance in order to gain sustainable competitive advantages to survive in today’s competitive environment. This serves as the driving force for a number of innovative strategic changes in many organizations. To cope with the changing expectations of the organization, there is a need for continuous improvement of the organizational performance. Different innovations can be integrated to keep the performance above the competitors of all time. In enhancing the performance of any organization, in doing this effectively, the factors that drive such performance have to be well understood.

Both Total Quality Management (TQM) and Knowledge Management (KM) practices have been used for improving the performance of many organizations (Hung, Lien, Fang & McLean, 2010; Janpen, Palaprom & Horadal, 2005). The clear definition of TQM is not given until the 1980s (Crosby, 1979; Deming, 1986; Juran, 1986). Practitioners, researchers and the like have collectively defended the positive effects of TQM practices on organizational performance. Many organizations adopt TQM as a management paradigm worldwide. TQM has its own roots established predominantly in the industry. This paradigm was adapted, spread later for the profit-making organizations (such as banks, insurance companies), and ultimately to
The contents of the thesis is for internal user only
REFERENCES


Ojo, B. J. (2008). Total quality management culture and productivity improvement in Ethiopia higher institutions. Academic Leadership, 6(3).


UNESCO (2011). *Assuring quality is ensuring the development of higher education in Iraq*. Erbil, Iraq: UNESCO.


Yeh, Y. M. C., & Ta, Y. (2005). The Implementation of knowledge management system In Taiwan’s higher education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 2*(9), 35-41.


