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A PERSPECTIVE ON MEDIA ENTREPRENEURSHIP POLICY: GLOBALIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEVELOPING ECONOMIES

Datis Khajeheian

One of the biggest challenges for developing societies is investing in the acquisition of knowledge, without providing infrastructures and resources, for take benefit from them. Thus, in many cases, academic institutes and universities in these societies suffer from the gap between theory and practice. To fill the gap, media entrepreneurship is considered a practical approach to implement acquired knowledge to create new products and services, even with imitative innovations and cloning successful business models. Data, which was gathered from samples of Iranian entrepreneurs brought as supporting evidence to conclude the promotion of media entrepreneurship results in more intelligent filtration in acquiring, distributing, adapting, and generalizing of existing global knowledge. Therefore, governments in those societies should attend to the promotion of entrepreneurship, particularly in digital media industry because of its particular potential in value creation. Also, literature about modes of innovation and the way nations benefit from their resources, along with various types of capital, considered for provision of a contingent approach. By developing a model from previously existed frameworks, present paper provides a contribution in media policy area. The proposed model creates a foundation for further research in the area of media entrepreneurship policy.
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Introduction and Problem Area

Mass of niches in different sectors of media industry, which are products of advances in digital technologies, creates interesting opportunities for entrepreneurs to enter new markets or increase their market share in the competitive markets they operate in. Historically, media markets were dominated by large companies which took advantage of the economies of scale of the mass audience market. Production absorbed the significant bulk of the over-all investment and smaller media companies were unable to fund these markets anymore. This capital-intensive nature of media products resulted in ignorance of small market segments in the industry, as their size and potential profit were not promising to pay considerable investment of production. The consequences have changed the way that media-related companies and enterprises do business.

Thanks to technological advancement, equipments used for media have become smaller, lighter, less expensive, more user-friendly, and multi-functional. Even during economic crises, most media firms are able to afford a light-weight ‘backpack’ of professional quality equipment. It is possible for a professional, with a specialty in one area, to learn convergence skills. Radio professionals, for example, can learn to write
for the Web, shoot pictures, and even, record and edit videos for their website. Even when working within their traditional specialty area, media professionals should learn to adjust their content according to the audience characteristics of a specific medium (Pitts and Zeng 2010: 31).

The changes in industrial economies made many market segments more promising in regard to the size of the companies. Media entrepreneurs who employ resources and are not subject to major sunk costs became able to cover niche markets, even became the dominant player, because in many niches there were little- or no- competitions whatsoever. The increasing importance of small enterprises in the media industry plays a valuable role in such trends. Bagdikian, in his book *The Media Monopoly* (1983) argues that fifty corporations dominated most of every mass media industry. In 1987, the number of companies reduced from fifty to twenty-nine and in 1990, the twenty-nine reduced to twenty-three. In 1997, there were ten biggest media firms that dominated almost every mass medium (Eijaz and Ahmad 2011: 101).

In the era of the knowledge economy, media industries can be utilized as an engine of economic development (Hollifield 2004: 101). Media entrepreneurship plays a crucial role in innovative changes to the economy, specifically in small sectors and for an individual's resource. Entrepreneurs provide new ways for others to gain knowledge, via their innovative products, which increase access to existing knowledge and fill in the gap between developing and already developed societies. They do not create radical types of innovation, nor even incremental ones, but imitate innovations already created and clone successful business models. The policy which is used for promotion and facilitation of entrepreneurial activities, especially in fertilized ground media industries, are low-capital and high-tech industries. The media entrepreneurship can contribute to the developing of economies because of its special capacities for value creation. Such perspectives are adaptive with Schramm's (1963) media functions, which includes the task ‘to extend the effective market’ as one of six essential functions of communications in developing countries. This paper is written to study the policy for digital media entrepreneurship, along with accounting for the lack of literature in both subjects of ‘media entrepreneurship’ and ‘policy for media entrepreneurship’. It is surprising that, despite an obvious importance of any of those areas, previous academic works are so few in number and one can hardly find a publication either on internet resources or in libraries. Therefore, I will try to outline the subject of media entrepreneurship in digital platforms and the policy making for its development, and the role it may have in the globalization of knowledge by distribution and implementation of knowledge. My main focus will be on developing nations and their economies.

The effective role of entrepreneurship in developing countries makes the subject important to study. Over the past two decades or so, the emphasis in regional economic development theory has shifted from a focus primarily on exogenous factors to an increasing focus on endogenous factors (Stough *et al.* 2011: 3). Stimson *et al.* (2006: 6) describe regional economic development as the application of economic processes and resources available to a region that result in the sustainable development of, and desired economic outcomes for a region and that meet the values and expectations of business, residents, and visitors. On the other hand, the main engine of economic growth and prosperity is entrepreneurship (Dutta *et al.* 2009), which is a complex and multifaceted
phenomenon (Faltin 2001). Entrepreneurship helps developing countries to exploit the opportunities by deliberate implementation of its abilities by allocation of resources. Developing countries have their own opportunities and challenges, and entrepreneurship in these economies influences these situations. Within this context, it seems reasonable to consider every country as a unique case and investigate the subject exclusively (Khajeheian 2013a: 132).

**Globalization of Knowledge**

Social Networks, as parts of Web 2.0, are used as the platform for open communications regardless of geographical location, as Mazrui (2001, Cited in Mohai, 2007:48) describes this as ‘the information availability and movement across vast distances’. Communities of practice, forums, free electronic learning, etc. provide the means for globalization of knowledge and highly affect the access to knowledge. While historically knowledge used to transfer in only direction from author to readers, readers nowadays can take their own part in the process and revive and rewrite the text by adding ideas and experiences which lead to contribution. Expansion of these tools will help development of knowledge and also, results in globalization of knowledge, both in acquisition and implementation. Media entrepreneurship policy supports expansion as a means for globalization and dissemination of knowledge.

OpenCourseWares, online educational systems, and other kinds of knowledge diffusions are the platforms and tools which can be used for globalization of knowledge. In our era, digital media and the Web 2.0, have made knowledge accessible for everyone, by breaking up space and time. As Movius (2010: 9) explains, this breaking up of space and time brought about by electronic media, has led to individuals being able to interact with one another and within frameworks of mediated interaction, regardless of special disparities. That is the essence of globalization, which, on its own, is a product of media. Most theorists agree that there is practically no globalization without media and communications (Rantanen 2005: 4). Terhi Rantanen defines globalization as a ‘process in which worldwide economic, political, cultural, and social relations have become increasingly mediated across time and space’, which again emphasizes on centrality of media in globalization (Ibid.: 8).

However, in many developing countries, we often face useless knowledge, which refers to the knowledge which is acquired but is of no use. This kind of knowledge is one of the challenges for higher education policy-makers, because nations spend huge money on teaching something that cannot be applied in the country. Therefore, either knowledge remains inapplicable, which may result in brain drain, or the gap between theory and practice expands, thus the beholders of acquired knowledge are limited to universities and academic institutions. This situation is typical of many countries, for example, Iran. This often leads to debates on ‘local knowledge’, which implies that it is necessary to correlate the knowledge acquisition with domestic situation, infrastructure, and society contingencies.

Thus, when we talk about the idea of globalization of knowledge, we should point that ‘globalization’ refers to many different countries – developed, developing, and least-developed countries with various characteristics and different fits which implement acquired knowledge. The problem which is the most closely related to the globali-
zation of knowledge is not whether or not knowledge is accessible (regardless of geographical boundaries) but, rather, how we can utilize knowledge for solving global issues. The study of the issue paves another path and shows how the world can provide a context for implementation of knowledge acquired from online learning and accessible intelligent sources.

In this case, the World System Theory may present a better concept of the asymmetric position of countries. The theory describes three levels of technology, which are involved in the global communications. Countries, which are equipped with modern technology, are labeled ‘core nations’, countries that are in transitional age, and striving hard to get access to modern technology are semi-peripheral nations, and lastly, countries with poor information and communication technology are peripheral nations. The WST is a functional model of the global flow of information, goods, and services from the core nations (e.g., the USA, EU, and Japan) to semi-peripheral (Mexico, Brazil, and Middle East), and peripheral (e.g., most of Africa, Latin America, and Asia) nations (Eijaz and Ahmad 2011: 101). This idea has also been used by other scholars to show the asymmetry of information production and management among countries. Moahi (2007: 1) explains that the flow of knowledge has been governed by uneven economic and political power between the developed and the developing countries.

This paper focuses on developing countries; it proposes a practical solution for creating fertile ground for the implementation of acquired knowledge in developing countries. However, acquiring knowledge does not necessarily lead to its implementation and to improving the mechanism of performing things and updating structures in the target society. For knowledge to be applicable, the foundation and context is needed, to provide a place for implementing knowledge. Entrepreneurship in the media industry proved its potential for promotion of the implementation of knowledge produced and disseminated globally. Data and facts, provided by media entrepreneurs, show that the entrepreneurship, in general, and media entrepreneurship, in particular, can play the role of a pull factor (Amit and Muller 1995), which contributes to the implementation of global knowledge in developing countries, building infrastructures, and creating networks, and also, transferring knowledge into people's lives inside country, which is the main goal of global knowledge.

**Innovation and Global Knowledge**

To broaden the understanding of the innovation process, we should distinguish among innovation processes at the level of the firm on the basis of the ‘learning mode’. Some innovations are the outcomes of processes where codified knowledge plays a major role (STI-mode refers to the science, technology, and innovation chain) and others come out of processes dominated by experience-based learning and with strong elements of tacit knowledge (DUI-mode refers to learning by doing, using and interacting) (Lundvall 2011: 26). He argues modes of innovation to be an important variable in the way any society deals with innovation and knowledge.

The argument about global knowledge interconnected with concept of learning systems. Global knowledge in its abstract mode is a flow of documented knowledge on accessible media within the globe. Societies benefit by their characteristics such as needs, learning system, innovation policy, etc. Contingency approach in this regard
plays a role of a critical factor and is a determinant agent in how societies benefit from global knowledge. Lundvall et al. (2002) argue about national systems of production and innovation and their role in competence building. They propose four types of capital involving factors of a national system for innovation, including production capital, intellectual capital, natural capital, and social capital. Then, they argue about how these factors affect on national systems of innovation. The production and efficient use of intellectual capital is fundamentally dependent upon social capital. A development strategy that focuses only on production capital and intellectual capital is not sustainable (Ibid.: 228). Lundvall himself credits Nordic countries (Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland) for their learning systems, because of a highly developed capacity to absorb and use new technology developed elsewhere (Lundvall 2011: 28). The categorization of resources with respect to capital is presented in Table 1.

In this table, Lundvall et al. (2002) provide an insight about how different societies enjoy their resources depending on the type of capital. They also provide some critical review with this regard. According to them, Freeman cherishes the concept of innovation system because he considered it useful for less developed countries that want to catch up, while Viotti believes that in less developed countries incremental innovation, diffusion and learning may occur but not innovation (cited in Lundvall et al. 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology of Capitals by Resources (Lundvall et al. 2002: 228)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easily reproducible resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media Entrepreneurship

As media entrepreneurship is still a young and undeveloped field, this phenomenon is poorly investigated. Most research in media management to date focuses on large and established firms. In comparison, very little is known about entrepreneurial activities of independent start-up companies in different media industries (Achtenhagen 2008: 124). There are small number corresponded to studies of the impact of media on entrepreneurship (Hang and Van Weezle 2007). Khajeheian and Arbatani (2011) investigated media entrepreneurship during recession in economy. They argue that global recession produced some serious negative effects in media industry, mostly Manifested in a decrease in advertising income, and a downturn in many media products sale. However, like any other phenomenon in the world, recession has another face which is a growth of entrepreneurial activities in media. This caused media entrepreneurship raise as a suitable option for unemployed technical personnel. The interesting side of this phenomenon consists of low entry barriers, low capital requirements, more specialization of media production in the digital sector, encourage people to enter the media entrepreneurial activities. In fact, digital media entrepreneurship plays a crucial role for economy to prevent the expansion of recession in the general level. It needs few resources, but offers considerable results, which in economic terms mean lower unemployment rates, more national and domestic production, and more services. Media Entrepreneur-
ship also emits some unnecessary costly processes, like elimination of many physical processes to reach a product, it helps economy to get power and prepare to jump up again. Achtenhagen (2008: 138–139) defines Media Entrepreneurs’ role as change agents in society, by five functions. Firstly, by adopting a mission to create and sustain some kind of artistic, cultural and/or societal value (not just economic value); secondly, recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission; thirdly, engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning; fourthly, by acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand; and finally, by exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.

The most concise definition of Media Entrepreneurship to date has been presented by Khajeheian (2013a: 127) as following:

Individuals or small firms which use their own or others’ resources to create value by extracting opportunities via offering a service or product consist of any innovation in each of product/service characteristics, process, distribution channel or place, or different innovative usage to media market, or any other market which media is its main channel of interaction.

An important point in this definition is emphasis on different types on innovations including innovation in characteristics, process, distribution channel, usage, etc.

Thus, we can diffuse innovation to any effort from individuals or firms who offer the value for customers in any above mentioned area of novelty inside any given media platforms. Obviously, Media Convergence is a leveraging factor to expand the broadness of media for entrepreneurial activities; therefore, it supports further development of media entrepreneurship. Also in my opinion, Media may cause due to its virtual proximity a new and different meaning for a knowledge spillover, which replaces the access to better knowledge infrastructure for geographic proximity. Thus, the competition in media sector may lead to more access to knowledge, more chance to development and more effective role in the global knowledge.

For a better understanding of media entrepreneurship, one should have a certain idea about what innovation is in the context of the phenomenon. Ireland et al. (2003: 981) introduce two types of innovation in which firms can engage – disruptive and sustaining. In general, disruptive innovation produces revolutionary change in markets while sustaining innovation leads to incremental change (Tushman and O'Reilly, cited in Ireland et al. 2003).

Incremental – or sustaining – innovation is the product of learning how to exploit existing capabilities that contribute to competitive advantages. In contrast, radical or disruptive innovation is derived from identifying and exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities through new combinations of resources to create new capabilities that lead to competitive advantages. They believe that through effective Strategic Entrepreneurship, firms are able to engage in both disruptive and sustaining innovation. However, there is another type on innovation which should be considered in details, especially in developing economies, referred as imitative innovations. Disruptive innovations mostly flourish in developed economies because of their established markets and R&D expenditures, while in developing economies imitative innovations are more successful (Khajeheian 2013a: 128). This type of innovation plays a major role in structure of media entrepre-
neurship activities in developing countries. We should note that Hindle and Klyver's (2007) literature review reveals that societies stressing different cultural values will experience different types of innovation and entrepreneurship. The relationship between culture and entrepreneurship is not causal, and cultural values impact entrepreneurship through the agency of economic freedom. National cultures influence individuals' capacities to interpret and respond to strategic issues. One consequence might result in an impact on the levels of innovation and entrepreneurial participation demonstrated by population. According to their conclusion, Imitative innovations have risen from cultural values of developing countries at the background of the infrastructures which prevent from disruptive innovations or make them inappropriate.

Review on Proposed Frameworks and Models
In this section, the framework and models found in the literature will be reviewed. It is important to use existing knowledge to develop a better understanding of the subject. Three frameworks have already been explored.

1. Digital Media (Television) Policy in global media ecosystem
A framework recently proposed for media policy in the global media ecosystem provides us a canvas to develop a theoretical framework. Khajeheian (2013b) characterized global media ecosystem by six major factors: Globalization of Genres and Contents, Digitalization of Production and Distribution, Interactivity and Bottom-Up Participation, Media Convergence, Mergers and Acquisitions, and Audience Fragmentation. Any effort in formulating global media policy should mention these trends as effective factors. The policy is set by media governance and in the age of media convergence, the media mix or media matrix management is the combination of the media used to implementation of a given policy.

![Global Media Ecosystem](image)

**Fig. 1. Media Policy in global media Ecosystem (Khajeheian 2013b: 34)**

We use the proposed framework as a canvas to develop our preliminary model about the media entrepreneurship policy, but will include more knowledge from other frameworks or models in following sections.
Before presenting next frameworks, an explanation on global media from the literature review seems necessary. Although components of globalization are nothing new, the deployment of business and capital across borders have continued at an unprecedented pace since the arrival of New Media (Creeber and Martin 2009: 5). According to the changes in Global Media Policy,

We have witnessed a shift from vertical, top-down, and state-based modes of regulation to horizontal arrangements, while, at the same time, governing processes have become more permeable to interventions from a plurality of players with stakes in media and communication, and also there has been a shift from formal and centralized steering processes to informal, and sometimes invisible, policy interventions in the media and communication sector (Raboy and Padovani 2010: 153).

They have also explained that

this development explains the growing attention devoted to self-regulatory and co-regulatory mechanisms, including loose interactions that have come to be analyzed as networked forms of governance and finally, we have witnessed a 'shifting in the location of authority' by which more and more institutional arrangements to steer communication systems take place at the supranational level.

This also implies a plurality of decision-making arenas where different interests, goals, and opportunities are played out (Raboy and Padovani 2010: 153).

Also, they argue that ‘due to developments in technologies and digital convergence, has been a shift from sector-specific detailed regulation to more general and broad parameters for managing media and technology’ (Ibid.: 153). Macionis and Plummer explained characteristics of the new media as openness and transparency for all users, which have evaluated to participants and co-authors not only audiences anymore. Networking information exchange from device to device blurred boundary of author and audience (cited in Casey et al. 2008). They distinguish three aspects of Globalization of the Media as Means, and Ownership and Content.

2. Digital Innovation Commercialization

Another model which provides insight about commercialization of digital innovations, from idea to the marketable products is what I proposed in my Ph.D thesis. In this framework, there are four internal dimensions, and one external. Internal ones include Resource, Product, Enterprise, and Strategy, while External dimension is the Environment, which is out of control for media managers and entrepreneurs. It is the most concise model about which factors may help the digital idea to commercialize to the markets as products. This model also describes 23 factors within the five dimensions which help to create a successful digital product by small media enterprises. These factors include: Internet Access, Economic Payment infrastructure, market information infrastructure, regulations, available distribution channels (Infrastructure category); Competitive Strategy, Revenue Model, Market and Customers needs, Business Outlook (Strategy Category), New Product Development, Timing to market, idea (product category), Outsourcing and Cooperation, Equipment Assets, Social Assets, Team, Stability, Intensify (Resources Category; which classifies in internal and external resources and com-
petitive advantage), Entrepreneurship Style, Agility, Organizational Learning and Business Knowledge (Enterprise Category). In this typology of media enterprise, Resources and Infrastructure are two major categories which are related to development of society. Three other categories are deeply related with knowledge, business knowledge here, and mainly, acquired from global knowledge. The model offers infrastructure (media environment in fact) as the ground for circling the wheel of media entrepreneurship. In this idea, if the ground slopes downward, the wheel circles easily (entrepreneurship occurs with a high rate of success and with fewer drawbacks), while uneasy ground makes the wheel to move hard, or even prevent its move (entrepreneurship becomes hard, risky and with a low chance for success). That is what makes media policy significant in the study of media entrepreneurship development.

3. Efficient Media Market Framework

In nurturing media entrepreneurship it is critical to allow media markets to act as efficient as it possible. The factor that influences activity of media entrepreneurs, which deeply incorporates with degree of economic development, is media market efficiency. Structure of media market plays a crucial role in flourishing media entrepreneurship. Some of the structures provide opportunities for commercialization of innovations while incomplete ones prevent it. Efficient media market provides diversity of options for media entrepreneurs to market their innovations. So, the efficiency of the market is a very important factor in the success of media entrepreneurs. For the understanding of media markets and how they may affect the promotion of entrepreneurship, it is important to know the market players. Any media market, regardless of its development and efficiency, includes Large media companies, which benefit from resource and operational competitive advantage; Small and Entrepreneur media companies, whose strength is their innovation and new ideas; and media users, who help the media to cover a more extensive area than its natural power of coverage, by their feedbacks – whether technical or practical – and content generation. The strength of Media Entrepreneurs is exactly in the weak point of Media large companies. Media entrepreneurs rely on their innovative and risky ideas, which are not commonly covered by large ones. Large media companies concentrate on ideas which are applicable in huge markets and critical mass.

Besides these three aspects that shape major players of any media market, there are some financial and technical facilitators, which are one of the most important determiners of the media markets efficiency. Financials consist of venture capitals and institutions which invest or lend for commercialization of innovations, and technical are regularly small and large non-media companies which offer third-party services in commercialization. These facilitators evaluate and filter best innovations offered by media entrepreneurs, and introduce them to larger media companies to buy innovations, or acquisition of the small firms, or other options like joint ventures. Efficient market provides an exit market for media entrepreneurs to select their strategy: sell innovation and start new other one, sell the company and work as part of a larger company, or aggressively continue to act as an independent firm which aims to grow. Especially in this latter strategy venture capital will play a crucial role by financing the project. With this regard, Eliasson and Eliasson (2005), stress about the role of venture capitals in filling the gap between operational competitive advantage and innovation advantage.
Method and Data Sample

In this paper, I refer to the data and facts of developing societies. While normally the official data is difficult to reach, I used the primary data which I had gathered for my Ph.D thesis as a data source. The subject was media entrepreneurship by digital media innovation, the data, newness, and relevancy meet the requirements for reliability and credibility. In this data collection, 15 media entrepreneurs interviewed to explain their incentives, the core idea, strategies, and business models. The interviews and transcripts should be read again with the purpose of extracting data for the current study. The core subjects in relation with global knowledge includes Business Idea, imitative innovation, strategies, business models, best practices are the main elements of the globalization knowledge the media entrepreneurs imply in the domestic area.

The analysis of data shows that the enterprises perform as an influencing agent for the transfer of global knowledge into society and more important, in the implementation of the knowledge. That is where enterprises work distinguishably different than academic institutes which transfer knowledge in an abstract level. In fact, while academics' business is with theories, small businesses work with practices, so they intrinsically are great sources for transfer of global knowledge into domestic societies. Opportunity Recognition is a basic competency for entrepreneurs, which creates a realistic understanding from the needed knowledge and about the how and when to implement it.

Analysis: Policy for Promotion of Media Entrepreneurship

As Van de Donk et al. (2005: 12) argue, 'Policymaking is lagging behind new developments and not anticipating the future'. This claim has been proved more and more in the recent decades in regards with emergence of new technologies. Mobile technology and web expansion are two obvious examples that illustrated disability of media policy to be in consistence with new technologies, both in control and exploiting. Thus, it is not surprising that media policy has lagged behind to use media entrepreneurship in digital platforms as leverage for the benefit of the economy. However, the paper is intended to explain the subject to highlight the effective role governments can play to improve their societies' transition towards global knowledge.

Here is a preliminary model which is the first effort to model media entrepreneurship policy. A major part of this has been developed from three frameworks briefly explained in previous sections, but new insight has been inserted to adapt it with the perspective government, and policy-making organizations should play to foster and nurture entrepreneurial activities in their societies. This model may result to further more developed models to show how developing economies may fill the gaps inside their societies by efficiently playing their role in creating infrastructures needed to encourage entrepreneurial activity for young potential and educated population.

According to Fig. 1, the model generally follows a linear path: media governance (1) sets policy (2) that shapes media environment (3) which makes environment more suitable for media enterprises creation (4) which foster and encourage digital innovations and idea to flourish (5). This straight logic explains four functions for media governance to leverage the given policy: funding (financial support), setting flexible regulation, level of Globalizing the society with different aspects, membership in global organizations and institutions and engaging into international trade.
Policy effects on media environment, which provides intermediating and supporting service providers such as Technical and Financial facilitators, Business Solutions and consultants, Venture Capitals, Market information, and data and R&D agencies. Each of them may be public owned institutes or maybe the private ones supported by government to support efficiency of media market. This market makes a compromise for media large companies and media enterprises to use their advantages in resource and operation (large companies) and an advantage in innovation (enterprises). In the result of this profitable match of different actors in the market, the innovative ideas develop by the potential and interested individual entrepreneurs.

Fig. 2. Model developed for Media Entrepreneurship Policy and access to global knowledge

This model is adaptable to the media entrepreneurship policy to support the society's transition towards the knowledge economy. Innovation is still the core, either in product/service, in distribution channel, in usage, in geographic region or any other type. An efficient media market makes it possible to turn the creativity into innovation (idea to action) by facilitating the entrepreneurial action and reducing the risk of product in market by supportive institutes and actors. These actors are entrepreneur companies which are another necessary part of the media market. They introduce opportunities to fill the gaps and meet the needs by allocating the resources, skills and materials needed. They also influenced by the characteristics of the environment. In my Ph.D thesis I used the metaphor of ground for wheel of entrepreneurship. It may be downward (helps to move faster) or upward (permits to move). Thus, the media entrepreneurship policy may provide a more suitable environment for media entrepreneurs to act more productively and support creativity and innovations, either by individuals or R&D sections in the very companies. They are a necessary part of any industry, and they make the markets efficient and prospective for entrepreneurs to operate. That is the part of the market which is usually absent in the developing economies. Policy makers should mention how to support the creation and strengthening of these facilitators, because
presence of stronger facilitators means more access to services for entrepreneurs and less risk for their success. An important part of the model is the connection of SMEs network to the global knowledge and their operation as injectors and transmitters of global knowledge into the society. They form a digital network for connecting each other and other intermediate factors. These networks are the power of enterprise to combine their agility with competitive advantages and synergy of other connected enterprises. That is what has been discussed in the problem definition about developing countries challenges for acquisition of applicable knowledge.

The findings of this research confirm the idea that ‘developing countries may use social media as an opportunity for economic growth and employment, but firstly, they need to foster media entrepreneurship as an attitude and belief, and secondly, they should treat it a learnable practice. Entrepreneurial activity in new Media Markets and Social Media platforms require preparing potential entrepreneurs for successful commercialization of their innovations’ (Khajeheian 2013a: 132).

Conclusion
The findings of this research show that, in the study of how globalization influences societies, the level of development is an important determinant of perspective, process, and policy. Global knowledge has been studied with a universal perspective on freedom of information, mobilization of knowledge, remote education, etc. which are strongly focused on means and platforms of knowledge transfer. These debates commonly neglect the fact that the main problem in these kinds of societies is not in the acquisition of knowledge, but in how to operate it to improve people's lives and to promote the productivity, efficiency and effectiveness of operations. In developing and less developed countries, the acquired knowledge does not flow in policy making levels because in many cases the infrastructures, business practices and requirements of the society of origin are not provided. Therefore, acquired knowledge is applied in a limited scope and in many cases remains at a theoretical level in universities and academic institutes.

Entrepreneurship and creation of small and medium enterprises, on the other hand, is a practical and successful policy to implementation of acquired knowledge. In this process, acquisition takes place with an opportunity to recognize, which in its own is a strong filtration of what to pick and learn from the big amount of available knowledge. As entrepreneurs search for applicable knowledge to implement in the context of society, they pick the most suitable ones. That prevents from acquiring inapplicable knowledge and wasting the energy, time, money and talents for learning something irrelevant. The nature of entrepreneurship is pragmatism and action-oriented; therefore, the promotion of entrepreneurship is a strategy to guarantee the acquisition of knowledge according to needs as the selection and vacancies are based on recognized opportunities, and they arise from society lacks and needs.

They are also used as sources for Adaptation, by localizing and providing acquired knowledge with requirements and cultural-economical-societal-political contingencies of the domestic context. One of the popular and relative sources of innovation is “imitative innovation”, which broadly implements by entrepreneurs in developing countries and based on cloning the successes in business models and products. This kind of innovation is great sources of knowledge adaptation are its own, as well as knowledge dis-
tribution, for developing societies to enjoy from what performed well in countries of origins with fewer challenges.

The media platforms, with strong emphasize on social media, are the most patented contexts for entrepreneurial activities, because of low entry barriers, high availability, low prices, moderate requirements, and broad opportunities markets. They fit with youth characteristics and a considerable percentage of the youth population are positive to engage with it.

While many other industries are based on technology and their effect on culture and social norms is indirect, media is the most important tool which has a direct effect on the society and is the main change agent in globalization of cultures. Thus, the media entrepreneurship policy is the concept which, despite being neglected in research, is able to play a considerable role in the transition of economies and especially, of the developing ones to the global knowledge economy.
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