IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance (IOSR-JEF)
e-ISSN: 2321-5933, p-ISSN: 2321-5925. Volume 12, Issue 3 Ser. III (May –June 2021), PP 40-46
www.iosrjournals.org

Knowledge management and organizational success in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt, Rivers state

Rachel Konyefa Dickson (PhD)
Department of Management
Niger Delta University, Bayelsa State

Abstract
This research investigated the association between knowledge management and organizational success among manufacturing companies in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. The researcher decided to use a cross-sectional survey design. The population was made up of 212 employees from 34 registered manufacturing firms with the ministry of commerce and trade in Rivers State. Primary data was collected using a questionnaire. A sample size of 150 was determined using the Taro Yamane sample size determination formula. Expert scrutiny was sought to determine the instrument's validity, while the Cronbach-alpha Coefficient was used to ensure its reliability, with all elements reaching the 0.70 Nunnally (1978) set acceptance benchmark. A total of 138 respondents' data was appropriate for analysis after cleaning the data. Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used for hypothesis testing. The result showed that knowledge management dimensions are strongly and positively linked to organizational success measures such as productivity, market share, and profitability. Based on the results of the findings, the researchers came to the conclusion that knowledge management relates to organizational success. However, the researcher recommended that, to improve organizational productivity, market share, and profitability, the management of the companies should prioritize effective knowledge management practices.

Keywords: *Knowledge management, organizational success, productivity, market share and profitability*

Date of Submission: 21-05-2021 Date of Acceptance: 06-06-2021

I. Introduction

Increasing global pressure characterizes today's market climate. Rapid technological advances such as methods, materials, and strategy to manufacture a product or service provide firms with more complex changes than ever in the way they operate in what is now a technological and knowledge-based economy. The secret to corporate performance is increased customer demand in terms of product quality and increased investor returns in terms of shareholder wealth maximization (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, and Herron, 1996). These factors also forced management to look for ways to gain a competitive edge in order to expand. The success of an organisation is thought to be an effective mechanism for gaining a competitive edge and succeeding in the global business environment (Akhavan, Jafari, & Faithian, 2006; Alavi, Kayworth, & Leinder, 2006). It offers organizations a number of strategic benefits, including cost savings, differentiation through new product and service growth, and improved service quality (Allameh, Zare, & Davoodi, 2011). It is a micro environmental factor that influences a company's profitability. As a result, information management is critical to organizational performance. This means that the capacity, capability, and competence of the employees decide the firm's performance. That is, abilities, expertise, strengths, and awareness all play a role in deciding the organization's effectiveness and performance. Several studies have shown that knowledge management has the potential to improve organizational performance (Anderson, 2009)

In theory, growth, market share, profitability, and customer satisfaction are all indicators of organizational performance. The ability to accomplish goal determines a good organization (Baridam, 2001). Employee work behaviour and strategy can enhance firm efficiency, potentially boosting organizational success, development, and survival. Employee creativity and innovation are also critical to success. In a business, when supply becomes irregular and expensive, distribution networks might likely be ineffective and redundant, expertise therefore becomes inadequate and sometimes outdated, current knowledge is well ahead of what is acquired in the market, and the ability to exploit and turn an opportunity profitably, there is a need for innovation (Dahiya, & Gupta, 2012). Innovation is important to a company's growth and sustainability, it's critical for management to recognize clear factors that encourage and improve success in the workplace, such as knowledge creation, acquisition, sharing and storage (Dahiya, & Gupta, 2012)

In any corporate organization, knowledge management processes such as recognition, discovery, storage, sharing, and implementation remain sources of success. Because of the dynamism in business

operations, knowledge management activities have become increasingly critical in providing strategic guidance for organizations to improve their efficiency and competitiveness. Its application is a key source of long-term innovation and organizational performance (Guadamillas & Forcadell, 2002). In today's knowledge-based economy, companies see knowledge management as a key to growth (Gupta, Iyer & Aronson, 2000). The surfacing of a knowledge-driven system has redefined a new approach essential for companies to establish ways to efficiently acquire and manage varying knowledge, which, when developed and disseminated within an organization, has the potential to add value to a company. On the other hand, ineffective information management makes intelligence redundant and useless to the organization (Gumus, 2007). Information management, according to empirical research, improves results and helps the company achieve its goal and vision (Crossan, & Apaydin, 2010: Damanpour, Walker, & Combinative, 2009; Al-Mabrouk, 2006).

Furthermore, the firm's absorption capability, organizational structure, organizational strategy, structure, leadership, and human resource management all play contribute in this. As a result, to achieve optimum efficiency, businesses must formulate measures and policies to enhance knowledge management. Chang and Lee (2008) noted an important connection between knowledge management and the success of Turkish companies, while Darroch and McNaughton (2003) noted that knowledge management promotes organizational sustainability. Thus, this paper explores the association between knowledge management and organizational success among manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

II. Literature Review

The literature review is carefully done to address the conceptual parameters of knowledge management and organizational success. The key variables of knowledge management critical to this study are; acquisition, creation, storage, sharing and dissemination of knowledge. The researcher's interest is to ascertain whether knowledge management variables have a link to organizational success measures such as productivity, market share, profitability and customer satisfaction. To achieve this, the study, however, is anchored on the resource-based view and the completive advantage theory.

2.1 Knowledge management

In the context of a firm's structure and strategies, knowledge management is the process of gathering, maintaining, understanding, exchanging, and incorporating information (Darroch, 2005). Gholami, Asli, Shirkouhi, and Noruzy (2012) define knowledge management as an attempt to uncover the tacit and explicit knowledge of individuals, groups, and organizations and transform this treasure into organizational assets that individuals and managers can use at various levels of decision making. Knowledge management (KM) is a structured and integrated management strategy for generating, sharing, preserving, and applying knowledge in order to improve an organization's manpower efficiency and effectiveness (Dimitriades, 2005; Anderson, 2009).

Knowledge management has to do with the process of collecting and transferring a firm's combined know-how, whether it is tacit or explicit (Gold, Malhotra & Segars, 2001; Andriessen, 2004; Antonio, Lau, Richard,Yam, Esther & Tang, 2010). As a result, knowledge management can be described as any process or activity for creating, acquiring, capturing, sharing, and using knowledge to enhance learning and productivity wherever it occurs in an organization (Gonzalez-Padron, Chabowski, Hult & Ketchen, 2010). The goal of KM is to continuously put together internal and external information to cope with market changes, solve current problems, and innovate for company development.

Due to the nuances of the essence of information amplification, academics and practitioners have attempted to define Knowledge Management in a variety of ways (Alavi, Kayworth & Leinder, 2006; Chen & Huang, 2009; Andrus, 2005). Surprisingly, no single concept can fully describe the situation, as different scholars approached knowledge management from various angles and dictating how they interpret it (Greiner, Bohmann, & Kromar, 2007; Alavi, 1999). Businesses must leverage knowledge as a core strategic technique to gain long-term competitive advantage. In order to describe the definition, a variety of terminologies and models have been used. Some authors, for example, conceived knowledge management as a discipline (Becker, 2008), systemic management of implicit knowledge (Aulawi, Sudirman, Suryadi, & Govindarau, 2009), and explicit knowledge management (Aulawi, Sudirman, Suryadi, & Govindarau, 2009; Beckman, 1999). Others see it as a management technique aimed at improving organizational employees' competency and productivity by creating, transferring, transmitting, storing, and enforcing information (Dahiya, & Gupta, 2012; Allameh, Zare, & Davoodi, 2012). It is regarded as a valuable process that has an effect on various aspects of organizational success (Chang & Lee, 2008). knowledge Management has been described by researchers as a business strategy that develops, accumulates, organizes, and uses knowledge to improve organizational efficiency (Creamer & Freund, 2010).

Developing, transferring, distributing, and implementing, as well as acquisition, storage, transition, usage, and measurement, identification, selection, arranging and maintenance are all important aspects of knowledge management (Dahiya et al (Donate, & Guadamillas, 2011; Akhavan, Jafari & Faithian, 2006).

Guadamillas and Forcadell (2002) described how to find and share existing knowledge, how to experiment and develop new knowledge, how to structure knowledge production and sharing, and how to assess the strategic value of knowledge and learning.

Gloet (2006) noted that acquisition, transmission, capture, organization, formalization, delivery, application, or implementation, as well as development, storage, exploitation, and communication responsiveness, are all critical to a company's success. Managers are responsible for managing knowledge staff, promoting knowledge development, creating a knowledge-friendly community, and ensuring that knowledge is exchanged and used in addition to collecting, converting, and storing data and information using information technology resources (Booker, 2008; Bures, 2003). As a result, they must demonstrate their understanding of knowledge and how it can be used to support business goals (knowledge process), information technology resources and how they can be used to support knowledge processes, and knowledge employees and how to develop, exchange, and use knowledge to produce value for the company as a whole. Even though most companies do not recognize the need for a separate department to oversee knowledge management programs, there are benefits to creating a structured knowledge management structure.

2.2 Organizational Success

Organizational success is conceptualized as the ability of a firm to define specific objectives and determine a strategy to achieve such objectives. The success of an organization is a planned and deliberate effort of people who are working in the organization. As a result, employees' behavior, attitude, strategies, and knowledge all play an important role in organizational success. In this paper, the researchers identified the key measures of organizational success as productivity, market share, profitability and customer satisfaction.

Productivity

This is the volume of output generated for every unit of input (labour, equipment, capital). Productivity can be expressed in a number of different ways. For example, in a factory, productivity is determined by the amount of hours it takes to make a product, while in the service sector, productivity is measured by the revenue received by an employee divided by his or her salary. Productivity is the ratio of output to input over time that describes the relationship between process output and all inputs. This ratio is useful for determining the efficiency of a company or operation. Organization as a corporate process keeps track of efficiency and sets higher goals. Without a question, the corporate goal is to increase efficiency in any business operation. Knowledge management is a method or strategy for increasing efficiency. Information management encourages knowledge exchange and transforms the culture of an enterprise. It makes the job easier and more efficient by delivering the appropriate details to the appropriate people at the appropriate time (Abrams, 2001). By making best practices, progress or failure stories available around the enterprise, knowledge management to avoid re-invention of the wheel. Employees are given access to the organization's common expertise in order to produce the best results in their job areas, thanks to knowledge management.

Market Share

This is the percentage of total sales earned by a company in a specific sector or industry for a set period of time. Market share is calculated by dividing a company's revenue for a given time period by the total revenues of the industry over the same time period (Chen, Watanabe & Griffy-Brown, 2007). This metric is used to determine the size of a business in comparison to its rivals and competitors. Increases in market share will help a business achieve greater scale in its operations while also improving profitability (Ahuja, & Katila, 2001). Companies are constantly attempting to increase their market share, as well as the size of the overall market, by appealing to broader demographics, lowering costs, or advertising. Sales statistics do not always reflect how well a company is doing in comparison to its rivals. Changes in sales, on the other hand, clearly represent changes in market size or economic conditions. The proportion of the business that the company is able to win can be used to assess the firm's success in comparison to rivals (Ardichivili, Page & Wentling, 2003; Bontis, 2004).

Profitability

This is a company's or industry's ability to make a profit, and it is measured in terms of many common numbers that calculate one of two generic forms of performance: how much a company earns from what they have and how much they make from what they take in (Addicott, 2006). Profitability is the primary aim of any business venture. The company would not be able to succeed in the long term if it does not become profitable. As a result, determining current and past profitability, as well as predicting potential profitability, is critical. Profits and expenses are used to determine profitability. The term "income" refers to the money earned by a company's operations. Crops and livestock, for example, generate income when they are grown and sold. However, many people who enter the company by practices such as borrowing money do not make money. This

is essentially a financial exchange between the company and the lender to raise funds for the company's operations or asset purchases. An income statement is used to determine profitability. This is basically a list of the entire business's profits and expenditures for a period of time (usually a year). The most important factor is to achieve bottom-line profit, regardless of how much money you make in sales. Profit is what makes it possible to prosper and expand in the future.

III. Methodology

The study used a cross-sectional survey design to obtain responses from 212 employees of the thirty-four (34) registered manufacturing firms in Rivers State's Port Harcourt metropolis. A standardized questionnaire was used to collect primary data. Using the Taro Yamane sample size determination formula, a sample size of 150 was calculated. Expert scrutiny was used to ensure the research instrument's validity, while the Cronbach-alpha Coefficient was used to ensure its reliability, with both products exceeding Numally's 0.70 acceptance benchmark (1978). Just 138 respondents' data was appropriate for data analysis after data cleaning. Tables, frequencies, maps, mean, and standard deviation were used for descriptive statistics, while the Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient was used for hypothesis testing.

Hypotheses testing

The following hypotheses have been proposed to ascertain the relationship between knowledge creation and the measures of organizational success

Ho1: There is no correlation between the knowledge creation and productivity.
Ho2: There is no correlation between knowledge creation and market share.
Ho3: there is no association between knowledge creation and profitability.

Table1: Showed Test Result of Knowledge Creation and organizational success measures

	K. Creation	Prod	Mkt S.	Prof.
Spearman's rho	Creation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.721** .832** .760**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000 .000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138
	Prod.	Correlation Coefficient	.613**	.1000 .636** .570**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138
	Cust.Sat.	Correlation Coefficient	.532**	.636** .000 .732**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138
	Prof.	Correlation Coefficient	.560**	570** .732** .1000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138

Source: *SPSS Result, 2021*

The study shows that knowledge creation has a strong and positive relationship with organizational success measures, with a correlation coefficient of 0.721 and a P-value of.000 coefficient. In this case, the null hypothesis is dismissed.

With a correlation coefficient of 0.832 and a P-value of.000 coefficient, the study shows a substantial relationship between knowledge creation and market share. In this case, the null hypothesis is dismissed.

With a correlation of 0.760 and a P value of 0.000, the study shows a strong association between knowledge creation and profitability. In this case, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis testing

The following hypotheses have been proposed to ascertain the relationship between knowledge sharing and the measures of organizational success

Ho4: There is no correlation between the knowledge sharing and productivity.
Ho5: There is no correlation between knowledge sharing and market share.
Ho: there is no association between knowledge sharing and profitability.

Table2: Showed the Test Result of Knowledge sharing and Organizational Success Measures

	K. Sharing	Prof	Mkt S.	Prof.
Spearman's rho	Sharing	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.607** .552** .715**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000 .000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138
	Prod.	Correlation Coefficient	.607**	1000 .636** .570**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138
	Customer	Correlation Coefficient	.552**	.636** .1000 .732**
	Satisfaction	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000 .000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138
	Profitability	Correlation Coefficient	.715**	570** .732** .1000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000 .000
		N	138	138 138 138

Source: SPSS Result, 2021

The analysis reveals that knowledge sharing is related to organizational success in a significant way; the analysis reveals a significant association between knowledge sharing and productivity with a correlation coefficient of 0.607 and a P value of 0.000. In this case, the null hypothesis is rejected.

The study also discovered a strong association between information sharing and market share, with a correlation coefficient of 0.508 and a P value of 0.000 coefficients. In this case, the null hypothesis is dismissed. Furthermore, the study shows a significant association between information sharing and profitability, with a correlation coefficient of 0.715 and a P value of 0.000. In this case, the null hypothesis is dismissed.

IV. Discussion of Findings

The findings of the research on the composition of the study variables, as well as the relationship between them, were discussed in this paper. The process of making accessible and amplifying knowledge generated by individuals, as well as crystallizing and linking it to an organization's knowledge system, has been described in the management literature as the knowledge development process in the organization (Hafedh, Akoum, Zbib, & Ahmed, 2007). In the sampled manufacturing firms, knowledge formation as a method of knowledge management was found to have a positive and important relationship with efficiency. The probability value and the coefficient of the (R) proved to be an effective policy for enhancing information growth in manufacturing firms. This finding corroborates previous research that found a connection between knowledge management and organizational success (Chin-Loy, Mujtaba & Dastoor, 2007). Information management, according to Gabriel (2012), generates environmental opportunities for corporate success.

Information sharing is also known as social interaction behavior, which entails the exchanging of employee knowledge, experiences, and skills within a department or organization (Grugulis, & Bevitt, 2006). According to the study's findings, there is a strong and positive relationship between information sharing and organizational performance measures in manufacturing firms. The correlation coefficient and probability values in table 2 showed that increasing manufacturing firms' knowledge sharing capacity would lead to a substantial increase in worker and other resource output, resulting in corporate success. This finding supports the claims of (Chen & Mohamed, 2008; Abdullah & Sinha, 2009), who claim that knowledge management is a crucial success factor in any organization's results. The results of this research back up the analytical findings of a previous study (Camison & Lopez, 2010). The results of the study showed that knowledge management and organizational performance have a significant and positive relationship.

V. Conclusion/ Recommendations

Knowledge is a key factor that drives organizational success. The application of knowledge management practices is a deliberate effort of every conscious organization to stimulate a firm's performance. Knowledge is a strategic variable that must be managed to enhance internal and external operations of the organization to create value and achieve sustainable competitive advantage. The researcher concludes that knowledge management significantly and positively relates to organizational success measures such as productivity, market share and profitability. However, based on the findings, the following recommendations were made; that the management of the manufacturing firms should encourage the creation of quality knowledge to facilitate organizational success. The management and staff should develop a culture of knowledge sharing as a means of increasing individual learning to improve firm success. The management of firms should generally emphasize effective knowledge management practice to enhance organizational productivity, market share and profitability.

References

[1]. Abdullah, D. H. & Sinha, R. R, (2009). Knowledge management and intellectual capital emerging perspectives (Ed.), Critical factors for KM implementation: An L&T, E&C division case study 8 (9), 53-71.
[2]. Abrams, V. (2001). Knowledge management architectures beyond technology, Harvard business online journal, 5(2), 30-45.
[3]. Addicott, R. (2006). Networks, organizational learning and knowledge management: NHS Cancer Networks, Journal of Management and Public Money, 14(5), 220-222.
[4]. Aham, A. (2000). Research methodology in Business and Social Sciences, Owerri: Canun Publisher.
[5]. Ahuja, G., & Katila, R, (2001). Technological acquisitions and the innovation performance of acquiring firms: A longitudinal study. Strategic Management Journal, 7 (22), 197-220.
[6]. Akhavan, P., Jafari, M., & Faithian, M., (2006). Critical success factors of knowledge management systems: Amulti-case analysis. European Business Review, 18(2), 97-113.
[7]. Alavi, Y. (1999). Knowledge Management Systems: Issues, challenges and Benefits, Management Information Systems, Quarterly Journal, 25(1), 107-136.
[8]. Alavi, M., Kayworth, T. T., & Leinder, D. E., (2005-2006). An empirical examination of the influence of organizational structure on knowledge management practices. Journal of Management Information Systems, 22(3), 191-224 .
[9]. Allameh, S. M., Zare, S. M., & Davoodi, S. M. R., (2011). Examining the impact of km enables on knowledge management processes. Prosoenia Computer Science 6(3), 1211-1223.
[10]. Al-Mabrouk, K. (2006). Critical success factors affecting knowledge management adoption: A review of the literature. International Journal of Business Management, 4(9), 29-46.
[11]. Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J. and Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. Academy of Management Journal, 4 (39), 1154-1184.
[12]. Anderson, K. K. (2009). Organizational capabilities as predictors of affective knowledge management: An empirical examination approach. California Management Review, 12(13, 556-572).
[13]. Andriessen, D. (2004). Reconciling the Rigor-Relevance Dilemma in Intellectual Capital Research: Organizational Knowledge Approach. California Management Review, 12(13), 556-572.
[14]. Andrus, D. C. (2005). The Wiki and the Blog: Toward a Complex Adaptive Intelligence Community. Journal of Intelligent Quotient, 3(2), 105-120.
[15]. Antonio, K., Lau, W., Richard, C. M., Yam, E. L., Esther, P.Y. & Tang, R. (2010). The impact of technological innovation capabilities on innovation performance: An empirical study in Hong Kong. Journal of Science and Technology Policy in China, 1 (2), 163-186.
[16]. Ardichivili, A., Page, V., & Wentling, T. (2003). Motivation and barriers to participation in virtual knowledge-sharing communities of practice. Journal of Knowledge Management, 7 (1), 64-77.
[17]. Aulawi, H., Sudirman, I., Suryadi, K., & Govindarau, R., (2009). Knowledge sharing behavior, antecedent and their impact on the individual innovation capability. Journal of Applied Sciences Research, 5(12), 2238-2246.
[18]. Baridan, D. (2001). What is knowledge management? Knowledge and Innovation: Journal, 1(2), 127-143.
[19]. Becker, K. (2008). Unlearning as a driver of sustainable change and innovation: three Australian case studies. International Journal of Technology Management, 42 (1/2), 89-106.
[20]. Beckman, R. H. (1999). Knowledge sharing at Beckman Labs. Journal of Business Strategy, 19(1), 1-15.
[21]. Bontis, N. (2004). The strategic management of intelligence and intellectual capacity and organizational knowledge. Journal of Strategic Management, 8(7), 10-12.
[22]. Booker, L. (2008). The relevance of knowledge management and intellectual capital research. Knowledge and Process Management Review, 7(10), 50.
[23]. Bures, V., (2003). Cultural barriers in knowledge sharing, Epm Economics and Management, 6 (9), 57-62.
[24]. Camison, C. & Lopez, A. V. (2010). An examination of the relationship between manufacturing flexibility and firm performance: The mediating role of innovation, international Journal of Operations & Production Management, 30 (8), 853-878.
[25]. Chang, S. C., & Lee, M. S., (2008). The linkage between knowledge accumulation capability and organizational innovation. Journal of Knowledge Management, 12(1), 3-20.
[26]. Chen, C., & Huang, J. (2009). Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance- The mediating role of knowledge management capacity. Journal of Business Research, 62(1), 104-114.
[27]. Chen, C., Watanabe, C. & Griffy-Brown, C. (2007). The co-evolution process of technological innovation: An empirical study of mobile phone vendors and telecommunication service operators in Japan. Technology in Society, 29(1), 1-22.
[28]. Chen, L. & Mohamed, S. (2008). Impact of internal business environment on knowledge management within construction organizations. Journal of Construction Innovation, Emerald, 8, 61-81.
[29]. Chin-Loy, C., Mujtaba, B. G. & Dastoor, B. (2007). Organizational knowledge management research and practices for developing economies. Society of Afghan Engineers Journal, 58(9), 18-97.
[30]. Crawford, C. B. (2005). Effect of transformational leadership and organizational position on knowledge management. Journal of Knowledge Management, 9(6), 6-16.
[31]. Creamer, G. & Freund, Y. (2010). Learning a board balanced scorecard to improve corporate performance. Decision Support Systems, 49(4), 365-385.
[32]. Crossan, M. M. & Apaydin M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of literature. Journal of Management Studies, 47(6), 1054-1191.
[33]. Dahiya, D. & Gupta, M. P. (2012). Enterprise knowledge management system: A multi agent perspective. Information Systems Technology and Management, 8(285), 271-281.
[34]. Damanpour, F., Walker, R. M., & Combinative, C. N. A. (2009). Effects of innovation types and organizational performance: A longitudinal study of service organizations. Journal of Management Studies, 46(4), 650-675.
[35]. Darroch, J. & McNaughton, R. M. (2003). Beyond market orientation-knowledge management and the innovativeness of New Zealand firms. European Journal of Marketing, 37(3/4), 572-593.
[36]. Darroch, J. (2005). Knowledge management innovation and firm performance. Journal of Knowledge Management, 9(3), 101-115.
[37]. Dimitriades, Z. S. (2005). Creating strategic capabilities: Organizational learning and knowledge management in the new economy. European Business Review, 17(4), 314-324.
[38]. Donate, M. J. & Guadamillas, F. (2011). Organizational factors to support knowledge management and innovation. Journal of Knowledge Management, 15(6), 890-914.
[39]. Gabriel, J. M.O. (2012). Management Information System: Concepts and Controversies. Cutting Edge Publishing.

[40]. Gholami, M, H., Asli M, N., Shirkouhi, S. N., & Noruzy, A. (2012). Investigating the influence of knowledge management practices on organizational performance: An empirical Study. Acta Polytechnica Hungarica, 7(10), 205-216.
[41]. Gloet, M. (2006). Knowledge management and the links to HRM developing leadership and management capabilities to support sustainability. Management Research Review, 29(7), 402-413.
[42]. Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A. H. (2001). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. Journal of Management Information Systems, 1 (18), 185-214.
[43]. Gonzalez-Padron, T. L., Chabowski, B. R., Hult, G. T. M., & Ketchen, D. J. (2010). Knowledge management and balanced scorecard outcomes: Exploring the importance of interpretation, learning, and internationality. British Journal of Management, 21(4), 967-982.
[44]. Greiner, M. E., Bohmann, T., & Kromar, H. (2007). A strategy for knowledge management: Fostering a research agenda. Journal of Management Information Systems, 18(1), 5-21.
[45]. Grugulis, I, & Bevitt, S. (2006). The impact of investors in people: a case study of a hospital trust. Human Resource Management Journal, 12(3), 44-60.
[46]. Guadamillas, F. & Forcadell, F. J. (2002). A case study on the implementation of a Knowledge management strategy orientated to innovation. Knowledge and Process Management, 9(3), 162-171.
[47]. Gumus, M. (2007). The effect of communication on knowledge sharing in organizations. Journal of Knowledge Management Practice, 8(2), 25-96.
[48]. Gupta, B., Iyer, L.S., & Aronson, J. E. (2000). Knowledge Management practices and challenges, Industrial Management & Data Systems, 100 (1), 17-21.
[49]. Hafedh, M., Akoum, I., Zbib I. J., & Ahmed, Z. U. (2007). Iraq: Emergence of a new nation from the ashes. International Journal of Engineering Markets, 2(1), 7-21.

Rachel Konyefa Dickson. "Knowledge management and organizational success in manufacturing firms in Port Harcourt, Rivers state." *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance (IOSR-JEF)*, 12(3), 2021, pp. 40-46.