

Received: June 2023

Accepted: September 2023

DOI: 10.7862/rz.2023.mmr.17

CC-BY 4.0

Olufemi A. OGUNKOYA¹Abiodun A. ADEBAYO²Oluwatobi E. SOREMEKUN³

EFFECT OF KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT (KM) ON ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIAN MANUFACTURING SECTOR

This study aims to investigate the effect of knowledge management on organizational performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. The research employed primary data sources, with a sample size of two hundred and twenty (220) completed and returned questionnaires. The collected cross-sectional data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, multiple regression, and correlation coefficients, indicating that the overall regression model was appropriate. The finding shows that knowledge creation has a significant effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector and it was also revealed that knowledge sharing has a significant effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. The study concluded that knowledge management is considered a crucial factor for the competitiveness of organizations in the current business environment. As a recommendation, organizations are advised to establish knowledge-sharing platforms such as databases, intranets, and training activities to facilitate efficient knowledge sharing among staff and different divisions within the organization.

Keywords: Knowledge Management; Knowledge Creation; Knowledge Sharing; Organization Performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge management (KM) is used by modern businesses to gain an advantage in the information age and global market. Knowledge management (KM) is widely regarded as a crucial resource for any business, as it facilitates the creation of customer value, response to environmental shifts, attainment of corporate excellence, reduction of wasted

¹ Olufemi A. Ogunkoya, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria; e-mail: ogunkoya.olufemi@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng (corresponding author). ORCID: 0000-0001-7356-5086.

² Abiodun A. Adebayo, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria; e-mail: adebayo.abiodun@gmail.com.

³ Oluwatobi E. Soremekun, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria; e-mail: tobainotj01@gmail.com. ORCID: 0009-0004-4877-6534.

time and effort, improvement of productivity and creativity, and resolution of issues faced by both employees and customers. The goal of knowledge management (KM) is to encourage strategic managers and employees to pool their implicit and explicit skills for the greater good of the company or organization (Mansour, Abuarqoub, 2020).

By storing more information in more accessible locations and making that information more easily accessible to more people, KM helps businesses be more innovative, provide enhanced client service, and accomplish business excellence, as stated by Bolorma (2015). KM has become a critical aspect of modern organizations, as their ability to learn and share knowledge directly impacts productivity and sustainable competitive advantage (Fillion, Koffi, Ekionea, 2015). The role of KM in organizations is significant, as it facilitates effective adaptation to changes, increases productivity, and paves the way for development and innovation (Ekambaram, Sørensen, Bull-Berg, Olsson, 2018).

When it comes to a company's success or failure, knowledge serves as an intangible but essential asset (Ooi, 2014). Knowledge is seen as an asset by dynamic organizations because it improves customer satisfaction and promotes competitive edge in the market (Attia, Salama, 2018; Mothe et al., 2017). Over the last twenty years, knowledge management (KM) has received a lot of attention from the business world. It is now widely acknowledged as an essential part of formulating strategies, creating fresh goods and services, and overseeing managerial procedures (Mardani et al., 2018; Qasrawi et al., 2017). Since effective KM allows businesses to be more innovative and efficient, some companies see it as a strategic resource that gives them an edge over competitors (Bolisani, Bratianu, 2018).

The vast amounts of information possessed by organizations can be found in both structured and unstructured formats. Due to technological developments that allow for rapid information exchange, the rate at which knowledge is acquired is rising. Knowledge creation, sharing, application, and transformation are essential for enhancing processes and bringing innovative products and services to market quickly and cost-effectively (Abbas, Lagraa, 2017). Knowledge management (KM) is a technique used by many businesses to increase productivity (Yang, Chen, 2009). Knowledge management (KM) is becoming increasingly recognized as a valuable strategic asset that can help businesses gain an edge in their industries (Andrej, 2017). It is also an important instrument for promoting healthy economic growth and fortifying ties between manufacturing businesses and the international community (Faluyi, 2018; Kambey et al., 2018).

In the era of globalization, organizations are confronted with numerous challenges as they strive to outperform competitors and attract customers. Companies face formidable challenges due to the high levels of competition and the potential for customer defection. The inability of businesses to adjust to ever-evolving consumer tastes is a major contributor to these problems. Knowledge, according to studies (Cho, Korte, 2014; Tubigi, Alshawi, 2015), is a key factor in the widespread implementation of KM strategies in businesses.

The improper handling of funds, poorly executed plans, and economic challenges are just some of the reasons why manufacturing industries in Nigeria are failing at a high rate (Nwonyuku, 2016). Weak approaches to managing information both within and between companies are to blame for these problems. As a result, many of these businesses have difficulty generating enough revenue to keep going. Because of these obstacles, businesses can no longer succeed without implementing KM (Chawla, Joshi, 2017).

The primary purpose and objectives of this study involve examining the impact of knowledge management (KM) on organizational performance within the Nigeria manufacturing sector. Nonetheless, the specific aims of the research are to first and

foremost investigate the effect of knowledge creation on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. Secondly, determine the extent to which knowledge sharing influence organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector.

The following are the research questions that were asked in order to achieve the aforementioned aims of the study; firstly, what is the effect of knowledge creation on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector? Secondly, how does knowledge sharing influence organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector?

This research is important because it is the first of its kind to examine how knowledge management (KM) affects organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. The findings of this research can be used by manufacturing companies to better their internal knowledge management (KM). Managers need to be well-versed in the cultural variations of their employees in order to lead them efficiently. Human resource departments should abandon outdated practices in favour of new information that promotes intercultural commitment, interactions, and cooperation. Knowledge management (KM) is being embraced as a strategy to boost productivity and quality in many multiethnic organizations. However, most company leaders do not yet appreciate knowledge management's (KM) full potential.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Concept of Knowledge Management (KM)

Knowledge management (KM) is defined by Dei and van der Walt (2020) as “the management of processes regulating the collection, development, storage, distribution, and making use of knowledge through the use of appropriate technologies, structures of organization, and individuals in order to optimize internal learning, solving challenges, and decision making”. There are few authors who have stressed the growing importance of KM as an attribute for organizational achievement in both the public and private sectors (Al Ahababi et al., 2019; Gaviria-Marin et al., 2018; Gonzaga de Albuquerque et al., 2018). Despite the importance of KM, many businesses struggle to effectively implement it due to cultural obstacles within their businesses (Intezari et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2019; Martinsons et al., 2017). The intangible character of knowledge creates territoriality, which is highlighted by Singh (2019). This territorial behaviour causes people to hoard knowledge that ought to be shared with co-workers, which is a major barrier when considering the advantages of KM.

Since its inception in the 1990s, the concept of KM has received extensive study in the field of contemporary management and leadership. Al Saifi (2015), Hussinki et al., (2017), Peng et al., (2007) and Prusak (2014) all agree that KM is a collaborative and integrated approach that allows businesses to create, capture, organize, access, and utilize intellectual assets for long-term sustainability and strategic advantage. The widespread adoption of KM as an organizational practice is reflected in its current global prominence. Fostering a culture of learning and knowledge creation; creating an organizational knowledge architecture that supports flexibility and innovation; and creating a business approach to capitalizing on knowledge and capturing value are the three key mechanisms attributable to the implementation of KM practices (Loon, 2019).

Knowledge management is essential for facilitating communication among stakeholders and creating an environment conducive to new ideas. It helps employees work together more efficiently inside of businesses (Hamdoun et al., 2018; Santoro et al., 2018; Singh, El-Kassar, 2019). Knowledge management (KM) practices can be improved

through better internal information flow management (Nisar et al., 2019), which in turn helps businesses reap strategic benefits from data collected from a variety of sources and departments. Among the many definitions of KM, one noteworthy viewpoint stresses the importance of KM in developing, disseminating, and publicizing information both within and beyond an organization (Evangelista Durst, 2015; Oliva et al., 2019). Research on KM primarily focuses on its potential applications in the context of sustainability, especially with regards to the global information exchange essential to the success of sustainable development. Because of its ability to facilitate the sharing of information across time and space, KM is a major player in this field (Mohamed et al., 2009). In order to better evaluate the environmental, social, and economic impacts of decisions, there is a growing need to improve KM processes and practices (Bucci, El-Diraby, 2018).

2.2. Dimensions of Knowledge Management (KM)

2.2.1. Knowledge Creation

Lee and Wong (2015) argue that knowledge creation involves new ideas and concepts are generated when tacit and explicit knowledge interact with humans. Maravilhas and Martins (2019) stress that knowledge creation emerges from the interplay between existing knowledge and the process of acquiring knowledge, achieved through action, practical application, and engagement with others. Firms' ability to innovate and develop fresh technologies is bolstered when they devote enough money to knowledge creation, which in turn helps achieve objectives related to sustainability (Habib, Bao, 2019; UNGC, 2018).

Knowledge creation thrives in dynamic organizations because employees are encouraged to share what they have learned (Jarrahi, 2018). Organizations that value innovation often incentivize employees to come up with new ideas and solutions by offering financial and non-financial rewards (Chatzoudes et al., 2015). Knowledge-intensive businesses are those that put an emphasis on minimizing waste and maximizing efficiency (Albort-Morant et al., 2018). The environmental impact of their operations is constantly taken into account, and they actively promote and facilitate the development of environmentally friendly products (Tseng, 2014).

2.2.2. Knowledge Sharing

Sharing one's knowledge, whether it be explicit or tacit, is referred to as knowledge sharing (Jarrahi, 2018). It's a common form of communication in the workplace, helping employees think outside the box when confronted with a challenge (Attia, Salama, 2018) and fostering better methods of strategy, decision-making, and education (Bolisani, Bratianu, 2018). Error reduction, enhanced operational efficiency, and bigger economic sustainability are just some of the benefits gained from knowledge sharing among employees (Maravilhas, Martins, 2019). Dynamic businesses see knowledge sharing as a civic duty and take part in community outreach initiatives (Khodadadi, Feizi, 2015).

By sharing their findings with the public, learning organizations encourage collective innovation and foster a culture of mutual benefit (Al-Busaidi, Olfman, 2017). Some companies publish their complete production procedure to gain patrons' trust (Lucas, 2019). Knowledge sharing is significantly impacted by HR policies and procedures. The level of employee knowledge sharing affects both product innovation and customer satisfaction (Duffy, 2000). Additionally, it has been acknowledged that knowledge sharing is a catalyst for fostering innovative behaviours (Huarng, Mas-Tur, 2016).

2.3. Concept of Organization Performance

Management as well as business literature devote considerable attention to the topic of organizational performance (Cania, 2014). To achieve their goals, businesses constantly look for ways to improve their performance by making better use of their material and immaterial assets. The achievement of an organization's objectives is directly proportional to the effectiveness that it achieves when its approaches are implemented (Obeidat, 2016). Organizational performance depends on their ability to achieve continuous performance improvement (Cania, 2014).

Organizations of every kind and in all industries can benefit from considering performance in its many forms. Service and product delivery, creativity, market share, staff expertise, and the capacity to quickly resolve issues by means of contemporary methods and instruments for creating goods are all indicators of organizational performance (Imran, 2014). It also entails contrasting the organization's real-world results with its targeted or ideal outputs. The ability to access and efficiently manage a variety of resources within an organization is also correlated with organizational performance (Masa'deh et al., 2016).

Since making money is every business's top priority, how well they perform is crucial (Olanipekun et al., 2015). How well an organization uses its resources to accomplish its goals is what Daft (2010) described as performance. It includes things like how well the board is doing its job and how well its resources are being used (Pierre et al., 2009; Suryanto et al., 2017). Jenatabadi (2015) defines performance as the degree to which an organization meets its objectives without using too much of its available resources or putting too much stress on its employees. Methods for evaluating an organization's potential to achieve its stated goals of increased efficiency, productivity, or social impact. Syafarudin (2016) elaborates by saying that performance is the actual outcome achieved by an organization and is measured against targets.

2.4. Factors Affecting Effective Knowledge Management (KM) in Organizations

Knowledge management (KM) is a crucial tool for companies in order to successfully tackle the difficulties of adjusting, surviving, and staying competitive in a more and more tumultuous business climate (Agyeiwaah et al., 2017; Khalifa, Liu, 2003; Maier, Hadrach, 2011; Yiu, Law, 2014). As a result, businesses must consistently create new knowledge and implement it into operations (Baggio, Cooper, 2010; Cooper, 2014; Faulkner et al., 2003) to remain competitive. Despite the wealth of literature and related fields, there is scant proof that knowledge management practices are widely used or even adopted (Budeanu et al., 2016; Khalifa, Liu, 2003; Racherla, Hu, 2009). Companies place a high premium on employee output because it directly affects business results. Human resource management plays a crucial role in fostering a KM culture that promotes knowledge utilization because employee accomplishments have a significant impact on the adoption of KM approaches (Hallin, Marnburg, 2008; Hjalager, 2010). Employee motivation, performance, and competencies were all found to have close ties to KM in a study conducted by Agyeiwaah et al., (2017), which investigated the connection between human resources and KM.

Organizations, especially those in service industries, have been slow to adopt knowledge management (KM) strategies. However, the use of information technology and the development of appropriate applications have contributed to rapid progress in specific tourism-related activities, such as transportation and distribution (Weaver, Oppermann, 2000; Hjalager, 2010; Maier, Hadrach, 2011; Altinay, Paraskevas, Jang, 2015).

Organizations that use KM strategies report increased customer satisfaction and a lower turnover rate (Tribe, Liburd, 2016; Maier, Hadrich, 2011). Loyalty and client satisfaction are crucial success factors (Racherla, Hu, 2009; Baggio, Cooper, 2010; Agyeiwaah, McKercher, Suntikul, 2017), and employees who have knowledge about consumer preferences can use this information to offer outstanding support. Several crucial aspects affect how well and efficiently KM is used. Among these are some of the following:

2.5. Theoretical Review

2.5.1. Knowledge-Based View (KBV) Theory

The theory of the knowledge-based view (KBV) was introduced by Grant (2002). According to this theory, organizations have the purpose of generating, transforming, and exchanging knowledge as a means to gain a competitive advantage (Kogut, Zander, 1992). Furthermore, knowledge is an useful and difficult-to-replicate the resource because it takes various shapes within an entity and is directly tied to achievement results that can be used to gain an advantage over competitors. For a deeper comprehension of corporate conduct and business outcomes, we can turn to the knowledge-based view of an organization (Foss, 1997), which considers the nature, boundaries, and internal structure of a company with multiple employees.

Knowledge is seen as a company's most valuable strategic asset in the knowledge-based theory of the firm. Supporters of this theory contend that the key factors contributing to experienced advantage in competition and outstanding business performance involve the heterogeneous knowledge bases and abilities among firms (Barney, 1991). This is because knowledge-based assets are tough to imitate as they are socially complicated. The primary benefit of strategic alliances, from a knowledge-based viewpoint, is the sharing of information. Knowledge implementation benefits greatly from strategic alliances because they improve the efficiency with which knowledge is integrated and used. According to the work of Teece (1992), strategic alliances are formed when two or more organizations work together toward a common goal by combining their strengths and resources.

The idea of resources has been widened to consist of intangible assets, especially knowledge-based resources, in the knowledge-based view (KBV) theory, according to some researchers (Darroch, 2005; Sandhawalia, Dalcher, 2011; Subramaniam, Youndi, 2005). Diaz-Daiz, Aguir-Diaz and DeSaa-Perez (2008) argue that the KBV framework can be helpful in encouraging productive innovation within an organization. Therefore, the KBV provides theoretical support for the factors used in this investigation, which centres on the creation and utilization of various forms of knowledge.

2.5.2. Stakeholder Theory

According to the stakeholder theory, businesses are prompted to implement new environmental practices in order to improve their long-term performance by the demands of a wide range of stakeholders active within the context of the natural environment (Darnall et al., 2010; Sarkis et al., 2011). By Freeman's (1984) definition, stakeholders include "every person or organization who may influence or be influenced by the fulfillment of a company's purpose." Stakeholders with the greatest impact include consumers, workers, shareholders, and government/regulatory organs; secondary stakeholders include the press and a wide range of nongovernmental entities (Helmig et al., 2016). Stakeholders' views on ecological problems have broadened in recent years, putting

pressure on businesses to craft procedures, policies, and procedures that are consistent with their environmental goals (Yu, Ramanathan, 2015).

Stakeholder achievement on ecological problems is also found to have a substantial effect on the sustainability of a company, according to research carried out on UK manufacturing companies (Ramanathan et al., 2014). Organizations are being forced to rethink every aspect of their product life cycle as participants become more educated and engaged in environmentally friendly manufacturing methods (Jakhar et al., 2019). Since every stakeholder category possesses different levels of authority and legitimacy, determining how much impact they have on an organization is difficult (Kassinis, Vafeas, 2006). In general, the power, legitimacy, and a rush of pressure from stakeholders can be deduced (Mitchell et al., 1997).

3. METHODOLOGY

Survey research designs was used for this study's research methodology. Due to the exploratory character of this investigation, a survey research design was selected as the appropriate research strategy. The study population comprises employees of Cadbury Nigeria Plc, located at Lateef Jakande Road, Agidingbi, Ikeja, in the state of Lagos. The total number of employees in Cadbury Nigeria Plc consists of eight hundred thirty-five (835) (NSE Factbook, 2021). Cadbury Nigeria Plc was selected as the focus of this study because of the company's prominence in the worldwide confectionery and beverage industries and, more specifically, because of the fluidity of its operations and the accessibility of its internal networks, which made it possible to recruit a large sample of respondents.

The sample was selected using a probability sampling method. Every element in the population has the same chance (probability) of being selected for the sample when using the probability sampling method. The method yields objective estimates with a degree of accuracy that can be quantified. Two hundred and seventy (270) participants were used in the study, which was based on the sample size formula developed by Yamane (1967) with a confidence coefficient of 95% and a margin of error of 5%.

Primary data was collected and analyzed for this study. In order to collect information on how knowledge management (KM) affects organization performance in Nigeria's manufacturing sector, a well-structured questionnaire was implemented. Cronbach's alpha was also performed on the instrument, yielding values of 0.62 for knowledge creation and 0.59 for knowledge sharing. This demonstrates the accuracy of the measuring devices. The methods of descriptive statistics, frequency tables, simple percentage, and regression analysis were used to examine the collected data. Data can be summarized using descriptive statistics to provide insight into the nature of the population that comprises the study's sample.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After collecting and sorting appropriately completed questionnaires, a statistical package for social science (SPSS) would be used to obtain the result in which the method of data collected would be analyzed using frequency count and simple percentage for each reason advanced by respondents. The descriptive statistics of the data is shown.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the Data

Gender	Male	Female			
	42.7%	57.3%			
Age	20-30 years	31-40 years	41-50 years	Over 51 years	
	39.5%	31.4%	18.6%	10.5%	
Ethnicity	Yoruba	Igbo	Hausa		
	57.3%	32.5%	10.2%		
Marital Status	Single	Married	Divorced		
	47.3%	40.4%	12.3%		
Education	SSCE	OND	HND/B.Sc.	MBA/ M.Sc.	Others
	26.4%	32.7%	22.3%	14.5%	4.1%
Years in Operation	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Above 16 years	
	41.8%	31.4%	17.3%	9.5%	

Source: Researchers Field Survey (2023).

4.1. Hypotheses Testing

4.1.1. Research Hypothesis One:

H₀₁: Knowledge creation has no significant effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector.

Table 2. Summary of Regression Results on the effect of Knowledge Creation on Organization Performance in Nigeria Manufacturing Sector

(a) Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.917 ^a	.841	.834	.5146847		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge Creation						
(b) ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	527.41	1	527.41	42.875	.000 ^b
	Residual	2435.4	119	12.300		
	Total	2962.81	220			
a. Dependent Variable: Organization Performance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge Creation						
(c) Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		β	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.049	.299		23.900	.000
	Knowledge Creation	.314	.035	.621	8.884	.001
a. Dependent Variable: Organization Performance						

Source: Researchers Field Survey (2023).

Table 2 (a) revealed that the coefficient of determination (R^2) .841, which explains the how much variability of one factor can be caused by its relationship to another factor. This implies that knowledge creation explains 84.1% in the variations of organization performance which is statistically significant. However, the model did not explain 15.9% in the variation knowledge creation, implying that there are other knowledge creation factors which were not captured in the current model. Also, from the table 2 (b), it indicates that the regression model predicts the dependent variable significantly well and also it indicates the statistical significance of the regression model that was run. Here, $p < 0.000$, which is less than 0.05 with an F-statistic of 42.875, is a good fit for the data. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected, while the alternative hypothesis is accepted thus that knowledge creation has a significant effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. The coefficients results in table 2 (c) revealed a statistically significant positive effect of knowledge creation on organization performance ($\beta = .621$, Sig. = .001, $P < 0.05$). This is a demonstration that knowledge creation had an overall statistically significant and positive effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector.

4.1.2. Research Hypothesis Two:

H₀₂: Knowledge sharing has no significant effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector.

Table 3. Summary of Regression Results on the effect of Knowledge Sharing on Organization Performance in Nigeria Manufacturing Sector

(a) Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.738 ^a	.545	.542	.96267		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge Sharing						
(b) ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	147.737	1	147.737	159.417	.000 ^b
	Residual	123.255	119	.927		
	Total	270.993	120			
a. Dependent Variable: Organization Performance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge Sharing						
(c) Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.796	.286		21.974	.000
	Knowledge Sharing	.570	.061	.738	12.626	.003
a. Dependent Variable: Organization Performance						

Source: Researchers Field Survey (2023).

Table 3 (a) revealed that the coefficient of determination (R^2) .545, which explains the how much variability of one factor can be caused by its relationship to another factor. This implies that knowledge sharing explains 54.5% in the variations of organization performance which is statistically significant. However, the model did not explain 45.5% in the variation knowledge sharing, implying that there are other knowledge sharing factors which were not captured in the current model. Also, from the table 3 (b), it indicates that the regression model predicts the dependent variable significantly well and also it indicates the statistical significance of the regression model that was run. Here, $p < 0.000$, which is less than 0.05 with an F-statistic of 159.417, is a good fit for the data. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected, while the alternative hypothesis is accepted thus that knowledge sharing has a significant effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. The coefficients results in table 3 (c) revealed a statistically significant positive effect of knowledge sharing on organization performance ($\beta = .738$, Sig. = .003, $P < 0.05$). This is a demonstration that knowledge sharing had an overall statistically significant and positive effect on organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector.

4.2. Discussion of Findings

The first hypothesis tested in this research found that there is a positive relationship between knowledge creation and organization performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. Sylva et al., (2016) found similar results in their research on the effect of knowledge creation on innovation in Nigerian manufacturing firms. The authors realized that knowledge creation was found to be very instrumental in boosting innovation through the acquisition, transformation, and application of novel and carefully cultivated ideas and the linking of the knowledge power of organizations in order to produce superior innovations and services.

The analysis of the second hypothesis also demonstrated that knowledge sharing has a significant impact on organizational performance in Nigeria manufacturing sector. Consistent with the findings of Ndegwa et al. (2015), who studied the impact of knowledge sharing on job satisfaction in top 10 businesses and found that knowledge sharing has a positive and significant impact on job satisfaction. Lee and Wong (2015) looked into how to quantify knowledge sharing in SMEs. The findings indicate that knowledge sharing and firm size had an impact on specific aspects of SMEs' knowledge management performance.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION FOR MANAGEMENT

Based on the research findings, the following conclusions can be drawn from this study. Firstly, knowledge management is an effective method for boosting creativity and morale in the workplace. Companies in Nigeria, and the Nigerian manufacturing sector in particular, would benefit from using more up-to-date methods of knowledge creation and dissemination because doing so would boost both innovation and employee satisfaction. Knowledge is viewed as a crucial resource in today's interconnected world. As a result, a growing number of businesses are adopting knowledge management in an effort to boost productivity. Knowledge management's contribution to the manufacturing sector's productivity is examined here using the case of Cadbury Nigeria Plc in Ikeja, Lagos state. High-performing organizations practice knowledge management, which includes the processes of knowledge creation, knowledge sharing, and knowledge acquisition. This proves that intangible resources like knowledge can boost performance in the Nigerian

manufacturing sector, particularly in the key areas of business such as marketing, product and process development, and service delivery.

In conclusion, knowledge management is now widely recognized as an essential factor in any successful business. To maintain a competitive edge, businesses must invest in knowledge creation. In addition, the proliferation of information has prompted businesses to adopt knowledge management systems as a means of formulating competitive advantages. Knowledge has long been recognized as a crucial asset that can help businesses improve performance and gain a competitive edge in the market. Knowledge management, the study found, is a tool that helps us make better use of our resources, allowing us to more effectively and efficiently reach our loftier business objectives. Its goal is to help the organization meet its objectives and anticipate its future needs by generating new opportunities, generating value, gaining competitive advantages, and enhancing performance.

5.1. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this investigation, the following recommendations were provided: firstly, in order to improve their performance, businesses and their leaders should acknowledge the significance of knowledge management and operations and invest more in increasing their ability to generate, acquire, and share knowledge. Secondly, knowledge leadership is crucial to the knowledge creation process because it facilitates and promotes knowledge sharing, establishes an appropriate work environment, provides infrastructure that aids the work process, and ensures that information and data are made available to knowledge workers in a timely manner. Thirdly, organizations can promote knowledge creation by encouraging workers to engage in activities like reading professional reports, reaching out to outside experts, and participating in training programs and workshops. Lastly, organizations need knowledge-sharing bases like databases, intranets, and training activities to effectively disseminate information across departments and teams.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, S., Lagraa, J. (2017). *Organizational performance in manufacturing companies a comparative study*. "Journal of Human Resource Management", 3(5).
- Agyeiwaah, E., McKercher, B., Suntikul, W. (2017). *Identifying core indicators of sustainable tourism: A path forward?* "Tourism Management Perspectives", 24.
- Al Ahbabi, S.A., Singh, S., Balasubramanian, S., Gaur, S.S. (2019). *Employee perception of impact of knowledge management processes on public sector performance*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 23(2)
- Al Saifi, S.A. (2015). *Positioning organisational culture in knowledge management research*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 19.
- Albort-Morant, G., Leal-Millán, A., Cepeda-Carrion, G., Henseler, J. (2018). *Developing green innovation performance by fostering of organizational knowledge and competitive relations*. "Review of Managerial Science", 12(2).
- Al-Busaidi, K.A., Olfman, L. (2017). *Knowledge sharing through inter-organizational knowledge sharing systems*. "VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems", 47(1).
- Altinay, L., Paraskevas, A., Jang, S.S. (2015). *Planning research in hospitality and tourism*. Routledge.

- Andrej, N. (2017). *Knowledge management and competitive advantage*. "Journal of Business Management", 50(1).
- Attia, A., Salama, I. (2018). *Knowledge management capability and supply chain management practices in the Saudi food industry*. "Business Process Management Journal", 24.
- Baggio, R., Cooper, C. (2010). *Knowledge transfer in a tourism destination: the effects of a network structure*. "The Service Industries Journal", 30(10).
- Barney, J.B. (1991). *Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage*. "Journal of Management", 17(1).
- Bolisani, E., Bratianu, C. (2018). *The elusive definition of knowledge [In:] Emergent Knowledge Strategies: Strategic Thinking in Knowledge Management*. Springer International Publishing, Cham.
- Bolorma, D. (2015). *Knowledge management capability level assessment of higher education institutions: case study from Mongolia*. "Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences", 147.
- Bucci, M., El-Diraby, T.E. (2018). *The functions of knowledge management processes in urban impact assessment: The case of Ontario*. "Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal", 36(3).
- Budeanu, A., Miller, G., Moscardo, G., Ooi, C.S. (2016). *Special Volume: Sustainable tourism: progress, challenges and opportunities*. "Journal of Cleaner Production", 111.
- Cania, L. (2014). *The impact of strategic human resource management on organizational performance*. "Economia: Seria Management", 17(2).
- Chatzoudes, D., Chatzoglou, P., Vraimaki, E. (2015). *The central role of knowledge management in business operations: developing a new conceptual framework*. "Business Process Management Journal", 21.
- Chawla, D., Joshi, H. (2017). *A comparative study of knowledge management assessment in business excellence awarded and non-awarded organizations in India*. "SAGE, Global Business Review", 12(2).
- Cho, T., Korte, R. (2014). *Managing Knowledge Performance: Testing the Components of a Knowledge Management System on Organizational Performance*. "Asia Pacific Education Review", 15(2).
- Cooper, P. (2014). *Data, information, knowledge and wisdom*. "Anaesthesia, Intensive Care Medicine", 15(1).
- Daft, R.L. (2010). *New era of management* (9th ed.). Australia: South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- Darnall, N., Henriques, I., Sadorsky, P. (2010). *Adopting proactive environmental strategy: The influence of stakeholders and firm size*. "Journal of Management Studies", 47(6).
- Darroch, J. (2005). *Knowledge management, innovation and firm performance*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 9(3).
- Dei, D.J., van der Walt, T.B. (2020). *Knowledge management practices in universities: The role of communities of practice*. "Social Sciences, Humanities Open", 2.
- Diaz-Daiz, N., Aguir-Diaz, I., DeSaa-Perez, P. (2008). *The effect of technological knowledge assets on performance the innovation choice in Spanish Firms*. "Research Policy", 37.
- Duffy, J. (2000). *Knowledge management: What every information professional should know*. "Information Management Journal", 34(3).
- Ekambaram, A., Sørensen, A.O., Bull-Berg, H., Olsson, N.O.E. (2018). *The Role of Big Data and Knowledge Management in Improving Projects and Project-based organizations*. "Procedia Computer Science", 138.

- Evangelista, P., Durst, S. (2015). *Knowledge management in environmental sustainability practices of third-party logistics service providers*. "VINE", 45.
- Faluyi, A. (2018). *Knowledge management and organizational performance*. "International Journal of Knowledge Management", 5(1).
- Faulkner, B., Laws, E., Moscardo, G. (2003). *Embracing and managing change in tourism: International case studies*. Routledge.
- Fillion, G., Koffi, V., Ekionea, J.P.B. (2015). *Peter Senge's learning organization: a Critical view and the addition of some New concepts to actualize theory and Practice*. "Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict", 19(3).
- Foss, N. (1997). *Resources, Firms and Strategies: A Reader in the Resource-Based Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman Publishing Inc.
- Gaviria-Marin, M., Merigó, J.M., Baier-Fuentes, H. (2018). *Knowledge management: A global examination based on bibliometric analysis*. "Technological Forecasting and Social Change", 140.
- Gonzaga de Albuquerque, A.P., Coutinho de Melo, F.J., Dumke de Medeiros, D., Tomaz de Aquino, J., De Barros Jeronimo, T. (2018). *Knowledge management alignment to the community of practice in a company of cutting and bending steel*. "Brazilian Journal of Operational and Production Management", 15.
- Grant, R.M. (2002). *The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: Implications for strategy formulation*. "California Management Review", 33(3).
- Habib, A., Bao, Y. (2019). *Impact of knowledge management capability and green supply chain management practices on firm performance*. "International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science", 8(6).
- Hallin, C.A., Marnburg, E. (2008). *Knowledge management in the hospitality industry: A review of empirical research*. "Tourism Management", 29(2).
- Hamdoun, M., Jabbour, C.J., Othman, H. (2018). *Knowledge transfer and organizational innovation: Impacts of quality and environmental management*. "Journal of Cleaner Production", 193.
- Helmig, B., Spraul, K., Ingenhoff, D. (2016). *Under positive pressure: How stakeholder pressure affects corporate social responsibility implementation*. "Business, Society", 55(2).
- Hjalager, A.M. (2010). *A review of innovation research in tourism*. "Tourism Management", 31(1).
- Huang, K.H., Mas-Tur, A. (2016). *New knowledge impacts in designing implementable innovative realities*. "Journal of Business Research", 69(5).
- Hussinki, H., Kianto, A., Vanhala, M., Ritala, P. (2017). *Assessing the universality of knowledge management practices*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 21.
- Imran, M.K. (2014). *Impact of knowledge management infrastructure on organizational performance with moderating role of KM performance: An empirical study on banking sector of Pakistan*. "Information and Knowledge Management", 4(8).
- Intezari, A., Taskin, N., Pauleen, D.J. (2017). *Looking beyond knowledge sharing: an integrative approach to knowledge management culture*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 21.

- Jakhar, S.K., Mangla, S.K., Luthra, S., Kusi-Sarpong, S. (2019), *When stakeholder pressure drives the circular economy: Measuring the mediating role of innovation capabilities*. "Management Decision", 57(4).
- Jarrahi, M.H. (2018). *Social Media, Social Capital and Knowledge Sharing in Enterprise*. "IT Professional", 20.
- Jenatabadi, H.S. (2015). *An overview of organizational performance index: Definitions and measurement*. Malaysia: Department of Science and Technology Studies University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Kambey, J.P., Wuryaningrat, N.F., Kumajas, L.I. (2018). *Examining leadership and knowledge sharing role on small and medium enterprises innovation capabilities*. "International Journal of Economics and Business Administration", 6(1).
- Kassinis, G., Vafeas, N. (2006). *Stakeholder pressures and environmental performance*. "Academy of Management Journal", 49(1).
- Khalifa, M., Liu, V. (2003). *Determinants of successful knowledge management programs*. "Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management", 1(2).
- Khodadadi, M., Feizi, M. (2015). *The Impact of Knowledge Management on Social Responsibility at Social Security Organization in East Azarbaijan Province*. "Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review", 33(2581).
- Lee, C.S., Wong, K.Y. (2015). *Knowledge management performance measurement in micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises: An exploratory study*. "Business Information Review", 32(4).
- Liu, Y., Chan, C., Zhao, C., Liu, C., (2019). *Unpacking knowledge management practices in China: do institution, national and organizational culture matter?* "Journal of Knowledge Management", 23(4).
- Loon, M. (2019). *Knowledge management practice system: Theorising from an international meta-standard*. "Journal of Business Research", 94.
- Lucas, M.T. (2019). *Understanding environmental management practices: integrating views from strategic management and ecological economics*. "Business Strategy and the Environment", 19.
- Maier, R., Hadrich, T. (2011). *Knowledge management systems* [In:] Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management, Second Edition (p. 779-790). IGI Global.
- Mansour, T., Abuarqoub, I.A. (2020). *The Role of Knowledge Management in Improving the Performance of Media Institutions: A Case Study of Abu Dhabi TV*. "Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy", 11(12).
- Maravilhas, S., Martins, J. (2019). *Strategic knowledge management in a digital environment: Tacit and explicit knowledge in Fab Labs*. "Journal of Business Research", 94.
- Mardani, A., Nikoosokhan, S., Moradi, M., Doustar, M. (2018). *The relationship between knowledge management and innovation performance*. "Journal of High Technology Management Research", 29.
- Martinsons, M.G., Davison, R.M., Huang, Q. (2017). *Strategic knowledge management failures in small professional service firms in China*. "International Journal of Information Management", 37.
- Masa'deh, R., Obeidat, B., Tarhini, A. (2016). *A Jordanian empirical study of the associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and firm performance: A structural equation modelling approach*. "Journal of Management Development", 35(5).

- Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R., Wood, D.J. (1997). *Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts*. "Academy of Management Review", 22(4).
- Mohamed, M., Stankosky, M., Mohamed, M. (2009). *An empirical assessment of knowledge management criticality for sustainable development*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 13.
- Mothe, C., Nguyen-Thi, U.T., Triguero, A. (2017). *Innovative products and services with environmental benefits: design of search strategies for external knowledge and absorptive capacity*. "Journal of Environmental Planning and Management", 61(11).
- Ndegwa, J., Machuki, V., Maalu, J., Awino, Z., Iraki, X. (2015). *Knowledge sharing, organizational learning, and performance of top 100 medium enterprises in Kenya*. Paper presented at 1 DBA-Africa management review international conference. Access on the internet: <http://journals.uonbi.ac.ke/damr/article/viewFile/1292/1091>.
- Nisar, T.M., Prabhakar, G., Strakova, L. (2019). *Social media information benefits, knowledge management and smart organizations*. "Journal of Business Research", 94.
- Nwonyuku, A. (2016). *Knowledge management in food and beverage sector in Nigeria*. "Knowledge and Management", 1(24).
- Obeidat, B.Y. (2016). *Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility, employee engagement, and organizational performance: The case of Jordanian mobile telecommunication companies*. "International Journal of Communications, Network and System Sciences", 9(9).
- Olanipekun, W.D., Abioro, M.A., Akanni, L.F., Arulogun, O.O., Rabi, R.O. (2015). *Impact of strategic management on competitive advantage and organizational performance evidence from Nigerian bottling company*. "Journal of Policy and Development Studies", 9(2).
- Oliva, F.L., Semensato, B. I., Prioste, D. B., Winandy, E. J., Bution, J.L., Couto, M.H., Bottacin, M.A., Mac Lennan, L.F., Teberga, M.F., Santos, R.F., Singh, S.K., da Silva, S.F., Massaini, S.A. (2019). *Innovation in the main Brazilian business sectors: characteristics, types and comparison of innovation*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 23.
- Ooi, K.B. (2014). *TQM: a facilitator to enhance knowledge management? A structural analysis*. "Expert Systems with Applications", 41.
- Peng, J., Li-Hua, R., Moffett, S. (2007). *Trend of knowledge management in China: challenges and opportunities*. "Journal of Technology Management", 2.
- Pierre, R., Devlin, Yip, G., Gerry, J. (2009). *Measuring organizational performance: Towards methodological best practice*. "Journal of Management", 35(3).
- Prusak, R. (2014). *Influence of selected strategic variables on the development of the intellectual capital of an enterprise*. "Management", 18(1).
- Qasrawi, B.T., Almahamid, S. M., Qasrawi, S.T. (2017). *The impact of TQM practices and KM processes on organisational performance: an empirical investigation*. "International Journal of Quality, Reliability Management", 34.
- Racherla, P., Hu, C. (2009). *A framework for knowledge-based crisis management in the hospitality and tourism industry*. "Cornell Hospitality Quarterly", 50(4).
- Ramanathan, R., Poomkaew, B., Nath, P. (2014). *The impact of organizational pressures on environmental performance of firms*. "Business Ethics: A European Review", 23(2).
- Sandhawalia, B.S., Dalcher, D. (2011). *Developing knowledge management Capabilities: A Structured Approach*. "Journal of Knowledge Management", 15(2).
- Santoro, G., Vrontis, D., Thrassou, A., Dezi, L. (2018). *Technological Forecasting, Social Change the Internet of Things: Building a knowledge management system for open*

- innovation and knowledge management capacity. "Technological Forecasting and Social Change"*, 136.
- Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q., Lai, K.H. (2011). *An organizational theoretic review of green supply chain management literature. "International Journal of Production Economics"*, 130(1).
- Singh, S.K. (2019). *Territoriality, task performance, and workplace deviance: Empirical evidence on role of knowledge hiding. "Journal of Business Resources"*, 97.
- Singh, S. K., El-Kassar, A.N. (2019). *Role of big data analytics in developing sustainable capabilities. "Journal of Cleaner Production"*, 13.
- Subramaniam, M., Youndi, H. (2005). *The influence of intellectual capital in the types of innovative capabilities. "Academy of Management Journal"*, 48.
- Suryanto T., Thalassinou, E.J., Thalassinou, I.E. (2017). *Board Characteristics, Audit Committee and Audit Quality: The Case of Indonesia. "International Journal of Economics and Business Administration"*, 5(3).
- Syafarudin, D. (2016). *Impact of leadership on organizational performance. A case study of D&R cambric communication. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), University of Applied Sciences.*
- Sylva, W., Ofoegbu, C.W., Akpan, E.E. (2016). *The Impact of Knowledge Management on Product Innovation of Manufacturing Firms in Nigeria. "Information and Knowledge Management"*, 6(6).
- Teece, D.J. (1992). *Foreign investment and technological development in silicon. "California Management Review"*, 34(2).
- Tribe, J., Liburd, J. (2016). *The tourism knowledge system. "Annals of Tourism Research"*, 57.
- Tseng, S.M. (2014). *The impact of knowledge management capabilities and supplier relationship management on corporate performance. "International Journal of Production Economics"*, 154.
- Tubigi, M., Alshawi, S. (2015). *The Impact of Knowledge Management Processes on Organizational Performance: The Case of the Airline Industry. "Journal of Enterprise Information Management"*, 28(2).
- UNGC (2018). *United Nations Global Compact. New York: United Nations, New York.*
- Weaver, D., Oppermann, M. (2000). *Tourism management. John Wiley and Sons.*
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis. 2nd Edition, New York: Harper and Row.*
- Yang, E., Chen, U. (2009). *Knowledge management and organizational performance. "Journal of Business Research"*, 1(3).
- Yiu, M., Law, R. (2014). *Review and application of knowledge management and knowledge sharing in tourism. "Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research"*, 19(7).
- Yu, W., Ramanathan, R. (2015). *An empirical examination of stakeholder pressures, green operations practices and environmental performance. "International Journal of Production Research"*, 53(21).

APPENDIX

S/No	Question Relating to Knowledge Creation	SA	A	UD	SD	D
1.	I am encouraged to find alternative solutions for existing tasks in my organization.	29.5%	41.5%	5%	14.1%	10%
2.	My organization learns from what staff members suggest.	32.3%	45.5%	12.2%	-	10%
3.	In my organization, archival reports are easily accessible for members.	37.3%	26.8%	7.7%	15%	13.2%
Question Relating to Knowledge Sharing						
4.	My organization facilitates communication and a consultation culture between members.	44.6%	34.5%	3.2%	12.7%	5%
5.	In my organization, knowledge is shared between staff members.	29.1%	48.6%	5.5%	9.1%	7.7%
6.	My organization organizes time to share ideas.	50.9%	29.1%	4.1%	6.4%	9.5%
Question Relating to Knowledge Acquisition						
7.	My organization mainly relies on internal information.	44.1%	38.6%	5%	12.3%	-
8.	My organization encourages staff members to up-grade their skills.	51.4%	38.6%	2.3%	4.5%	3.2%
9.	My organization is market-oriented by obtaining members and industry information.	40%	29.1%	8.2%	9.5%	13.2%
Question Relating to Organization Performance						
10.	Profitability	27.3%	44.5%	9.5%	6.4%	12.3%
11.	Total sales of goods and services	38.6%	35.5%	6.8 %	8.2%	10.9%
12.	Market share	43.2%	33.6%	9.5%	5.5%	8.2%
13.	Decreased cost of fuel consumption	12.3%	8.2%	3.2%	44.5%	31.8%

