

## Impact of marketing knowledge management on organizational performance (with respect to Pharmaceutical Organizations)

Bahram Kheiri, Hamed Razipour (Corresponding author), Vahidreza Mirabi

Faculty member, Azad University-Central Tehran  
Email: razipour\_h@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** In current competitive and challenging marketplace, many companies need to take a holistic and systematic approach toward internal organizational knowledge in favor of making a competitive advantage. Therefore, in recent years they have been concentrating on knowledge sustaining and utilization. In general, most of the effective marketing approaches, which have been hidden under customers' characteristics and their shopping approach can be revealed by a knowledge based on marketing management. Specific emphasis on managing the communication with customers has made marketing responsibility as an applied domain for customers' data analysis. Knowledge can be a critical tool if organization uses it as a mean toward utilization of current opportunities in competitive market. The main motivation of current paper is to evaluate the effect of marketing knowledge management (MKM) on organizational performance. Based on these variables, a questionnaire was developed using previous studies and a Cronbach's Alpha obtained is 0.824, which indicates reasonable reliability of 400 of distributed questionnaires. The data was analyzed using SPSS and Lisrel. Results from analysis indicates that if an organization poses some of the MKM advantages and capabilities then it will make competitive advantage, which in turn the organizational performance shall be improved as well. Any kind of increasing in MKM capabilities and properties would lead into better organizational market performance. In particular, such capabilities will make them to have better performance in target markets.

[Bahram Kheiri, Hamed Razipour, Vahidreza Mirabi. **Impact of marketing knowledge management on organizational performance (with respect to Pharmaceutical Organizations)**. *Researcher*. 2012;4(7):73-81]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 10

**Key Words:** Marketing knowledge management, Marketing properties, Marketing capabilities, Organizational performance, Marketing management.

### Introduction

Industrial activities in current global market are unlimited; therefore, diverse demands and tastes require higher quality and better products. Such goals can be achieved only if organizations identify their capabilities and limitations, allocate sufficient resources, evaluate their abilities and finally design and develop long term strategies. This approach would assist managers to identify barriers and potential assisting factors on one hand and to select feasible methods on the other hand, which will determine their future steps toward achieving highest expecting yield.

Nowadays marketing knowledge has received more attention from organizations, public and private institutions and also nations; it was changed from the initial steps of selling and distribution to a sophisticated philosophy connecting organizations with their markets. Thus most of the big and small companies are aware of the difference between sales and marketing. Therefore, they are planning to organize their marketing approach. Some of the countries are improving their internal system of distribution and its potential role in global market. Other countries also are trying to implement the results from marketing researches, to advertise and to pricing, which would improve their plans as well. In the present marketplace, Marketing knowledge

management and its implementation is very important for small and big organizations in Iran and other countries.

In order to access to secure and constant internal and international markets, commercial institutions are very much concerned to identify threats and opportunities for marketing and exporting. Therefore, being familiar with MKM and analyzing the most influential factors on marketing are critical to solve the problem.

In recent decades, considerable studies have reviewed the concept of knowledge management (KM) (Pit & Clarck, 1999; Barchen, 1998; Clario et al., 2003; Carrion et al., 2004; Wang, 2004; Tsai & Shiye, 2004; Darooch, 2005; Lin & Tsing, 2005; Tanerwerd, 2005; White, 2005; Yang, 2006; Madan, 2009). Hence, these researches are not consistent with definition of knowledge and knowledge management. Furthermore, more awareness of knowledge influence on organizational performance via various studies has been evaluated (Barchen, 1998; Cakison, 1999; Messy et al., 2002; Roveli, 2005; Tanerwerd, 2005).

Due to insufficient attention devoted to KM in Iran from both academic and commercial sectors, studies on KM are not complete. However, few studies in this area have been conducted that are accessible.

These studies are mainly focused on understanding the concept of KM in Iranian organizations and its determinant factors. Along with new developments and economic improvements, more understanding of KM, its utilization and its role in Iranian economy seems to be required. Therefore, relationships between various parts of KM and Iranian organizational performance need to be evaluated to justify more investments in this area.

Providing a resource based organizational view and evaluating the existing KM definitions is something that McIntosh (1998) proposed in his paper on KM. According to him KM needs to be applied based on knowledge capabilities and properties toward achieving organizational goals. This definition is a practical method for KM evaluation as a holistic concept obtained from knowledge unique role. This definition also indicates knowledge role on various organizational performance, which leads into better understanding of reactions and responses that present unrealistic and holistic results.

While research on MKM including KM is rare (Tsai & Shiye, 2004), present study aims to apply a comprehensive definition with emphasis on MKM in specific area of knowledge. This paper shall introduce a model to evaluate the relationship between MKM and organizational performance (Pharmaceutical organizations). Iranian pharmaceutical industry, in regard to various opportunities in the country, is able to be an important part of Iranian economy. This industry

indicated a huge growth in recent years, which present its competitive nature. This situation has put pharmaceutical companies in a position which is very suitable for research to evaluate the impacts of MKM capabilities and properties on pharmaceutical organizational performance (either producing, importing or distributor companies). It is found that specific pharmaceutical marketing properties and capabilities are necessary to get effective MKM and improve pharmaceutical organizational performance.

### Methodology

In order to accomplish, the research data was collected from 116 pharmaceutical companies. Data in the first phase was gathered via hierarchical sampling and in the second phase via random sampling. Data was collected by distributing developed questionnaire consisting of 33 questions. In this study 400 questionnaires were distributed to 34 importing, 60 producing and 22 distributing companies in Tehran during one year. Collected data were analyzed by using SPSS 18 and Lisrel. Questionnaire was designed in two sections: in the first section there was personal information such as age, gender, income and so forth, and in the second section there was some of the criterion in which question variables are supposed to be evaluated. Following table presents variables, items and Cronbach's Alpha for each variables (see table 1).

Table 1. Variables, items and Cronbach's Alpha for each variables

Criteria	Number of Item	Source	Cronbach's Alpha
Developing marketing properties	1-7	Akrosh & Ale-Mohammad (2010)	0.757
Investment in marketing properties	8-13	Akrosh & Ale-Mohammad (2010)	0.761
Internal marketing capabilities	14-20	Akrosh & Ale-Mohammad (2010)	0.815
External marketing capabilities	21-24	Akrosh & Ale-Mohammad (2010)	0.719
Financial performance	25-27	Akrosh & Ale-Mohammad (2010)	0.768
Market performance		Akrosh & Ale-Mohammad (2010)	0.784
Customer performance		Akrosh & Ale-Mohammad (2010)	0.774

As it is shown in foregoing table, reliability for all items obtained to be higher than 0.7 means that data are reliable. After checking reliability, it is time to take appropriate analysis technique. For the purpose of current study, structural equation modeling (SEM) is used. In doing so, multivariable analysis seems to be the most suitable approach in which SEM is one of the major methods for analysis. In this regard, SEM is used to analyze various variables which in a theoretical structure it can indicate variables mutual effects on each other. In order to discuss the final results, in first part it is worth to present respondents' demographic information as descriptive analysis.

### Findings

#### Descriptive Analysis

##### Gender

According to data collected form respondents, the sample compromise 126 male and 274 female.

##### Age

As shown in table 2, respondents are classified into six groups in which those who are in age of 25 to 29 compromises the highest rates while respondents who are in group 40 to 44 years old compromise the lowest rate.

Table 2. respondents are classified into six groups in which those who are in age of 25 to 29 comprises the highest rates while respondents who are in group 40 to 44 years old comprise the lowest rate

Age	Frequency	%
20-24	96	0.24
25-29	140	0.35
30-34	98	5.24
35-39	26	5.6
40-44	20	0.5
45 and above	20	0.5
Total	400	100

#### Academic Qualification

Respondents who are awarded as bachelor degrees seem to comprise highest number and those with associate degree comprise the least rates (see table 3).

Table 3. Respondents who are awarded as bachelor degrees seem to comprise highest number and those with associate degree comprise the least rates

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage%
Diploma and lower	18	5.4
Associate degree	13	3.3
Degree	164	0.14
Master	59	14.8
PhD	146	36.5
Total	400	100

#### Career

Among other factors, respondents' career status also was evaluated. As shown in the following table (table 4), most of the respondents are operating in private companies, which comprise 58.5 % of total sample.

Table 4. Among other factors, respondents' career status also was evaluated. As shown in the following table, most of the respondents are operating in private companies, which comprise 58.5 % of total sample

Career	Frequency	Percentage
Student	113	28.3
Governmental job	13	3.3
Private companies	234	58.5
Self-employed	35	8.8
Unemployed	5	1.3
Total	400	100

#### Income

According to table 5, most of the respondents can earn an average income of between 250 \$ to 500 \$ and the minimum numbers can earn 150 \$ to 250 \$ per month.

Table 5. most of the respondents can earn an average income of between 250 \$ to 500 \$ and the minimum numbers can earn 150 \$ to 250 \$ per month

Income	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 150\$	85	21.3
150 to 250\$	50	12.5
250 to 500\$	97	24.3
500 to 750\$	85	21.3
More than 750\$	83	20.8
Total	400	100

In the second part, analytical results are provided. As mentioned before, current study implemented structural equation modeling (SEM), which is a comprehensive approach toward testing the research hypotheses and relationship between observed variables and latent variables. By using this approach, it is possible to test reliability of the theoretical models using regression and other tools. Multivariable analysis is the most powerful and reliable method for analysis used in social sciences because such social issues naturally are multivariable. In this regard, SEM is one of the most frequent used approaches which analyzes “K” independent variable and “n” dependent variable simultaneously. In this approach, first we need to evaluate the validity which is done under Confirmative Factor Analysis (CFA). In this approach, operational load of each measure should be an amount of “t” (higher than 1/96). In present study we could obtain such validity; therefore, it is suitable to precede the analysis which compromise features of latent variables as well.

However, in order to get to the final structural model, structure needs to be modified a little. As discussed in SEM, researcher should apply to use the difference level of q-square and main model. In doing so, D2 test is required to be implemented, which judge the decline in q-square. As shown in table 6, initial model after three phases and in the form of fourth model has reached to suitable space being used in SEM. Therefore, the operation to free covariance between variables is stopped at the fourth phase to get the best matrix covariance (see table 6).

Table 6: Research performed models

square declining level-Q	RMSEA	df	$\Delta$		Reformed Models
---	0/169	4	---	24/81	1Model
%1	0/102	3	7/50	17/31	(start of reformation) 2Model
%2	0/085	2	7/50	9/81	3Model
Not meaningful	0/064	1	7/75	2/31	4Model

Therefore based on findings from this model, now it is easy to either keep some of the questions or eliminate them. In the fourth model value of variance error is significant, which are statistically reliable. The “t” value also has been evaluated for each structure which are reliable and valid for further processing as it is shown in table 7.

Table 7: “t” value

Research structure	Sign in model	Operational Load	t	p-value
MKM Properties and capabilities	Property	73.0	31.15	1%
	Capital	68.0	94.13	1%
	Internal	82.0	07.18	1%
	External	80.0	35.17	1%

In order to assess CFA, there are various criterion path models. In current research criterion such as  $\chi^2$ , RMR, GFI, AGFI, NFI, NNFI, IFI, CFI and also variance error criteria of RMSEA. Among these criterions,  $\chi^2$  is known as successful criteria; the less value of  $\chi^2$  is the best. The following table (see table 8) indicates the value of variance based on each of foregoing criterions.

Table 8: CFA based on various criterions

Criteria	Acceptable limit	Reported value
RMR	Close to Zero	0.01
SRMR	Close to Zero	0.01
GFI	0.9 and above	0.99
NFI	0.9 and above	0.99
NNFI	0.9 and above	0.99
IFI	0.9 and above	0.99
CFI	0.9 and above	0.99
RMSEA	Less than 0.08	0.06

As shown the “t” value in all of the criterions seem to be higher than 1.96, which indicates that research structure is suitable to be assessed under latent features.

### Conclusion and Discussion

After discussing the findings, this section would present conclusion based on those findings. Current study laid mainly on previous studies on marketing knowledge management and organizational performance that had led into a new model based on specific cultural and social dimensions in the country. In addition, suggestions also are provided in line with limitations. Implementation of research findings requires looking at limitations as well.

#### *Hypothesis testing and interpretation*

Hypothesis 1:

KMK properties and capabilities (KMKPC) can positively affect overall organizational performance

H0: KMK properties and capabilities cannot positively affect overall organizational performance

H1: KMK properties and capabilities can positively affect overall organizational performance

#### *Statistical analysis*

According to the research findings, research hypothesis 1 is accepted. As it is discussed, coefficient value of the effect of MKM capabilities and properties on organizational performance is 0.84 and a “t” value of 10/25, which is higher than 1.96. Therefore, MKM capabilities and properties have positive affect on overall organizational performance.

#### *Interpretation*

Due to meaningful and positive influence of MKMPC, it can be argued that in question sample existence of MKMPC would create organizational competitive advantage that in turn can enhance organizational performance (OP). In other word, statistically there is a significant and direct relationship between MKMPC and OP; and the more MKMPC, the better OP.

#### *Comparison with previous studies*

Findings from this study are consistent with what has been asserted in Akrosh and Al-e-Mohammad (2010), which opined the positive influence of MKMPC on overall OP.

#### *Hypothesis 2:*

MKMPC can positively affect market performance of pharmaceutical companies

H0: MKMPC cannot positively affect market performance of pharmaceutical companies

H1: MKMPC can positively affect market performance of pharmaceutical companies

#### *Statistical analysis*

As shown coefficient value of the effect of MKM capabilities and properties on organizational performance is 0.79 and a “t” value of 8/34, which is higher than 1.96. Therefore, MKM capabilities and properties have positive affect on pharmaceutical overall organizational performance.

#### *Interpretation*

Due to meaningful and positive influence of MKMPC, it can be argued that in question sample existence of MKMPC would create organizational brand image and reputation among consumers that in turn can promote sales and market share. In other words, statistically there is a significant and direct relationship between MKMPC and companies’ market performance and the more MKMPC the better market performance among pharmaceutical companies.

#### *Comparison with previous studies*

Findings from this research are consistent with Akrosh and Al-e-Mohammad (2010), which asserts MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies’ overall market performance.

#### *Hypothesis 3:*

MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies’ customer performance

H0: MKMPC cannot positively affect pharmaceutical companies’ customer performance

H1: MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies’ customer performance

#### *Statistical analysis*

As shown coefficient value of the effect of MKM capabilities and properties on pharmaceutical companies’ customer performance is 0.56 and a “t” value of 9/31, which is higher than 1.96. Therefore, MKM capabilities and properties have positive affect on pharmaceutical companies’ customer performance.

#### *Interpretation*

As it is discussed, MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies’ customer performance in this sample, which can create more satisfaction, enhance customers’ loyalty, promote new products in target markets, develop new supply channels and enhance relationship with customers that in turn would increase sales and market share. It also can be argued that by providing more competitive advantages for customer, companies can enhance customers’ performance. In other words, the higher MKMPC the better pharmaceutical companies’ customer performance.

*Comparison with previous studies*

Findings from this research are consistent with Akrosh and Al-e-Mohammad (2010), which asserts MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies' customer performance.

*Hypothesis 4:*

MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies' financial performance

H0: MKMPC cannot positively affect pharmaceutical companies' financial performance

H1: MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies' financial performance

*Statistical analysis*

As shown coefficient value of the work independency on employees' job motivation is 0.58 and a "t" value of 8/67, which is higher than 1.96. Therefore MKM capabilities and properties have positive affect on pharmaceutical companies' financial performance.

*Interpretation*

As it is discussed, MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies' financial performance. In other words, the higher MKMPC the better pharmaceutical companies' financial performance.

*Comparison with previous studies*

Findings from this research are consistent with Akrosh and Al-e-Mohammad (2010), which asserts MKMPC can positively affect pharmaceutical companies' financial performance.

*Suggestions*

I: Once the importance of MKMPC in organizational performance was elaborated, authors suggest enhancing MKMPC in organizations to promote performance as well

II: More investment on brand image and reputation would create more competitive advantage and also can improve the performance.

III: Based on the third hypothesis, it is suggested to apply MKM directly which can lead into more satisfaction and loyalty.

IV: Financial performance is considered as one of the basic principles related to leadership style and it is known as an important criterion in health commercial operation which should be considered in MKM at modern organizations as tangible reward.

*Limitations*

- Lack of sufficient paper and resources in MKM
- Lack of cultural concerns in filling up the questionnaires among respondents

- Problems in developing self-designed questionnaire
- Problems in converting MKM models into a measurable model
- Finding the accessible marketing knowledge in pharmaceutical companies

*Further research*

As this research was focused on marketing capabilities and properties aspect, it is suggested to further study the structures and MKM conceptualization. Current study is conducted among pharmaceutical companies in Tehran; further studies would be performed on other organizations and industries. In addition, while this study investigates the direct relationship between MKM and commercial performance of pharmaceutical companies, further studies can be done on evaluation of introductions and results of MKM and their impact on organizational performance. Finally, the main motivation in this study is devoted to MKM; it is suggested to study the collaboration between MKM and organizational performance and the way they affect commercial performance.

**References**

1. Abtahi, A, Salavati, A. (2006). Organizational knowledge management. Payvand Pub, Vol. 1, pp: 34-92.
2. Abrain, J, (2007). Management information systems. Treansalte by: Maniyan, A, Fatahi, M, & Vasegh, B, Negah danesh, Tehran.
3. Abutorabi et al., (2007). Relationship between organizational structure and knowledge management among Southern Khorasaan employees' of physical training organization. 5<sup>th</sup> conference on physical training and sport science. Mazandaran University.
4. Afraze, A, (2005). Knowledge management (Principles, concepts, models, measurements and implementation). Farazeh, Tehran.
5. Akhavan, P, Jafari, M. (2006). "Critical issues for knowledge management implementation at a national level" VINE, Vol. 36, No. 1, PP: 52-66.
6. Akroush, M. And Al-Mohammad,S(2006) "Effect of marketing assets and capabilities on performance: an empirical investigation of Bank operating in Jordan" Jordan Journal of Business Administration Vol. 2 No3, pp 440-63.
7. Alvani, M, Nategh, T. and Farahi, M. (2007). Role of social capital in organizational knowledge management development. Quarterly of management science. Vol. 5.
8. Alavi, M and Leidner, D.E (2000). "Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management System: Conceptual foundations and research issues" MIS Quarterly, Vol. 25 No.1, pp.

- 335-343.
9. Alvis M., Leidneri D. (2002), Knowledge management systems, International journal of information Management, PP 30 – 33.
  10. Andreou,A, and Bontis , N.(2007), "A model for resource allocation using operational knowledge assets" The Learning Organization, Vol14 No.4, pp 345-74.
  11. Bahrami, I. (1994). Marketing in developed business. Pishbord. Second ed.
  12. Bishap, J.W.; Scott, K.D Burroughs, S, M. (2000). Support, Commitment and Employee Outcomes in Team Environment, Review, Vol.17, 2, pp.218-225.
  13. Bart H, Van D. (2006). "Foundations and applications of a knowledge management scan"; *European Management Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 2.
  14. Bozbura F.T. (2007). "Knowledge management practices in turkish SME" Journal of interprise information management Vol. 20, No.2, PP:209-221.
  15. Beach, R., Muhlemann, A. P., Price, D. H. R., Paterson, A., & Sharp, J. A. (2000). "A Review of Manufacturing Flexibility", *European Journal of Operational Research*, 122, 41– 57.
  16. Bhatt, G.D. (2001). Knowledge management in organizations: examining the interaction between technologies, techniques, and people, Journal of Knowledge Management, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 68-75.
  17. Blackler, F. (1995). The knowledge, knowledge work and organization: An overview and interpretation, Organization Studies, Vol.16, No.6, pp.1021-1046.
  18. Che, Z.H. (2008). "Pricing Strategy and Reserved Capacity Plan Based on Product Life Cycle and Production Function on LCD TV Manufacturer", *Expert Systems with Applications*, doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.
  19. Ching-Torng, L. Hero, & Ch. Po-Young, Ch. (2005). "Agility index in the supply chain, Int", J.Production Economics. Charles w.lamb,jr., Joseph F-hair,Jr.,Carl MC Daniel," Essentials of Marketing", (cincinnati: south western college publishing 1999), pp.12-14
  20. Danpoort, E & prosatt, B (2009). "The role of knowledge management in universities goals", (<http://www.kms.com>).
  21. Davenport. T and Prusak, L. (1998). Working knowledge: How Organizations manage what they know. Boston: Harvard Business school press.
  22. Drlikowskil W. (2003). Organizational change and groupware system, jobo wiley and sons, Ltd, newyork.
  23. Duffy N. (1999). "Benchmarking knowledge strategy"; *In Leveragin knowledge for Business performance Knowledge, Action Business School, Johannesburg*.
  24. Esmaeilpour. H, (2005). Principles of marketing management. Negah Danesh. Tehran.
  25. Gandhi, S 2004. 'Knowledge management and reference services', The journal of academic librarianship, vol. 30, no. 5, pp.81 – 368.
  26. Gary Hail; Pick Tate AND Tom Parker (1995). Leadership and the Customer Revolution, 1st ed., A Van Nostrand Reinhold Book, p.11.
  27. Garcia-Ayuso M. (2003). "Intangibles: Lessons from the Past and a Look into the Future", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 4(4), 597-604.
  28. Garnett. Jonathan (2001). "Work based Learning and the Intellectual Capital of Universities and Employers", *The Learning Organization*. 8 (2), 78-81.
  29. Gupta, B., Iyer, L. S., Aronson, J. E. (2000). "Knowledge Management: Practices and Challenges", *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 100, 1-2. Heinz (2001) applying the balanced scorecard concept.
  30. H. Artail (2006). Application of KM measures to the impact of a specialized groupware system, American university of Beirut.
  31. Hung. C.Y. et al. (2005). "Critical factors in adopting a knowledge management system for the pharmaceutical industry". *Industrial management and data systems*. Vol. 105, No. 4, PP: 164-183.
  32. Hackett, B. (2000). Beyond knowledge management: new ways to work and learn, New York: The Conference Board.
  33. Itami, H. (1987). "Mobilizing Invisible Assets", London: Harvard University Press. International journal of emerging marketsvol .5 No.1, PP38-77.
  34. Irannejad, M. Sasan gohar, P. (1992). organization and management, from theory to practice. Iranian Supreme Banking Institution.
  35. Jennex. M.E. Olfman. L. (2004). "Assessing knowledge management success. Effectiveness models" proceeding of the 37th. How an international Conference of system sciences.
  36. Kakabadse, N. K., A. Kakabadse, & A. Kouzmin (2003). Reviewing the knowledge management literature: towards a taxonomy, Journal of Knowledge Management, Vol. 7, No.4, pp.75–91.
  37. Kautz Karlheinz (2006). Establishing Knowledge Management, The journal Of Knowledge Management, pp 12- 15.
  38. Kotler, Philip. (2000). *Marketing Management*, Millenium Edition: Custom Edition for University of Phoenix (10th Ed)", Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
  39. Kanji G.K moura (2002) kanjis business scorecard total quality Management.
  40. Lee H., Choi B. (2003). "Knowledge management

- enablers, processes, and organizational performance: an integrative view and empirical examination"; *Management Information Journal*: Vol. 20, No.1.
41. Miles G., Miles R. E., Perrone, V., Edvinsson L. (1998); Some conceptual and research barriers to the utilization of knowledge; *California Management Review*, Vol. 40 No 3.
  42. Marco, D& Art, E (2009), knowledge management for higher Education, university of verginiya press.
  43. Malhotra, Y. (2005). "Integrating knowledge management technologies in organizational business processes: getting real enterprises to deliver real business performance". Vol. 9, No. 1. PP: 7-28, Emerald Group Publishing Limited. ISSN 1367-3270. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
  44. Marr, G. & Schiuma, A. Neely (2002). "Assessing Strategic Knowledge Assets in E- Business", *International Journal of Business Performance Management*. 4, (2-4), 279-295.
  45. Monacko, N.J (2008). "knowledge management in universities" *Journal of Academy of U.P.M university, malasian vol 10, No42*.
  46. Nonano, B, J and al (2005). "Introduction to organizational culture, New york press.
  47. Nonaka I., Takeuchi H.(2004). *The knowledge creating company*; 1995, Oxford University Press
  - Massingham, Peter, *Linking Business level Strategy with Activities and Knowledge Resources*; *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 8, No. 6.
  48. Ourmozdi. N. (2007). Determination and measurement of factors in knowledge management establishment in Iranian oil productions and Distribution Company in Tehran. Shahid Beheshti University, faculty of management and accounting. pp: 58-66.
  49. Parsaeiyan, A. (2001). *Theory and Design of organization*. Cultural researches office. 10<sup>th</sup> ed.
  50. Perez, E. (1999). Knowledge management in the library, *Database Magazine*, Vol.22, No.2, p. 75.
  51. Pirooz, Sh. (2008). What is knowledge management. Cited in Rosh network website.
  52. Plessis.M.D, Boon.J.A (2004). "Knowledge management in e-business and customer relationship management: South African case study findings ", *International journal of information management* (24), pp.73-86.
  53. Scott and Moorgan. (2008). *Knowledge oriented organizations*. Translate by: Asadi. G. R. Sarir, Tehran.
  54. Skyrme, D. (2003). "Knowledge management making sense of an oxymoron". <http://Skyrme.Com>.
  55. Susana Perez L. et al. (2004). "Managing knowledge: the link between culture and organizational learning". *Journal of knowledge management* Vol 8, No. 6. PP: 93-104.
  56. Sanchez, M. Paloma; Castrillo, Rocío; Elena, Susana (2006), "Paper Presented at the International Conference on Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators", History and New Perspectives. Lugano 15-17. November.
  57. Seemann P., De Long D, Stucky S, Guthrie E. (1999). "Building Intangible Assets: A Strategic Frame Work for Investing in Intellectual Capital PAKeM99 Proceedings", The Practical Application Company Ltd.
  58. Skyrme D. J. (1998). "Developing a Knowledge Strategy, in *Strategy Watcher*", Technology Support for Knowledge Management, *Mid American Journal of Business*, 14-20.
  59. Soliman F. (1998). "Optimum Level of process mapping and least cost business process re-engineering"; *International, Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol.18, No. 5.
  60. Suuasse N.N., Sewry D.A. (2003). "An investigation of knowledge management Implementation Strategies"; *proceedings of SAICSIT*. tohnsen (2007) balanced scorecard theoretical perspectives public management managerial auditing journal.
  61. Tadbir, 182. 8<sup>th</sup> year. (2007). achieving the peak using knowledge management.
  62. Tadbir, 183. 8<sup>th</sup> year. (2007). knowledge management flow.
  63. Tadbir, 161. 16<sup>th</sup> year. (2005). Knowledge management failure in organizations.
  64. Tadbir, 169. 17<sup>th</sup> year. (2006). Knowledge management success factors in organizations.
  65. Tadbir, 171. 17<sup>th</sup> year. (2006). The future of knowledge management.
  66. Tadbir, 311. 20<sup>th</sup> year. (2009). Organizational performance management.
  67. Tadbir, 212. 20<sup>th</sup> year. (2009). Knowledge management in organizations.
  68. Tafavogh, M. (2007). Review and determine organizational culture in relation with knowledge management. Master thesis, Shahid Beheshti University.
  69. Tams, H. Translated by: Hassan, R. (2000). *Knowledge management*. Saiko. fourth ed.
  70. Wiig K. M. (1997). "Knowledge management: where did it come from and where will it go?"; *Expert Systems with Applications*, Vol.13 No 1.
  71. Syed-Ikhsan. S.O.S. Rowland, F. (2004). "Knowledge management in a public organization: a study on the relationship between organizational elements and the performance of knowledge

- transfer". Journal: Journal of Knowledge Management. Vol. 8, No. 2, PP: 95-111.
72. Wang, T., & Chang, T. (2007). "Forecasting the probability of successful knowledge management by consistent fuzzy preference relations". Expert Systems with Applications, Vol. 32, No. 3, PP: 801-813.
73. Wang, E., Klein, G., & Jiang, J.J. (2007). "IT support in manufacturing firms for a knowledge management dynamic capability link to performance". International Journal of Production Research, Vol. 45, No. 11, PP: 2419-2434.
74. Wu, W.W. and Lee, Y (2007). "Selecting knowledge management strategies by using analytic network process". Expert system with applications. www.sciencedirect.com. Vol. 32. No. 2. PP: 841-847.
75. Wug K. (1999). "Establish, Govern, Renew the Enterprise Knowledge Practices", Schema Press Arlington.
76. Wiro Sock, B (2010). "Innovations of knowledge management" publisher of Innovation schooly and professional press.
77. Zack. M.H. (1999). Developing Knowledge Strategy. Knowledge management Review, 41(3):125.

7/2/2012