

Determining a framework for understanding the knowledge management indicators and measuring the distance between the existing knowledge and the desired knowledge in Iran Khodro Company

Noushin Hafezizadeh

Department of industrial management, firoozkoohbranch, islamicazad university, firoozkooh, iran

Abstract:

The present study titled "Determining a framework for understanding the knowledge management gap and measuring the gap between the existing knowledge and the desired knowledge of IranKhodro Company and a number of ways to remove this gap" is carried out in IranKhodro Company. The purpose of this study was to investigate the gap between the existing knowledge and the desired knowledge in IranKhodro Company and provide some solutions for removing this gap. In the present study, eight hypotheses are presented in the answer to the research questions. The six-year gap in the knowledge management model presented in Taiwan in 2005 is based on the theoretical framework used in this study. One-sample T-test was used to analyze the data. The results of the study showed that the eight gap was verified and the assumption of the equality of variances was confirmed and the assumption of the equality of the means was confirmed at 95% confidence level and therefore, there is no difference between the attitudes of staff and managers regarding these gaps. Requests were presented in the application area

Key words: knowledge management, existing knowledge, desirable knowledge

Introduction

Today, knowledge management has become one of the most important topics in the global context. In recent times, successful companies have begun joining the knowledge process, and knowledge of knowledge management, knowledge management, and knowledge management organizations has been intensifying. Over time, organizations have been viewed as knowledge engines, which need expertise in the field of knowledge and skill, and through the activities of its founders, they are engaged in the production and distribution of goods. As such, knowledge management is a key tool in the business community for companies that want to change their rules of conduct in the field of innovation and change. Also, the ability to create the future instead of predicting and responding to it is one of the results that has led to the establishment of knowledge systems. Although the knowledge of the

members of the organization is essential for the development of the basis of organizational knowledge, the organization's knowledge is something beyond the simple knowledge of individuals. Organizational knowledge is formed through the unique interaction patterns of the technology, methods, and organization of the organization and can not easily be imitated by other organizations. The existence of interactions between technologies, methods, and people in the organization has profound results and profits for knowledge management, because of the fact that the interactive pattern between the technologies, methods, and organizations of the organization is unique (it is unique to the organization) and can not easily be sold in the market. , So it can not be imparted by other organizations (bryman,2007)

In fact, the emphasis on knowledge management is the result of economic, industrial and cultural development. Many scholars believe that humankind has now stepped on its feet, an era that is based on the competitiveness of organizations, rather than dependence on natural resources or operational productivity, but rather the design of products and services of a variety and quality. Nowadays, knowledge on the source of work, the capital of the earth, which has been used by the characteristics of agricultural and capital societies, has been introduced in knowledge societies (Desouza,2006)

Knowledge management is the full utilization of information and information in a manner that is associated with the skills, competencies, beliefs, intuition, commitments, and potential impacts of individuals. In today's economy, knowledge is equal to people, money, learning, flexibility, competitive power, and competitiveness, and despite the fact that more than labor, time, or time is necessary for the survival of the organization, it is considered as an asset in the organization, which in practice is in fact neglected. In other words, knowledge is the basis and the impetus of the post-industrial economy. Knowledge management can be defined as a type of organization of spiritual assets

Which organizes the unique resources of critical and critical activities of the organization by identifying the potential bottlenecks that prevent from finding the right knowledge in the right direction.

In other words, knowledge management prevents dissolution and eliminates intellectual property, and through increased intelligence, value, and flexibility, it provides opportunities for strengthening decision making, products and services.

This organizational phenomenon complements and strengthens other organizational processes through focusing on maintaining the competitive advantage of the organization, including comprehensive quality management, organizational reengineering

Statement of problem

The results of numerous researches and studies indicate that countries that have surpassed knowledge in developing countries are more competitive in terms of competitiveness and economic performance

than others. Also, countries that do not have a good economic status are suffering from the lack of knowledge of their constituent institutions. The following statistics can be used to claim this. Also, based on the theoretical foundations, the number of scientific productions and the quantity of knowledge production for each billion dollars, including the indicators of knowledge management development, are counted.

Also, in the context of the organization of knowledge management, it becomes important that, in the context of global competition, organizations need to gain knowledge in relation to their potential future vendors, customers, and scientific and technological advancements that can assist them with the replacement of their goods and services or to improve them. To be

It can be admitted that one of the reasons for the weaknesses and difficulties in all levels of the organizations of Iranian organizations is the lack of procedures for the system of knowledge management which leads to the creation, maintenance and transfer of knowledge. Due to the absence of such procedures, there are wide gaps between existing knowledge and knowledge. The requirements of the organization are designed and implemented, including the occurrence of mistakes, recurrence, cost increases, loss of quality of products and services, dissatisfaction of internal and external customers, and the lack of competitive power in the national and international arena. Also, the lack of systematic knowledge management practices and the existence of knowledge gaps. The resultant Web created much of the value of organizational knowledge is inevitably part of this valuable resource. Vkhvah that Basrf time, effort and cost Bsyarhasl has been ignored again and for taking advantage of it in the future, no way will not be considered. (Desouza, 2006)

Also, not paying enough attention to the proper management of knowledge and making tacit knowledge in the minds of employees into explicit organizational knowledge rely only on organizational knowledge to individuals, and as a result, as soon as the holders of this knowledge leave the organization in different forms, this personal knowledge also goes away. In some cases, the unwillingness of individuals to share existing knowledge and to conceal it due to the loss of power takes away a large part of the valuable resources of organizational knowledge from the other organizational pillars, thus increasing the gap between the existing knowledge and the actual knowledge required by our organization (Grossman, 2006)

The research has sought to identify the differences between the existing knowledge and knowledge required by Petrochemical Research and Technology Company and some solutions have been developed to address these differences.

research method

The purpose of the research is to determine the appropriate method for investigating the subject matter of the research. Regarding the classification of research based on their purpose, they can be divided into

three categories: basic research, applied research, and development. This research is a practical one. In the context of this, the development of applied knowledge is in a particular context. In other words, applied research is directed towards the practical application of knowledge

However, from the perspective of categorizing research based on the method of data collection (research design), they can be divided into descriptive (non-experimental) and experimental studies, which is a descriptive study because it includes a set of methods whose purpose is to describe conditions or phenomena Are under investigation. Among the various types of descriptive research, the present study is a cross-sectional survey to examine the distribution of characteristics of a statistical society.

Test hypotheses

Table 1. Table of test results. Research hypotheses

result	Indicators	gap
reject	Peripheral Scanning Vertical feedback information – The domain of knowledge –	1
accept	Your pathology – Going – Knowledge standardization –	2
accept	Employee orientation – Management commitment – Employee commitment –	3
accept	Knowledge storage – Knowledge assessment – Organizational Structure –	4

accept	team work – connections – Differences between education and – experience of staff managers	5
accept	Knowledge Communities – Material reward system – Non-material reward system –	6
accept	the trust – Organizational climate – Knowledge: power source –	7
accept	Staff knowledge and skills – Knowledge and skills of managers – Learning Organization Learning –	8

Comparison of employees 'and managers' attitudes towards gaps

To compare the attitudes of staff and managers with regard to the existing gaps in the model, since the .data are considered normal, we will use an independent sample t test

Table 2 Test Table Comparison between the Attitude of Employees and Managers of Employees and Managers regarding Slots

Independent sample t tests			Equivalence test for variances			
Significant level (double sided)	Degree of freedom	T Statistics	The significance level	Fisher Amount		
0.000	28	6.105	0.915	0.011	Assuming the equality of variances	Gap2
0.002	5.504	5.842			Assuming the equality of	

					variances	
0.000	28	4.732	0.045	4.387	Assuming the equality of variances	Gap3
0.000	16.481	8.167			Assuming the equality of variances	
0.028	28	2.318	0.439	0.617	Assuming the equality of variances	Gap4
0.012	8.833	3.170			Assuming the equality of variances	
0.520	28	0.652	0.110	2.720	Assuming the equality of variances	Gap5
0.244	20.515	1.198			Assuming the equality of variances	
0.330	28	- 0.992	0.006	8.843	Assuming the equality of variances	Gap7
0.068	23.887	- 0.910			Assuming the equality of variances	
0.250	28	1.175	0.344	0.927	Assuming the equality of variances	Gap8
0.232	6.465	1.318			Assuming the equality of variances	

1-Split Two: In relation to the gap, two assumptions of equality of variances are accepted. The assumption of the equality of the means is also rejected at 95% confidence level, and there is a difference between the attitudes of employees and managers regarding this gap.

2-Split Three: In relation to the gap, the three assumptions of equality of variances are rejected. The assumption of the equality of the means is also rejected at 95% confidence level, and there is a difference between the attitudes of employees and managers regarding this gap.

3-Slot 4: In relation to the gap, four assumptions of equality of variances are accepted. The assumption of the equality of means is also rejected at 95% confidence level, so there is a difference between attitude and managers regarding this gap.

4-Split Five: In relation to the gap, five assumptions of equality of variances are accepted. The assumption of the equality of means is also confirmed at 95% confidence level and therefore there is no difference between the attitudes of employees and managers regarding this gap.

5-Gap 7: In relation to the gap, seven assumptions of equality of variances are rejected. The assumption of the equality of means is also confirmed at 95% confidence level and therefore there is no difference between the attitudes of employees and managers regarding this gap.

6-Splitter Eight: In relation to the gap, eight assumptions of the equation of variances are confirmed. The assumption of the equality of the means is confirmed at 95% confidence level and therefore there is

conclusion

In this part of the research, we first provide an introduction to the analysis of data and what has been done in the previous chapters. Further, descriptive statistics of the data include descriptive data about demographic variables including education level, gender, age and organizational status of sample members. Subsequently, the description of data relating to model gaps, the description of variable data culture and communication is presented. Then, inferential statistics including the test for confirmation or rejection of the model gaps were done by a T-test. Of course, before performing this test for each gap, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was performed to ensure that the data distribution is normal in each slot. The Chi-square test was used to examine the culture and communications of the organization. The AHP method was used to prioritize the model's indexes, and the Friedman test was used to rank it according to the employees' opinion. Finally, these two Together. In the end, through the mean comparison test and variance, we compared the attitudes of staff and managers in relation to each gap.

References:

- 1- Abou-Zeid, E. (2002).A knowledge management reference model. Journal of Knowledge Management, 6(5), 486-499.

- 2- Aamson, I. (2005), Knowledge management-The next generation of TQM. Total Quality Management, 16(8&9), 987-1000.
- 3- Ahmed Parvaiz, K., Lim Kwang K., Zairi M., (1999). Measurement practice for knowledge management. Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counseling Today, 11(8), 304-311.
- 4- Alazmi, M., &Zairi, M, (2003). Knowledge management critical success factors. Total Quality Management, 14(2), 199-204.
- 5- Armstrong, M. (224).Strategic human resource manafement: A guide to action. (2nd KOGAN PAGE.
- 6- Blackman, D. A., Hemderson S. (225). Know Ways in knowlefge management. The Learning Organizaton, 12(2), 152-168.
- 7- Boisot, M. Exploring information space: A strategic perspective on information systems. In D. Rooney, G. Hearn, A. Ninan (1st Ed.), Hamdbook in the knowledge economy (p.178). UK: Edeard Edgar Publishing Limited.
- 8- Bontis, N. (2002). Managing organizational knowledge diagnosing intellrctual capital. In C. W. Choo, N. Bontis (Eds.), The Strategic Management of Intellectual Capital nad Organizational Knowledge (pp. 621-643). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 9- Bontis, N. ,Dragonetti N., Jacobsen K., Roos G. (199). The knowledge toolbow: A review of tools available to measure and manage intangible resources. European Managemnt Journal, 17(4), 391-402.
- 10- Bryman, A., Bell, E. (2007). Sampling. In Business research methods (pp. 180-207). UK: Oxford University Press.

- 11- Bueno, E., Paz S., and Rodriguez O. (2004) .The role of social capital in today's economy: Empirical evidence and proposal of a new model of intellectual capital. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 5(4), 556-574.
- 12- Carson, E., Ranzijn R., Winefield A., Marsden H. (2004). Intellectual capital: Mapping employee and work group attributes. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 5(3), 443-463.
- 13- Ngai, E.W.T., Chal, E.W.C. (2005). Evaluation of knowledge management tools using AHP. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 29(4), 889-899.
- 14- Chesbrough, H. (2003). The Logic of open innovation: Managing intellectual property. *California Management Review*, 45(3), 33-46.
- 15- Chou, S., He Mong, y. (2004). Facilitating knowledge creation by knowledge assets. *Proceeding of the 37th Hawaii International Conferences on System Sciences*. 1-10.
- 16- Coakes, E., Bradburn A. (2005). What is the value of intellectual capital?. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, 3(2), 60-68.
- 17- Cozby, P. (1997). Measurement concepts. In *Methods in behavioral research* (pp. 85-97). The USA: Mc Graw Hill Publication.
- 18- Davebport, T. H. , De Long D. W., Beers M. C. (1997). Building successful knowledge management projects: Managing the knowledge of organization, Ernest and Young LLP.
- 19- Davenport, T. H, Volpel S. C. (2001).The rise of knowledge towards attention management. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(3), 212-221.
- 20- Desouza, K. C., Awaza Y. (2006). Engaging tensions of knowledge management control. *Singapore Management Review*, 1(28), 1-13.

- 21- Dorrach, J. (2003). Developing a measure of knowledge management behaviors and practices. *Journal of knowledge Management*, 7(5), 41-54.
- 22- Edvinsson, L. Sullival P. (1996). Developing a model for managing intellectual capital. *European management Journal*, 14(4), 64-70.
- 23- Fadyen, M. A., Mc. Cannella A. A., JR.(2004). Social capital and knowledge creation: Diminishing return on the number and strength of exchange relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 735-746.
- 24- Grossman, M. (2006). An overview of knowledge management assessment approaches. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 8(2), 242-247.
- 25- Hall, R., Andriani, P. (2002). Managing knowledge for innovation. *Long Range Planning*, 35(7), 29-48.
- 26- Huang Hua, W., Shih Hong, Y., Huang Hsiao, W., Liu Che, H. (2006). Can knowledge management create firm value? Empirical evidence from the United States and Taiwan. *The Business Review*, 5(1), 178-183.
- 27- Hoffman, J. J., Hoelscher, M. L., Sherif, K. (2005). Social capital: Knowledge management and sustained superior performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(3), 93-100.
- 28- Hong Jon, C., Kuo Chia, L. (1999). Knowledge management in the learning organization *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 20(4), 207-215.
- 29- Hsun, S.H. (2005). Knowledge management and its relationship with TQM. *Toatal Quality Management*, 16(3) 351-361.
- 30- Kemp J., Pudlatz., Perez Ph.(2000). *European KM Forum IST-2000*, 1-63.

- 31- Klein, J. H., Connell N., Meyer E. (2005). Knowledge characteristics of communities of practice. *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, 3(3), 106-114.
- 32- Kucza, T(2001). *Knowledge management model*. Finland: VTT Publication.
- 33- Liao Shu, H. (2003). Knowledge management technologies and applications: Literature review from 1995 to 2002. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 25, 155-164.
- 35- Lin, Ch., Yeh Jong, M., Tseng Shu, M. (2005). Bridging the implementation gaps in the knowledge management system for enhancing corporate performance. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 29, 163-173.
- 36- Loew, R., Bleimann, U., Walsh, P. (2004). Knowledge broker network based on communication between humans. *Campus-wide Information Systems*, 21(5), 185-190.
- 37- Lovrich, N.P., Pierce, J. C., Jr. (1984). Knowledge gap phenomena effect of situation-specific and transsituational factors. *Communication Research*, 11(3), 415-433.
- 38- Lucas, L. M., Ogilvie, D. (2006). Things are not always what they seem: How reputation, culture and incentives influence knowledge transfer. *The Learning Organization*, 13(1), 7-24.
- 39- Malhotra, Y. (2000). Knowledge assets in the global economy: Assessment of national intellectual capital. *Journal of Global Information Management*, 8(3), 5-15.
- 40- Malhotra, Y. (2002). Knowledge management & new organization forms: A framework for business model innovation. *Information Resources Management*, 8(3), 5-15.
- 41- Malhotra, Y. (2005). Integrating knowledge management technologies in organizational business processes: Getting real time enterprises to deliver real business performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(1), 7-8.