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Abstract: Today knowledge is considered as a valuable key in competition. Not only it is known as the foundation for stable development, but also it is the source of keeping competitive nature of an organization which is an advantage for the organization. The two fold role of knowledge strategy, both as the main obstacle and also as the empowering factor in knowledge management activities, makes the importance of this factor double in efficient managing of knowledge management processes. The present article is examining any kind of relationship between different kinds of organizational knowledge strategy and different dimension of knowledge management. In order to analyze differences between different organizational knowledge strategies, the proposed conceptual framework by Bierly and Chakrabarti has been used here. In this article the relationship between four kinds of organizational knowledge strategy which are loners, explorers, exploiters and innovators knowledge strategy and six dimensions of knowledge management has been examined. This project is applied in nature and the methodology which has been used is correlational-descriptive; it is categorized as field study. For analyzing the findings of the research and accepting or rejecting the proposed hypothesis, statistical techniques like step by step regression as well as Pearson correlational coefficient has been used. The results indicated that there is a meaningful relationship (about 99%) between different kinds of organizational knowledge strategy and six dimensions of knowledge management.
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Introduction

Colleges and universities are discovering that they need to manage their ever-growing academic and intellectual resources more efficiently, especially those resources that are created electronically and can be easily abandoned or lost (Bernbom, 2001).

Institutions are acknowledging the need to account for resources such as processes, procedures, individual and collective representations or interpretations, online materials, or research-in progress (Bollinger & Smith, 2001) that are not only explicit but also tacitly oriented (Achava-Amrung, 2001; Wiig, 1993). Institutions are also addressing the development of repositories that facilitate learning creation and the reuse of intellectual resources (Na Ubon & Kimble, 2002). Educational institutions are attempting to exploit emerging technology that enables them to capture, organize, and disseminate such resources (Milam, 2001).

The emphasis on knowledge usage for purely educational purposes is in its infancy. Only 6% of educational institutions formally plan, document, and implement their programs on an organizational level (Kidwell et al., 2000). Few institutions are taking advantage of knowledge usage in higher education. Knowledge Management (KM), the process that governs knowledge usage (Bhatt, 2001), should not strike higher education institutions as a radically new idea, because it is simply a new spin on their raison d’etre (Kidwell et al.).

Although knowledge-building strategies may have potential, it is unknown whether they are applicable to educational settings. Thorn (2001) addressed this part of the problem by observing that knowledge-building is such a wide open area of study that it is difficult to understand the implications for an educational setting. Similar reference is made by Zack (1999) in his expression of how organizations are complex and information and data are often fragmented, redundant or obscure. He asserted that the implementation of knowledge-building schemes is dependent upon configuring an organization’s resources and capabilities through specific characteristics unique to that organization. Aligning an organization’s policies and practices to facilitate knowledge-building with the associated vast amount of information, coupled with the host of technical possibilities leads to the unique element of discovering effective and efficient knowledge-building strategies.

There are several plausible explanations why knowledge-building has not been fully integrated into the educational setting. Perhaps the constructs of knowledge-building are too nebulous to specify (Hildreth & Kimble, 2002; Malhotra,2002), or organizations in higher education tend to be complex and disjointed (Cronin & Davenport, 2001). The failure of institutions to engage stakeholders may also be a factor (Newman & Conrad, 2000; Reid, 2000), or the organization’s technology may be an inhibitor for knowledge practices (Marwick, 2001). Thus, additional research documenting the use of knowledge-building and its associated activities in higher education is needed. Higher education has numerous resources; the ability to create, retain, transfer, and utilize these resources through knowledge-building could possibly sharpen the management of that knowledge. The challenge is to investigate whether knowledge initiatives are effective in a higher education environment.
Knowledge Strategy

Knowledge can be a strategic asset as universities with superior knowledge can combine it with other assets, resources and capabilities in ways that their competitors cannot to generate value (Zack, 1999). In fact, “the sustainable competitive advantage of universities flows from the creation, ownership, protection and use of difficult-to-imitate commercial and industrial knowledge assets” (Teece, 2000, p. 35). Every strategic position or decision taken by a university “is linked to some set of intellectual resources and capabilities” (Zack, 1999). An organization’s competitive position creates a requirement for particular new knowledge; however, its existing knowledge resources simultaneously create opportunities and constraints, hence the requirement to generate strategies to coordinate these competing demands (Zack, 1999). A knowledge strategy can be viewed as “the employment of knowledge processes to an existing or new knowledge domain in order to achieve strategic goals” (von Krogh et al., 2001, p. 46), “the overall approach an organization intends to take to align its knowledge resources and capabilities to the intellectual requirements of its strategy” (Zack, 1999, p. 135) and “a number of key decisions related to knowledge that provide a context or strategic intent for the universities” (Casselman and Samson, 2007, p. 70). Each of these definitions recognizes the intentionality of the process in that strategies are selected to best deal with the organization’s situation.

Bierly and Chakrabarti (1996) conducted a cluster analysis of the pharmaceutical industry based upon four knowledge strategy dimension trade-offs: knowledge source, radicalness of learning, speed of learning, and breadth of knowledge. Their results identified four distinct generic knowledge strategies among firms: loners, explorers, exploiters, and innovators. Loners were ineffective, with higher R&D expenditure ratios, slow technology cycles and low knowledge dispersion (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996). An explorer is a creator or acquirer of the knowledge required to be competitive in its strategic position (Zack, 1999). Explorers were found to have high levels of radicalness but were similar to other groups in other areas (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996). An exploiter has capabilities that exceed the requirements of its competitive position, allowing it to use its knowledge to deepen or broaden its position (Zack, 1999). Exploiters were seen to have low R&D expenditure and broad but shallow knowledge bases (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996). Members of the innovator profile closely integrate the best characteristics of explorers and exploiters (Zack, 1999). Innovators were the most aggressive and fastest learners, combining internal, external, radical and incremental learning (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996).

A balance, equilibrium, or a cycling between exploitation and exploration is necessary and was empirically found to jointly and positively influence universities performance (He and Wong, 2004; Levinthal and March, 1993; Pearce, 2006). Zack (1999) identified innovators and explorers as being aggressive strategies, suggesting that they should outperform the more conservative strategies. In fact, innovator and explorer strategies were empirically demonstrated to be more profitable than loner and exploiter strategies (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996).
In a second knowledge strategy typology, von Krogh et al. (2001) identified two core knowledge processes: knowledge creation and knowledge transfer. The target of a process for knowledge creation is to enhance the potential for creating innovation, whereas the intent of knowledge transfer is to use created knowledge to benefit the firm, which may include transfers with external partners (von Krogh et al., 2001). Integration of these two dimensions results in four strategies: leveraging, expanding, appropriating, and probing. Leveraging can be oriented towards achieving efficiency in operations and ensuring that the firm internally transfers existing knowledge from various knowledge domains to improve innovation (von Krogh et al., 2001).

Leveraging is an effective strategy as to acquire similar knowledge as competitors have to engage in similar experiences. However this takes time and the processes used and replicated within the organization may be difficult to imitate due to their tacitness (Zack, 1999). The emphasis of expanding is on increasing the scope and depth of knowledge by refining what is known and by bringing in additional expertise relevant for knowledge creation – better understanding of key processes can allow for substantial cost-reduction, helps create new process and product innovations, and reduces risks by building up local competence (von Krogh et al., 2001).

Knowledge-based competitive advantage is sustainable through expansion because the more a university already knows, the more it can learn (Zack, 1999). Appropriating is predominantly externally oriented on knowledge domains that do not already exist in the university, capturing knowledge from external partners and managing risk by spreading effort (von Krogh et al., 2001).

**Four Different Knowledge Strategies**

Based on Bierly and Chakrabarti (1996) theoretical framework about competitive values, four distinctive kinds of knowledge strategy can be identified:

1) Loners knowledge strategy
2) Explorers knowledge strategy
3) Exploiters knowledge strategy
4) Innovators knowledge strategy

1) **Loners Knowledge Strategy**: Loners were ineffective, with higher R&D expenditure ratios, slow technology cycles and low knowledge dispersion (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996).
2) Explorers Knowledge Strategy: An explorer is a creator or acquirer of the knowledge required to be competitive in its strategic position (Zack, 1999).

3) Exploiters Knowledge Strategy: Exploiters were seen to have low R&D expenditure and broad but shallow knowledge bases (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996). Members of the innovator profile closely integrate the best characteristics of explorers and exploiters (Zack, 1999).

4) Innovators Knowledge Strategy:

Innovators were the most aggressive and fastest learners, combining internal, external, radical and incremental learning (Bierly and Chakrabarti, 1996). (table,1)

Table 1: Bierly and Chakrabarti's model, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal learning</th>
<th>External learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Learning</td>
<td>Loners Knowledge Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical Learning</td>
<td>Explorers Knowledge Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge strategies types

- Loners
- Exploiters
- Explorers
- Innovators

Knowledge Management

Based on the classification made by experts in the field of job, 1980 decade was named quality movement decade (emphasizing on using mental power of personnel to achieve better quality,1990) was named Re-engineering decade (using technology to improve work process and diminish costs), finally 2000 is known as knowledge management decade.
Knowledge is the mental aspect of saved ideas, realities, concepts, data and techniques in human memory. Its source is human mind and it is based on the information which is obtained through experience, beliefs and personal values.

It is transformable in association with decisions and actions and would become mature and fruitful. Two persons' knowledge which receives the same information is not identical. (Due to the increasing importance of knowledge in the age of knowledge economy, organizations inevitably have to be attentive about concepts like creativity, innovation entrepreneurship, gaining sustainable, competitive advantage. Issues of knowledge production and knowledge processing have challenged organization in the current time.

Knowledge management is a set of processes for understanding and applying knowledge strategic resources in an organization. It is a structured approach which proposes methods for recognition, assessment, organizing storing and applying knowledge in order to meet the needs and aims of the organization. (Davenport and Marchard, 1999).

Knowledge management is a process by which organizations are able to detect, select, organize, distribute and transmit vital information and experiences which would be used in activities like problem resolution, dynamic learning, strategic programming and decision making. (Gupta, 2000).

Today knowledge management is considered as the main source of competitiveness. This does not mean that in the present competitive world, knowledge management can not be used for gaining competitive advantage, accomplishing goals and being creative, but decisively it can be claimed that today knowledge management skills could be used for entering inventiveness in organizations.

In modern economy, knowledge is the source of economical, industrial developments and other traditional factors like land, workforce and money are standing at subsequent levels of importance (druker,1993).

Knowledge Management Cycle

Knowledge management is a continues process. It causes to knowledge increase in a cyclical manner. Management cycle is divided in to expressions with shared consequent points, from 3 to 8 which is shown in table 2.
In the present study cycle of knowledge management is categorized into six different processes by combining and adjusting three above mentioned theories. These processes are as follows:

1) **Knowledge creation**: Organizations have conscious effort from both inside and outside to examine and define appropriate knowledge and resources. In another word, it is possible to create new knowledge by finding new ways which personnel have found for doing tasks, or find new knowledge from outside sources.

2) **Knowledge capture**: New knowledge is known as valuable and appropriate way for satisfying contemporary and future needs. Keeping knowledge is a logical way which simplifies the process of gaining, extracting and distributing knowledge.

3) **Knowledge organization**: New knowledge is organized and refined by filtering it in order to provide a comprehensive list of beneficial aspects of knowledge in relation to different products and services. Knowledge is located within a context and lines, thus it could be searched, examined and saved.

4) **Knowledge storage**: Modern knowledge is saved in a way that people is an organization has access to it. Data base management and data saving technology can help to the process.

5) **Knowledge dissemination**: Based on the specific needs of the users, in an efficient suitable manner knowledge should be distributed. Moreover it is shared with applicable tools to make it understandable for all users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Theorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1- Creation and Sourcing  
2- Compilation and Transformation  
3- Dissemination  
4- Application and Value Realization | Wiig (1993) |
| 1- Knowledge Acquisition  
2- Knowledge Organization  
3- Knowledge Dissemination  
4- Knowledge Application | Parikh (2001) |
| 1-Create Knowledge  
2-Capture Knowledge  
3-Organize Knowledge  
4-Transfer Knowledge  
5- Use Knowledge | Horwitch and Armacost (2002) |
6) Knowledge application: Knowledge is used in a context in which users can learn and also produce new knowledge. In learning process there must be analysis and critical assessment of ideas plans and knowledge. According to, knowledge management literature, an organization must move toward active managing of its knowledge, to integrate this process to its overall strategic management framework.

The Relationship between Knowledge Strategies and Knowledge Management

Knowledge strategies can affect knowledge management in different ways. As knowledge and its related findings can penetrate into knowledge strategies, organizational knowledge strategies are also affected by knowledge management. The logic behind Strategic knowledge management is that presupposed specific values of an organization can result in favorable as well as unfavorable behavior and also resulting knowledge management processing. For example positive external and internal learning for exchanging knowledge would affect knowledge management in a positive way. On the other hand negative competition and unwillingness for sharing knowledge are among factors which affect knowledge management adversely. The result of the one of the most recent studies indicated that this is not true in all organization. (King and Marks, 2008)

![Knowledge Management Dimensions]

The Effect of Organizational Knowledge Strategies on Knowledge Management

Two researchers believe that organizational knowledge strategies could affect knowledge management in four different ways (Delong and Fahey, 2000).

1. Supposed knowledge strategy which indicates the most important kind of knowledge.

2. Knowledge strategy in interpersonal and organizational relations act as a mediator variable.

3. Knowledge strategy set the scene, for social interaction (reciprocal relationship between members of an organization.)
4. Knowledge strategy formulates needed processes for modern knowledge production and selection.

Research Hypotheses

The aim of the present study is to investigate the relationship between organizational knowledge strategy and knowledge management in University of Isfahan. In this research the relationship between four different kinds of organizational knowledge strategy, namely loners, explorer, exploiters and innovators knowledge strategy and knowledge management is examined.

Moreover this research specifically will consider the effect of different kinds of Knowledge Strategy on different aspects of knowledge management which consist of knowledge creation, knowledge capture, knowledge organization, knowledge storage, knowledge dissemination and knowledge application. For doing so four secondary (subordinate) research hypotheses as well as one major research hypothesis is proposed:

Major Research Hypothesis

There is relationship between organizational knowledge strategies and knowledge management in Isfahan University.

Secondary Research Hypotheses

There is relationship loners knowledge strategy and knowledge management in Isfahan university.

There is relationship between explorer knowledge strategy and knowledge management in Isfahan University.

There is relationship between exploiters knowledge strategy and knowledge management in Isfahan University.

There is relationship between innovators knowledge strategy and knowledge management in Isfahan University.

Research Methodology

This study is applied, correlational descriptive research and is categorized as field study. To collect related literature, the related books, articles and journals were consulted as data collection procedure and analyzing the collected data, two kinds of questionnaires has been used. The first is Bierly and Chakrabarti’s (1996) questionnaire about organizational knowledge
strategy types and the second of one is lassen's (2003) questionnaire about knowledge management dimensions. Each questionnaire contained 24 questions. Subjects answered the relevant questions based on a 5 staged Likert scale. Using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient the first questionnaire has 95.8% of constancy and the second has 94.9%. This shows that measuring tools have high levels of constancy. Isfahan university staff formed the population of this study which were randomly selected. The whole population was about 430 among which 109 were randomly selected. The relevant information about level of education, age, sex and years of service is as follows:

**Education:** 23% have diploma (25 persons) 62% have BA degree (68 person) and 15% MA (16 person ).

**SEX:** 64% (70 person) female and 36% (39 person ) were male participants.

**Age:** 37% was under 30 year old (40 person), 47% between 30-40 years old (51 person) and 16% more than 40 years old (18 person).

**Years of service:** 24% of participants have less than 5 years of record of service (26 person), 26% between 5-10 years (28 person) and 16% between 10-15 years (18 person), 23% between 15-20 years (25 person) and 11% more than 20 years (12 person).

In this study for the purpose of analyzing the collected data, SPSS software was used. Also descriptive statistics (percentage, frequency, mean, standard deviation) was used to test research question inferential statistics like variance test, Pearson correlation coefficient and regression test were used.

### Ranking Different Organizational Knowledge Strategy and Knowledge Management Aspects among Isfahan University Staff

The result of ranking different organizational Knowledge Strategy from the view point of Isfahan university staff is presented in table 3.

**Table3.** Comparision the mean of organizational Knowledge Strategy types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions (first questionnaire)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Organization Knowledge Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21, 17, 13, 9, 5, 1</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Ioners Knowledge Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 18, 14, 10, 6, 2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>explorer Knowledge Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23, 19, 15, 11, 7, 3</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>exploiters Knowledge Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 20, 16, 12, 8, 4</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>innovators Knowledge Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table number 7 the most powerful knowledge strategy was exploiters then innovators knowledge strategy and on the other hand the least powerful was loners knowledge strategy.

The results related to ranking different aspects of knowledge management in Isfahan university form the view point of the staff is represented in table 4.

Table 4. Comparison the mean of knowledge management dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions (first questionnaire)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Aspects of knowledge management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Knowledge creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>Knowledge capture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>Knowledge organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>Knowledge storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Knowledge dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Knowledge application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4 knowledge captures has most and knowledge organization has the least importance at university of Isfahan.

Testing Research Hypotheses

In this section we are going to test the related research hypotheses with making use of the collected data and related statistical methods. The obtained results from Pearson's correlation coefficient for different research hypotheses in table 5-9.

Table 5. Correlation Coefficient between loners Knowledge Strategy and Different Aspects of Knowledge Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loners Knowledge Strategy</th>
<th>Knowledge creation</th>
<th>Knowledge capture</th>
<th>Knowledge organization</th>
<th>Knowledge storage</th>
<th>Knowledge dissemination</th>
<th>Knowledge Application</th>
<th>Knowledge management</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>Acceptance of first hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Acceptance of first hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Acceptance of first hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r^2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Acceptance of first hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 5 it can be claimed that with 99% level the first research is accepted, implying that there is relationship between loners knowledge strategy and aspects of knowledge management. Based on coefficient for the most shared variance is related to knowledge dissemination and the least is related to knowledge storage.

Table 6. Correlation Coefficient between explorer Knowledge Strategy and Different Aspects of Knowledge Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Knowledge creation</th>
<th>Knowledge capture</th>
<th>Knowledge organization</th>
<th>Knowledge storage</th>
<th>Knowledge Dissemination</th>
<th>Knowledge Application</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Acceptance of second hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 6 it can be claimed that 99% there is relationship between explorer knowledge strategy and aspects of knowledge management. Which shows that second research hypothesis is confirmed. Based on the results the most level of shared variance is related to knowledge capture and knowledge dissemination and the least is related to knowledge storage.

Table 7. Correlation Coefficient between exploiters Knowledge Strategy and Different Aspects of Knowledge Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Knowledge creation</th>
<th>Knowledge capture</th>
<th>Knowledge organization</th>
<th>Knowledge storage</th>
<th>Knowledge Dissemination</th>
<th>Knowledge Application</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Acceptance of third hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 7, 99% there is relationship between exploiters knowledge strategy and aspects of knowledge management, thus the third research hypothesis is accepted. Based on identifying coefficient, the most percentage of shared variance is related to knowledge capture and knowledge dissemination and the least is related to knowledge storage.

Table 8. Correlation Coefficient between innovators Knowledge Strategy and Aspects of Knowledge Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Strategy</th>
<th>Knowledge creation</th>
<th>Knowledge capture</th>
<th>Knowledge organization</th>
<th>Knowledge storage</th>
<th>Knowledge dissemination</th>
<th>Knowledge application</th>
<th>Knowledge management</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovators R</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 8, the fourth research hypothesis which was based on the relationship between innovators knowledge strategy and aspect of knowledge management is 99% accepted. Based on coefficient of the most shared variance is related to knowledge organization and the least in related to knowledge storage.

Table 9. Correlation Coefficient between Organizational Knowledge Strategy and Aspects of Knowledge Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Strategy</th>
<th>Knowledge creation</th>
<th>Knowledge capture</th>
<th>Knowledge organization</th>
<th>Knowledge storage</th>
<th>Knowledge dissemination</th>
<th>Knowledge application</th>
<th>Knowledge management</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational R</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 9, 99% the main research hypothesis which was based on the relationship between organizational knowledge strategy and different aspects of knowledge management is accepted. The most percentage of shared variance is related to knowledge capture and the least is related to knowledge storage and knowledge application.

Figure 3: The Relationships between Variable

**Conclusion**

Today by means of knowledge management a set of processes for conception and application of strategic knowledge resources in organization can be created. On the other hand, knowledge strategy can affect knowledge management in different ways. As knowledge and its related findings can penetrate into knowledge strategy, organizational knowledge strategy is also affected by knowledge management. In general researches have shown that knowledge strategy can affect knowledge management in different ways. In the present study the concept of organizational knowledge strategy and knowledge management and the relationship between them was examined, then with the application of the proposed model the extent of relationship between four different kinds of organizational knowledge strategy (loners knowledge strategy, explorer knowledge strategy, expouters knowledge strategy and innovators knowledge strategy) and six dimensions of knowledge management (knowledge creation, knowledge capture, knowledge organization, knowledge storage, knowledge dissemination and knowledge application) in Isfahan university was evaluated.

For doing so after data collection procedures and analyzing them by appropriate statistical techniques the dominant situation in Isfahan University was examined.

Results indicated that the dominant knowledge strategy in Isfahan university is explorer and among different aspects of knowledge management knowledge storage has gain more attention than other dimensions. Moreover this research shows that 99%, there is significance relationship between different organizational knowledge strategy and dimensions of knowledge management due to the point that loners knowledge strategy and exploiters knowledge strategy
more than two other kinds of knowledge strategy would pare the ground for knowledge management, therefore preparing the situation for moving from explorer knowledge strategy toward these two types of knowledge strategy can be advent of creating, capture, organizing, storage, dissemination and application of knowledge in Isfahan university.
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