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Abstract

Competition and setting up the methods for attaining the competition benefits have been interesting for organizations and producers of goods and services for along time. Nowadays knowledge has the integral role for setting up enlarging and retaining a constant competition benefit among the countries and it is considered as the most vital variant in case of multiple growths of organizations. So with regard to the importance knowledge management and its noticeable effect in attaining competition benefits it was a matter of consideration in this essay to investigate the relations between the technical elements of knowledge management based on APQC model and attain the competition benefits in entrepreneur companies. The two methods used in this research are library readings and measurement. And the main source of gathering information is KMAT questionnaires. And as a result it became clear that there is a significant relationship between the technical elements of knowledge management, using knowledge, learning from the process of knowledge management, sharing and exchanging the knowledge, attaining the competition benefits including the timely presentation of the product, innovation in products, reducing the costs of the product, increasing the marketing shares and producing outputs with higher qualities.
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Introduction:

The world we live in nowadays, because of the depth of the phenomenon of globalization, rapid change is inevitable. Now, the modern competitive world, with different challenges such as increasing customer impact, intensity of competition, shortening product cycles and accelerate and sustain face technology to deal with these challenges and stay competitive world requires a dynamic and There are plenty of flexibility. Organizations to maintain flexibility and competitive advantage, we are trying to distinguish themselves from others. The resource-based view, it is assumed that organizations with regard to the resources they are distinguished from each other and can be superior to other competitors in the competition are present, of course, "a source for the organization creates a competitive advantage, a resource unique and only four conditions that must be rare, valuable, inimitable and is irreplaceable being. Nowadays, organizations have found that there are strong links between knowledge management and competitive advantage hidden nature of the knowledge that it has a unique source. managing knowledge is an essential strategic resource for organizations and the most important key to creating competitive advantage.

Knowledge Management:

Knowledge management is to manage a range of activities, exchange, create or Promotion Intellectual capital is used at the macro level. Clever design knowledge management Processes, Tools, etc., with the intention of increasing modernization, or improvement of feed Knowledge Each of the three elements of intellectual capital, the structural, social and human Visible D ourselves. Knowledge management is a process that helps organizations to information and Skills Are considered as important as the institutional memory and typically form Organizing There are no, identify, select, organize and publish freely. It Management Organizations to solve problems, learn, strategic planning and decision
making Dynamic Enabling efficient and effective manner (Adamson, 2005, pp.16.) In other words, knowledge management is a multidisciplinary approach to achieve organizational goals by providing the best of knowledge, which includes design, review and implementation of both technical and social processes to improve the application of knowledge (for the benefit of all persons) is (Australia, 2003, pp.3). In general we can say that knowledge management is an organizational process assets are produced assets, intellectual or knowledge-based (Hiscock, 2004, pp. 110).

Knowledge management and competitive advantage:
In the past, countries and manufacturers to hide the procedures and resources used to maintain its superiority over competitors, and governments economic and technical knowledge of the production of skills prevents the whereas the Nowadays rarely Emery Confidentiality can be found in the business world. However, displacement of people, reverse engineering, free flow of thoughts, ideas and technology can not be copied and replicated by competitors can be prevented. So the technology is finally available to everyone, does not make anyone a competitive advantage. Now this knowledge that can lead to competitive advantage, because before that all competitors, price and quality of their products and the quality of the optimal level of current market prices leading organizations pass interest the benefit from the wealth of scientific knowledge, has to step up and paced a higher degree of quality, innovation and efficiency will be. Advantages arising from the application of knowledge management are sustainable because higher interest income and can participate in certain procedures are followed. Also unlike physical capital in use, the value is decreased, the value of knowledge capital using the more it increases. ((MIR)) as an internal source, and the strategic role of knowledge management for competitive advantage will be examined, so that the knowledge management activities of the merits of the organization supports eventually led to the development of competitive advantage is paced (Figure 1). Competitive environment and internal environment are also factors that affect organizational competence (Maier, 2001, pp.54).

Figure 1: The relationship between competitive advantage and manage knowledge (Maier, 2001, pp. 54)
Innovative Knowledge Management and Organization:

Based on this knowledge management architecture, knowledge processing can be segmented into two broad classes: integrative and interactive (Figure 4), each addressing different knowledge management objectives. Together, these approaches provide a broad set of knowledge processing capabilities. They support well-structured repositories for managing explicit knowledge while enabling interaction to integrate tacit knowledge.

**Integrative Applications**

*Integrative* applications exhibit a sequential flow of explicit knowledge into and out of the repository. Producers and consumers interact with the repository rather than with each other directly. The repository becomes the primary medium for knowledge exchange, providing a place for members of a knowledge community to contribute their knowledge and views. The primary focus tends to be on the repository and the explicit knowledge it contains, rather than on the contributors, users, or the tacit knowledge they may hold.

Integrative applications vary in the extent to which knowledge producers and consumers come from the same knowledge community. At one extreme, which I label *electronic publishing*, the consumers (readers) neither directly engage in the same work nor belong to the same practice community as the producers (authors). Once published, the content tends to be stable, and those few updates that may be required are expected to originate with authors. The consumer accepts the content as is, and active feedback or modification by the user is not anticipated (although provisions could be made for that to occur). For example, the organization may produce a periodic newsletter, or the human resources department may publish its policies or a directory of employee skills and experience.

At the other extreme, the producers and consumers are members of the same practice community or organizational unit. While still exhibiting a sequential flow, the repository provides a means to integrate and build on their collective knowledge. I label these *integrated knowledge-bases*. A best-practices database is the most common application. Practices are collected, integrated and shared among people confronting similar problems.

Regarding the organizational roles for managing integrative applications, acquisition requires knowledge creators, finders, and collectors. Capturing verbal knowledge requires interviewers and transcribers. Documenting observed experiences requires organizational "reporters". Surfacing and interpreting deeply held cultural and social knowledge may require corporate anthropologists. Refining requires analysts, interpreters, abstractors, classifiers, editors, and integrators. A librarian or "knowledge curator" must manage the repository. Others must take responsibility for access, distribution and presentation. Finally, organizations may need people to train users to critically interpret, evaluate and adapt knowledge to new contexts.

**Interactive Applications**

*Interactive* applications are focused primarily on supporting interaction among people holding tacit knowledge. In contrast to integrative applications, the repository is a by-product of interaction and collaboration rather than the primary focus of the application. Its content is dynamic and emergent.

Interactive applications vary by the level of expertise between producers and consumers and the degree of structure imposed on their interaction. Where formal training or knowledge transfer is
the objective, the interaction tends to be primarily between instructor and student, or expert and novice, and structured around a discrete problem, assignment or lesson plan\(^{(22)}\). I refer to these applications as distributed learning.

In contrast, interaction among those performing common practices or tasks tends to be more ad hoc or emergent. I broadly refer to these applications as forums. They may take the form of a knowledge brokerage - an electronic discussion space where people may either search for knowledge (e.g., "Does anyone know...") or advertise their expertise. The most interactive forums support ongoing, collaborative discussions. The producers and consumers comprise the same group of people, continually responding to and building on each individual’s additions to the discussion. The flow continually loops back from presentation to acquisition. With the appropriate structuring and indexing of the content, a knowledge repository can emerge. A standard categorization scheme for indexing contributions provides the ability to reapply that knowledge across the enterprise.

Interactive applications play a major role in supporting integrative applications\(^{(23)}\). For example, a forum can be linked to an electronic publishing application for editors to discuss the quality of the contributions, or to offer a place for readers to react to and discuss the publication. Best practice databases typically require some degree of forum interaction, so that those attempting to adopt a practice have an opportunity to discuss its reapplication with its creators.

Regarding the organizational roles for managing interactive applications, acquisition requires recruiters and facilitators to encourage and manage participation in interactive forums so that those with the appropriate expertise are contributing. The refining, structuring, and indexing of the content often is done by the communicators themselves, using guidelines and categories built into the application, supplemented by a conference moderator. Assuring the quality of the knowledge may require quality assurance personnel such as subject matter experts and reputation brokers. Managing a conference repository over its lifecycle usually falls to a conference moderator. Others may be required to work with users to help them become comfortable and skilled with accessing and using the application.

The model used in this study APQC:

Nearly all uses of frameworks APQC has identified can be organized into these high-level areas: benchmarking, content management, and business process definition. The framework is really just a tool to accomplish these tasks; it is not an end in itself. Therefore, when determining whether or not to implement a framework, the most important question to ask is not necessarily what benefits the framework could provide, but instead, what the cost of not using this tool would be. In business process definition, frameworks and reference models help support process analysis, design, and modeling activities. Starting with a process framework or reference model accelerates these activities by giving professionals a basis on which to build. At best-practice organizations, the adopted framework is generally well reviewed and supported by a consulting firm, standards body, or industry association such as APQC (the PCF), Supply Chain Council (the SCOR® model), or the Telecommunications Forum (eTOM).

The cost of not using a process framework is the time it would take the process definition team to develop their own process model and obtain consensus from the various stakeholders about the processes included within it. As was seen in the all but the Cisco site visit (since Cisco focused only on benchmarking), organizations adopting process frameworks for process definition can quickly move beyond high level process definition and modeling discussions into
detailed discussions and working sessions about the merit of the chosen framework and how to adapt it to meet the organization’s needs.

Benchmarking and process measurement activities are generally too costly to perform without the use of a process framework or reference model. Internally, organizations need a common way to describe the work they do so that it can be consistently and repeatedly measured. Externally, organizations normalize their internal processes against the process framework or reference model and depend on the objective, standard definitions in the framework to enable the comparison of processes across organizational boundaries. The process framework or reference model becomes the Rosetta Stone for organizations benchmarking with others. Using a process framework or reference model as a common language reduces the effort required to begin benchmarking activities. A framework establishes a common language from the start.

Organizations reduce the time spent mapping their specific activities to the activities of other organizations because everyone participating in the benchmarking has the same, single process framework or reference model to map all processes to. What is the cost, then, of not using a process framework in benchmarking activities?

Consider a situation in which an organization must map its processes to the processes of each of its benchmarking partners. In a situation with five benchmarking partners, each partner must map to each of its four partners. Compare this to a situation in which the partners agree to adopt a process framework or reference model. With the centralized framework, each partner needs to map only once to the centralized model to ensure an accurate comparison. The process framework enables each distinct set of processes to be mapped into a common language that each entity can understand. Using a framework to overcome this cost is one the factors that enables external benchmarking for Cisco Systems. Content management activities rely on common taxonomies. Using a process framework or reference model as the basis for a content management taxonomy helps knowledge managers quickly build consensus among various stakeholders even when the structure of the reference model doesn’t precisely map to existing enterprise process model. The process framework or reference model acts as an interface between the way the content is organized and the way work is performed. It reduces rework imposed upon a knowledge manager when the organization changes the way work is done. Again, the cost associated with not adopting a process framework lies in the collaboration with stakeholders. Consider the example of the Williams Companies. Williams’ initial adoption of the PCF organized enterprise-wide financial content according to a single consistent, objective model. Mapping that taxonomy to the way work is done within the organization created an extensible and robust repository of content that can survive future changes to the ways Williams works. Use of the framework also eliminates costly retagging and reorganization when changes occur.

Figure 2: The framework for knowledge management perspective and Williams

( APQC ) ( Bukowtiz and Williams, 1999, pp. 14 )
Research Methodology:

Understanding and Introduction to Statistical Society (propaganda media companies):
A small and efficient management structure, tasks based on system optimum and appropriate interaction with other organizations and companies of the most important features is the advertising media companies.

Tactical factors for knowledge management in this research, the concept of knowledge management and business indicators including knowledge sharing and exchange of knowledge, learning and applying knowledge from the knowledge management are the timely supply of products as well as indicators of competitiveness, innovation products, increase market share, creating products of superior quality products to form. The population in this study, forty-six media companies are advertising that they are in the stage of technology development, and due to the small population size, sample coincide with the target population. The study gathered information through interviews and questionnaires have been analyzed. Questionnaire KMAT Five critical success factors of knowledge management, evaluation and communication of these agents has been measured with a competitive advantage. The questionnaire consisted of two sections is fifty-five questions, the first part containing thirty questions each question has six factors, critical success factors in the questionnaire are as follows: 1 - 2 management perspective - knowledge sharing culture 3 - Teaching and Learning 4 - IT 5 - document storage tank. In the second part, twenty-five questions that measure the effect of knowledge on a competitive advantage.

Research findings:
Ranking tactical elements of knowledge management in the advertising media companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average rating based on test</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Operating Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.33040</td>
<td>24.2826</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Learning knowledge management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.48521</td>
<td>24.1739</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.37445</td>
<td>21.3696</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Applying Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.708031</td>
<td>18.0000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking indicators competitive advantage in the advertising media companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average rating based on test</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Operating Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.71585</td>
<td>15.9565</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Produce superior quality products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.24997</td>
<td>15.5652</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Reduction of product price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.93439</td>
<td>15.4783</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Innovation in products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.15432</td>
<td>15.3043</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Increase market share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.85934</td>
<td>14.9565</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Timely supply of products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions:
Interpretation of the results of the Pearson correlation coefficient between the tactical elements of business management knowledge and competitive advantage in the advertising media companies are as follows:
Maximum correlation coefficient in the company, the sharing and exchange of knowledge and innovation in products (P = 0.000 And r = 0.509 ) And the lowest correlation coefficient between the use and production of superior quality products (P = 0.978 And r = 0.004 ). If the factors that have a significant relationship with a very intense and relatively "severe, in order to express the following would be:

1 - sharing knowledge and creating innovation in products (P = 0.00 And r = 0.509 )
2 - sharing knowledge and increasing market share (P = 0.00 And r = 0.507 )
3 - Use knowledge and timely supply of products (P = 0.006 And r = 0.401 )
4 - sharing knowledge and delivering timely products (P = 0.009 And r = 0.382 )
5 - sharing knowledge and reducing the cost of production (P = 0.009 And r = 0.381 )
6 - Knowledge and timely supply of products (P = 0.028 And r = 0.324 )
7 - sharing knowledge and producing superior quality products (P = 0.033 And r = 0.314 )

Similarly, applying knowledge and produce superior quality products (P = 0.978 And r = -0.004 ) And the application of knowledge and reduce the cost of production (P = 0.897 And r = -0.002 ) There is an inverse relationship. Also learning factor Knowledge management, the competitive advantage of any business indicators, no significant relationship. In general we can say that the correlation between Vmbadlh share knowledge and gain a competitive advantage, is at the highest level.

Suggestions:
With regard to knowledge acquisition, knowledge management is the first step, we must take this point into consideration, the results of the ranking factors of knowledge management, knowledge management process in the company demonstrates that the implementation of It is not. Principles and scientific knowledge management in addition to the many advantages it brings to organizations, the cost savings is good and everyone knows his role and responsibilities. In this regard, companies should be responsible for a knowledge-based strategy and precisely determine the prospects for long-term and short-term goals identified and to determine the desired direction and the resources and the framework for the basis of performance measurement in them. The use of experienced consultants to implement change management and knowledge creation, knowledge management, knowledge management and other solutions that are native to the directors of the company to be recommended.
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