

Knowledge Management and Organizational Resilience in Iranian Public Organizations

Ali Asghar. Fani Hasan. Danaee Fard
Department of Management, University of Tarbiat Modares

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience. The statistical population of this study is 28 Public organization of Iran. The sample for the Study determined 270 Middle and senior Managers that selected by simple random sampling. Organizational resilience questionnaires Mafabi et al (2012) and Knowledge management Amah (2013) were used. The reliability of the questionnaires in Iran renew determined. Data analysis was performed by means of descriptive and inferential statistics. Using descriptive statistics, demographic characteristics were examined. Pearson correlation coefficient used for answers to research hypothesis. The study was performed using the statistical software SPSS20. The results showed a positive and significant relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience. Specifically, knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization, were revealed to have a positive and significant influence on organizational resilience. Hence, concluded that knowledge management specifically knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization, enhances organizational resilience in Iranian public organizations.

Keywords: knowledge management, organizational resilience, knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing, knowledge utilization.

Introduction

Unstable environments create frequent challenges. In such an environment, only flexible, agile and very dynamic organizations will thrive (Lengnick-Hall et al, 2011). Thus, organizations to survive and find a constructive way forward during tough times should adapt to changing or face extinction. Because "Organization does not exist in vacuum rather it is mutually dependent on its external environment" (Koontz & Weihrich, 1999). Nowadays we frequently saw the butterfly effect theory. Stephenson (2010) rightly argues "investment choices on one side of the world can affect the cost of living on the other". This implies that organizations cannot control the variety unless they possess the requisite variety to bring the organization to a state of acceptable space (Umoh & Amah, 2013). Evidence shows that most organizations are buffeted with the forces of globalization, shifts in the economy, and an ever-changing workforce. According to KPMG, 40 percent of companies that suffer a major business disruption go out of business within two years because they are unable to recover from the long-term effects of a crisis. Data from the past decade note that 80 percent of all businesses that have a major fire do not recover; an estimated 40 percent of organizations without business continuity and recovery plans go out of business after a major disaster; and, 93 percent of companies that have a significant loss of data fail within five years (Devargas, 1999; Cocchiara, 2005). Irving and Anderson (2004) in their study found that an estimated 50 percent of organizations without business continuity and recovery plans go out of business after a major disaster. Curtis (2008) cites department of Labor data showing that of all companies that experience disaster, 65 percent fail, with 40 percent not re-opening, and 25 percent closing within 2 years (SchWeber & Bouchard, 2011) and public organizations in Iran of the state are no exception. Evidence shows that labor productivity in Iran is low in comparison with other Asian countries and is about 1.99 percent. The number in countries like China is 14.4 percent, Korea 6.1 percent, malaysia 6 percent, Thailand 5.4 percent, Taiwan 5.7 percent, Japan 4.5 percent, Singapore 4.1 percent. The show need to increase the resilience in the Iranian public organizations.

So looking for your strengths is an important starting point in understanding resilience (Neenan, 2009; p.57). Having purpose and commitment to it is condition necessary for resilience and meantime thinking is the 'senior partner' in this interdependent relationship (Neenan, 2009; p.28). What we think (i.e. the content of our thinking) and how we think (i.e. how we process information to arrive at our conclusions) are very important. The greater its ability to respond to challenges. Once we understand how to respond to challenges in life with resilience, downturns are not so overwhelming, defeating, or destructive. Resilient people respond to life's challenges with courage and emotional stamina, even when they are afraid. Downturns become challenges to face head-on and overcome. Even though we have no control over many events in our life accidents, natural disasters, crime, illness, the economy, etc. we can control how we respond to these events, and we can choose to do so with resilience.

Hence, the reasons important of organizational resilience is the leading turn threats into opportunities, coping with unexpected events in real time, withstand persecution, bounce back from failure, shock tolerance, thrive in a dynamic and volatile economic times. Moreover it is not possible for organizations to accurately predict the future. Even if they can predict, cannot plan projections based on the predictions of their own.

Wildavsky (1988) also argues that anticipation can lead to a great deal of unnecessarily wasted effort and wasted resources. Therefore resilience is key preparedness and survival.

Although, a great deal has been written about role of knowledge management in enhancing organizational resilience (Parsons, 2007; McManus, 2008 ; Mafabi et al, 2012; Umoh & Amah, 2013). However, little empirical research exists in developing countries, especially Iran. Hence, to bridge this gap in literature, this study examines the relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience of public organizations in Iran.

Literature review

The organizational resilience is a firm's ability to bounce back and often create new ways to flourish when faced with disruptive conditions (Meyer, 1982). The resilience is the "capacity to cope with unanticipated dangers after they have become manifest, learning to bounce back" (Wildavsky's, 1988). This capacity must be established before the emergence of outbreak. The organization that adapt proactively before changes occurs in their environment can be called resilient (Oliveira & Werther, 2013). Capacity building can be defined as the ability of an organization to carry out its mission (Wing, 2004). Luthans (2002) organizational resilience defines as "the developable capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, conflict, and failure or even positive events, progress, and increased responsibility". While characteristics such as flexibility, adaptation, improvisation, and agility may contribute to an organization's capacity for resilience, none of these capabilities is sufficient on its own to achieve it (Lengnick-Hall & Beck, 2011). managers need to be updated on limitations to their knowledge and the organization needs to implement widespread, deep knowledge of past experiences and lessons learned—not as a blueprint, but as part of a "lessons learned" system. (Brazeau, 2008; Comfort, 1994; Crichton et al., 2009; Hind et al, 1996; Mallak, 1998; Somers, 2009). Cognitive foundations for resilience require a solid grasp on reality and a relentless desire to question fundamental assumptions. Also, depends on an ability to conceptualize solutions that are both novel and appropriate (Lengnick-Hall & Beck, 2011).

If in the agricultural age, arm strength and in the industrial age, tools and machinery for survival and insolvency were considered important ingredient, in the present age that has become a global village and Shapiro and Varian (1999) called the information age, and Thurow (2003) the Third Industrial Revolution, the only source of strength and sustainability of organizations, is knowledge management.

But evidence suggests that awareness of knowledge management in the public sector is low. Lucier (2003) states that face approximately 84 percent of knowledge management programs on fail. Storey and Barnett (2000) also reported failure rate of over 80 percent. Despite the growing interest in knowledge management few companies have succeeded in creating a knowledge-based competence to gain and establish resilience (Umoh & Amah, 2013). Several obstacles have occurred in the course of conducting knowledge that even advanced industrial societies are not immune from the harm they and also, great corporations have been victimized in this way. These obstacles can be classified into the following four areas: 1. Knowledge gap 2- Knowledge Transfer gap 3- Knowledge implementation gap 4- knowledge integrate gap. The very important is to an organization that Knowledge management operations begin moment to understand the concept of knowledge management. Because we of one hand limitation know our and on the other hand on our do not know. But overall weakness, lack of culture that is supportive knowledge management process and helpful to the development of and knowledge creation (King and Marks, 2008). Also, Schein (1988) argue that acts that done in public sector organizations in sets information and knowledge is political. In Iran also, unsuccessful many of organizations in Iran is not low knowledge, rather the problem is gap between know and doing.

However, the organization of economic cooperation and development (OECD) in report in 2003, is examined importance and necessity of knowledge management in organizations. For some reason OECD, public organizations should move towards knowledge management including Knowledge has become a critical determinant of competitiveness for the public sector, private firms produce goods and services that are increasingly intensive in intangible capital, directly competing with the goods and services traditionally produced by the public sector, Ageing civil servants and faster staff turnover, Increasingly knowledgeable citizens require governments to be on top of newly created Knowledge, public policy goals (e.g. "fighting exclusion") have become more ambitious and complex than before. Liao & Wu (2010) pointed that implementation knowledge management process in every organization is necessary for increase employee individual learning capacity, also employee grouping. Mafabi et al (2012), and Umoh and Amah (2013) in their research found a significant relationship between knowledge management and organizational resilience.

Knowledge management

The discussion about knowledge management had a long history that antiquity is the history of human thought. It can be argued that traces the origin and evolution of knowledge management comes back to the third millennium BC. All thinkers from Plato to Descartes and Kant in the search term to express the nature of knowledge. Why did not specify a name for it could be the two reason. The concept was that does not need to management or do

not specify a name for it. Because used in practice but informally and whatever that nowadays new is about knowledge management, awareness of the process of knowledge management. Several experts and specialists involved in the development of knowledge management concept that they some of the most famous are include Drucker, Strawsman and Senge. The biggest research done to today about knowledge management is related to Nonaka & Takeuchi (1995) to title “The knowledge creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation”.

Bhatt (2001), stressing on the differentiation among data, information, and knowledge. Data based on Bhatt (2001) only raw fact, and then become information when they are organized. The selected information which are useful and meaningful become knowledge. Davenport and Prusak (1998) define knowledge as a fluid mix of experiences, values, contextual information and intuition that provides a structure to evaluate and incorporate new experiences and information. Knowledge is also the accumulation of ideas, learning, understanding, memory, sight, cognitive and technical skills, and so on (Novianto & Puspasari, 2012). The last step is to move from knowledge to wisdom and perfection. Wisdom is in fact the application of knowledge.

Knowledge management means identifying, developing, and leveraging knowledge across the organization with the purpose of achieving competitive advantage (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Beveren (2002) suggests that Knowledge management involves a wide spectrum of activities, designed to enable management, exchange, creation, or improvement of intellectual assets within an organization (Halawi et al., 2005). Davenport and Volpel (2001) also argues that Knowledge management is people Management and people management is knowledge management. Thus the benefits of knowledge management depend had to motivate people, their aspirations, their ability to knowledge sharing and use of knowledge.

Discussion about taxonomy species knowledge is very important. Because species various knowledge has various use in knowledge management and also, needy implementation models various in knowledge management. And by those comparing gained a better understanding of the knowledge.

This classifications are includes two to eight phase. And of content are most similar to each other, but inclusive words are with different orders. One of the most popular classifications of knowledge by Polanyi (1966) on two floors has been explicit and implicit. But their popularity in modern discussions is underlines of the famous book knowledge-creation company Nonaka and Takeuchi. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) state that tacit knowledge is knowledge that resides in the people’s minds, in fact resides in people’s brains and deeply rooted in individuals’ experiences, ideas, values and emotions. Many scholars such as Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), Vicari and Troilo (2000) and Kidwell et al (2001), directly or indirectly acknowledge that tacit knowledge cannot be easily encoded and low portability. Nonaka (1994) states that the transfer effective of tacit knowledge requires have a lot of communication and trust between individuals that contribute to the amplification and development of new knowledge. The tacit dimension of knowledge is comprised of both cognitive and technical elements (Nonaka, 1994). The cognitive element refers to an individual's mental models consisting of mental maps, beliefs, paradigms, and view-points. The technical component consists of concrete know-how, crafts, and skills that apply to a specific context.

Explicit knowledge is knowledge that aspect more objective, more rational and more technical and well accessible, classification and storage. Explicit knowledge also called knowledge recognizable. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) point out that explicit knowledge can be encrypted and encoded and therefore it could be easily processed, transfer and stored in the database. Explicit knowledge can be expressed in words and numbers and to form data, formulas, instructions and etc to be shared. This kind of knowledge can be in the form of a scientific formula or manual published between organization individuals.

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) argue that tacit and explicit knowledge are complementary and in creative activities of individuals influence each other. Knowledge is created through interactions between tacit and explicit knowledge and not from either tacit or explicit knowledge alone (Nonaka, 2000). This interaction is referred to as conversion. This conversion does not occur within individuals, but occurs between them and within organizational context. The main challenge knowledge management is in capabilities, identify and capture tacit knowledge and converting much better tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge.

Some other researchers classify knowledge differently. For example, Hansen et al (1999) there are two ways to manage knowledge, namely the codification and personalization strategies. Codification strategy where knowledge is carefully codified and stored in databases, where the database can be accessed and used easily by all members of the organization. While personalization where knowledge firmly attached to the people who developed them and tend to be shared through direct contact between individuals. The main function of the computer to personalization strategy is to help communicate knowledge, not save it. Chandler (2001) identified three major categories of knowledge that these are: technological, operational and managerial. Jorna (2001) mentions three types of knowledge: a) tacit or perceptual knowledge, This type of knowledge can be very global, but also very detailed and cannot be coded, it is about concrete experiences, and it can be shared only with those who are co-present b) coded knowledge, This dimension is the dimension of the sign as code that With the two-dimensional sign codes emerge and c) theoretical knowledge theoretical knowledge is the result of profound

answers to the question: “why is so and so the case?”. Reich et al. (2012) proposed that knowledge management had three dimensions, Enabling Environment, Knowledge Stock, and Knowledge Practices.

Earl (2001) Taxonomy classifies knowledge management strategies according to seven schools. The first three schools are labeled “Technocratic”, because they are based on information or management technologies. Knowledge management strategies in this category focus on using information or management technologies to support knowledge workers. These three schools are: systems, cartographic and engineering. The fourth school labeled “economic”, being the most commercial in orientation, explicitly creating revenue streams from the exploitation of knowledge and intellectual capital. The other three schools can be seen as more behavioral, there are: organizational, spatial and strategic. Strategies in this category are intended to transform the behaviors of both knowledge users and the organization so as to facilitate knowledge activities, such as sharing, creation, transfer, and utilization (Wang & Belardo, 2005).

Knowledge management process

Today, the most important processes in the organization the process of knowledge management. Similarly, the most important development in organization is evolution in knowledge innuendo innovation and production of new knowledge. Davenport and prusak (2000) stated that the increase of knowledge power and deal with the cultural changes of the most challenging issues in the process of knowledge management. The purpose of process of knowledge management, collection and organize organization knowledge and the exploitation and protection of the assets of the acquired knowledge. Liao and Wu (2010) pointed that implementation knowledge management process in every organization is necessary for increase employee individual learning capacity, also employee grouping.

Many studies have been done on knowledge management processes. For example, Alavi and Linder (2001) posed four processes of creating, storage, transfer, and application knowledge management. In addition, they have stated that there is not a main difference between this classifications, the only difference is the name and number of process steps.

Gould et al (2001) suggested that four knowledge management processes: acquisition, conversion, application, and protection. Many terms have been used to describe acquisition process: acquire, seek, generate, create, capture, and collaborate. Conversion – oriented knowledge management processes are those oriented toward making existing knowledge useful. Some of the processes that enable knowledge conversion are a firm’s ability to organize, integrate, combine, structure, coordinate, or distribute knowledge. Application- based processes are those oriented toward the actual use of the knowledge. Security- oriented knowledge management processes are those designed to protect the knowledge within an organization from illegal or inappropriate use or theft.

According to Darroch (2003) the knowledge management process consists of three parts: knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination, and knowledge utilization. Chen and Chen (2005) propose a four-stage model of the knowledge management process that includes knowledge creation, which, in addition to adding new knowledge, includes correction of existing knowledge, knowledge conversion, and knowledge circulation and completion. Johnson and Blumentritt (1998) derive a typology of KM consist of eight processes that need to be managed. These are: knowledge identification, knowledge acquisition, knowledge generation, knowledge validation, knowledge capture, knowledge diffusion, knowledge embodiment, knowledge realization, and knowledge utilization/application.

Lawson (2003) stated that the process of knowledge management is in relation to creation, capture, organization, storage, dissemination, and application. Bose (2004) suggests that these knowledge management processes: knowledge creation, knowledge registration, knowledge refining, knowledge dissemination, and knowledge application. The knowledge results experience and skills of the personnel. The knowledge that generated must be stored in databases to its original shape. Knowledge should be available to everyone in the organization at any time and place where it needs to be used. Nevis et al (1998) categorized knowledge management into knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing, and knowledge distribution. Lee and Hong (2002) proposed knowledge management processes as Knowledge capture, knowledge development, knowledge sharing, and knowledge utilization. Trivedi (2007) state four basic principles of knowledge capture, disseminate, reuse, and collaborate. He is also the goal of knowledge management obtain important outputs of data and information is produced.

Albeit knowledge management is a process of its own, but it phases itself inclusive other processes. Organizational knowledge creation as a process is involving two dimension. First dimension include learning at the individual, group, organizational level and second dimension two type tacit and explicit knowledge examined. Spiral of knowledge creation begin of individual level and moved to group level and just conversion process occurs of tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge and inverse. Several models knowledge conversion occurs in spiral of knowledge creation: 1. Socialization: in general, tacit knowledge is converted into tacit knowledge during discussions, meetings and one-on-one sessions. 2. Externalization: in general, tacit knowledge

is converted into explicit Knowledge and outlined in documents, manuals, seminars, dedicated literature etc. 3. Combination: in general, explicit knowledge is converted into another form of explicit knowledge 4. Internalization: in general, explicit knowledge is converted into tacit knowledge by individuals (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Fernandez and Sabherwal (2001), Sabherwal and Fernandez (2003) and Lee and Choi (2003) also processes Nonaka examined.

The ultimate goal of knowledge management is the application of knowledge to improve organizational performance. In fact, knowledge management not tool to earn money, but a way of life, because in of the individual vision and dreams and something that about the future we to it believe be shared, and what that of myriad experiences in organizations achieved, knowledge management not need on tools more for gathering data and information, rather needy a perspective new for combine information separate is that vision individual preferment and acts propel.

Organizational resilience

Resilience a notion borrowed from natural and human sciences, including psychology (Dentz & Bailli, 2005). Where the construct was used in the 1970s to portray the characteristics and positive adaptation of children classified as being at risk due to negative life circumstances (Gu & Day, 2007). Researchers began asking the question: Why do some children who are threatened by exposure to high-risk environments (poverty, violence, substance abuse/addiction, and/or parental depression) successfully adapt while others do not? They began to perform their research (e.g., Masten, 1997; Masten, Best & Garmezy, 1990; Rutter, 1979; Werner, 1993; Werner & Smith, 1977). The terms “invulnerable” and “invincible” were once used interchangeably to describe the concept that is now known as resilience. Over time, the term “resilience” was replaced by the term “invulnerable” and a new area of theory and research was born. Garmezy (1973) published the first research findings about resilience. In ecological research was proposed by Holling (1973) to describe both the system (an ecosystem, society or organization). In organizations also the first Wildavsky (1988) used the term resilience. But after the attack on September 11, 2001 to answer the question that Sandler O'Neill and Partners despite the huge losses that saw how they were able to survive? This term is common in organizations. The literature review showed that various types of fields use of term resilience. In psychology (Haggerty et al, 1996; Luthar, 2003), social sciences (Fraser et al, 1999; Saleebey, 2001), and education (Benard, 2004; Brown et al., 2001) which recognizes resilience not only internally in individuals but also externally in families, communities, and wider social environments (Truebridge, 2010). Also, the concept of organizational resilience has been studied in a number of settings including hospitals (Mallak, 1998), fire fighting teams (Weick, 1993), terrorist attacks (Beunza & Stark, 2004; Kendra & Wachtendorf, 2001), ecosystem (Holling, 1973; Folk, 2006). The concept (organizational Resilience) now used for, private sector, public, nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations.

There are many definitions of resilience to be found in a wide variety of academic fields including psychology, ecology, organizational studies, sociology, business, engineering, physics, healthcare and healthcare. These definitions pertain to different levels of analysis, ranging from the individual to the global level. First are discussed definitions of resilience in different fields. And then, in this paper we interested to understanding resilience at the level of the organization.

Psychological resiliencies linked to the invulnerability theory (i.e., the positive capacity of people to cope with trauma and to bounce back). Ecological resilience is based on the theory of viability (i.e., the ability for an organism to survive after disruption) (Abel Ouedraogo, 2013). For a business, resilience means being able first to absorb the impact of, and then effectively react to, severely disruptive change. (Coutu, 2002; Hamel & Valikangas, 2003; Pearson & Mitroff, 1993). In the field of engineering, resilience is seen as the ability to sense, recognize, adapt and absorb variations, changes, disturbances, disruptions and surprises (Hollnagel et al, 2006). Definitions of resilience in the physical sciences in which a material is resilient if it is able to regain its original shape and characteristics after being stretched or pounded (Lengnick-Hall & Beck, 2011). Health resilience is the capacity to maintain good health in the face of significant adversity (Resnick et al, 2011). Also, In management, organizational resilience means an organization's ability to rebuild itself in the wake of a threat that compromises its market share, productivity, reputation, brand image or mission (Koninck and Teneau, 2010; Rivest, 2010).

In organization theory, resilience (sometimes resiliency) often has been used to refer to a characteristic or capacity of individuals or organizations, or more specifically (a) the ability to absorb strain and preserve (or improve) functioning despite the presence of adversity (both pressures and external adversity, internal adversity such as rapid change, lousy leadership, performance and production pressures and external adversity--such as increasing competition and demands from stakeholders), or (b) an ability to recover or bounce back from untoward events (Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003). works in practice but not in theory (Laporte & Consolini, 1991).

Resilience is ordinary, not extraordinary

Why some of individual and organizations not only remain in adversity even can prosper while others destroyed?

The evidence suggests the behaviors, thoughts and actions underpinning resilience can be learnt and developed (e.g., McAllister & McKinnon, 2009; Jackson, Firtko & Edenborough, 2007). Scholars in this area then proposed that resilience can be achieved at any point in the life cycle (Cicchetti & Tucker, 1994). Marwa and Zairi (2008) examined 120 corporations that failed from 2000 to 2007. Their findings suggest that weak senior leadership quality was the primary reason for the downfall of firms. More specifically their findings suggest that leadership was the missing ingredient related to resilience. In Iranian public organizational, Hollnagell (2007) state that for being resilient, a system should have the four attributes: respond to regular and irregular threats in a robust, yet flexible manner, monitor what is going on including its own performance, anticipate risks (risk events) and opportunities, learn from experience. Morel et al (2009) in their study founded factor including: management commitment, reporting culture, learning/training, awareness, and flexibility. The IBT project began in 1975 by Maddi (1987). Maddi and a research team evaluated 450 male and female supervisors, managers, and decision makers with annual interviews, psychological tests, medical examinations, and work-performance reviews. During the dozen years of the study, companies in the "Ma Bell" monopoly experienced monumental upheaval due to the deregulation of the telecommunications industry. Nearly half the employees in the sample lost their jobs; One-third of the employees survived and thrived despite the stressful changes. Maddi et al (1987) determined that three basic attitudes permitted the stronger group to do well: commitment, control, and challenge.

These findings suggest that resilience is the ability of an organization that can grow with reflection and can be cultivated in most individuals and developed. Researches Aguirre (2007), American Psychological Association (2006), Bonanno (2004) has shown that resilience is ordinary, not extraordinary, and that people regularly demonstrate this ability. The basic foundation for understanding resilience requires a strong understanding of reality and knowledge, skills, and perspectives which it is applicable. It should be noted that this heritage is slowly being built. The resilience can serve as a jumping board or opportunities for growth beyond the equilibrium point.

But building resilience isn't free; it comes with both the direct costs of the actions you take and the indirect costs of opportunities lost by not using your resources in some other way. Enhancing the resilience of a system usually involves reducing efficiency, staying away from maximum yield states, maintaining reserves, and so forth. When this happens in response to a specified threat, it's theoretically possible to measure the cost (and the benefit) of what you do. The cost of lost resilience is generally hidden and appears only a posteriori. Also, resilience isn't always good. Whether resilience actually is good or not is an ethical question and the answer is not automatically yes. A dangerous pathogenic virus might be resilient if it can withstand many antiviral medicines or other measures to curtail the virus. Some social structures (e.g. organized crime) have proven to be highly resilient but clearly lack virtue. If resilience adds complexity (and entails significant carrying costs), it may paradoxically become self-defeating (Hassler & Kohler, 2014).

In this study we set our following hypothesis:

H1: There is a positive and significant relationship between Knowledge acquisition and Organizational Resilience within public organizations of Iran.

H2: There is a positive and significant relationship between knowledge storage and organizational resilience within public organizations of Iran.

H3: There is a positive and significant relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational resilience within public organizations of Iran.

H4: There is a positive and significant relationship between knowledge utilization and organizational resilience within public organizations of Iran.

Research Methodology

The study was a quantitative cross sectional survey. The study units for data generation were middle and senior managers in Iranian public organizations. 28 of the public organizations were selected as study population. All these organizations are owned by the government, who are responsible for the timely delivery of services to citizens. The intent of whole property is that the government controls all functions of the organization's and senior managers their choice. Because they occupy strategic positions and it is believed that managers are in position to truly respond to questions about organizational attributes (Baer and Frese, 2003). Questionnaires were distributed among middle and senior managers. The sample size was determined 270 people that were selected randomly. The independent variable in this study is knowledge management and it has four components; knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization. The dependent variable in this study is organizational resilience. Questionnaires set in two sections. First section consists of questions that evaluate the individual and job characteristics, including such characteristics as age, sex, education, work experience and management experience. The second section is of the 2 questionnaires of Mafabi et al (2012) organizational resilience and Amah (2013) KM. Organizational Resilience questionnaire is consists of 20 items and knowledge management questionnaire consists of 16 items, questions 1- 4 is related to

knowledge acquisition, 5-8 related to knowledge storage, 9-12 related to knowledge sharing and 13-16 related to knowledge utilization. The questions were used with a five-point Likert type scale for the respondents' views, 1= 'disagree strongly', 2= 'disagree slightly', 3= 'neither agree nor disagree', 4= 'agree slightly' and 5= 'agree strongly' and of the samples were requested to determine the importance of each of these factors. With give a score of 1-5 in the respective range, scores was calculated for each factor. Mafabi et al (2012) in their study found reliability 0/893 for organizational resilience. Umoh & Amah (2013) in their study found reliability 0/ 88 for KM. In this study, was tested renew the reliability of the questionnaires. For this purpose, the initial samples of 30 questionnaires were distributed among the studied sample. Then, using data obtained from the questionnaire was calculated Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient. The calculated organizational Resilience reliability ($\alpha = 0/821$) and knowledge management ($\alpha = 0/953$). The data made analysis using of SPSS version 20 for both descriptive and inferential. The descriptive statistics on the demographic characteristics were examined. The Pearson correlation coefficient was utilized for the analysis of data.

Research Results

Demographic characteristics

First using collected demographic data, various aspects of the target population analysis in terms of demographic variables. Information in this section extracted of the sample on the basis of demographic questions included in the questionnaires. To describe the sample is used of age, gender, education, work experience and management experience. 27.4% of managers younger than 40 years. 51.1% between 40 and 50 years and 21.5% more than 50 years. Minimum age is 32 years and maximum age is 59 years. 8.4% of managers were women and 95.2% male. The results show that the scale middle managers in public organizations quite heavily toward men. 3 percent had a lower of undergraduate and diploma degree. 19.3 percent graduate, 72 .6percent masters. 2.5 percent of managers also had a PhD degree. 22.6% of managers were less than 15 years of service. 56.3 percent of those between 15 and 23 years of service, and 21.1 percent had more than 23 years of service. 51.1 percent had Less than 10 years management experience, 39.3 percent of those between 10 and 18 years of management experience, and 9.6 percent had more than 18 years of management experience.

Descriptive statistics study variables

The results the descriptive statistics study variables shown in Table 1. The inadequate or poor average considered of 1 to 2, the mean average of 2.1 to 3, high average of 3.1 to 4 and very high average of 4.1 to 5.

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis of Knowledge Management Processes and organizational Resilience

variables	N	Mean	SD
Knowledge acquisition	270	2.75	1.225
Knowledge storage	270	2.9	1.239
Knowledge sharing	270	2.6	1.279
Knowledge utilization	270	2.73	1.159
Organizational Resilience	270	3.28	1.022

Table 1 shows the mean average for all dimension knowledge management and mean to up for organizational resilience. Respondents were considered moderate to the knowledge acquisition ($X = 2.75$), knowledge storage ($x = 2.9$), knowledge sharing ($X = 2.6$), and knowledge utilization ($X = 2.725$). However, were considered for organizational resilience ($X = 3.28$) high level of resilience. This suggests that other factors than knowledge management is affected to increase the resilience of public organizations.

Correlation between variables

Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to test the hypothesis that the results shown in Table 2.

Table2. Correlations Knowledge management processes and Organizational Resilience

		Knowledge Acquisition	Knowledge Storage	Knowledge Sharing	Knowledge Utilization	Organizational resilience
Knowledge Acquisition	Pearson Correlation	1	.574**	.397**	.642**	.540**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270	270
Knowledge Storage	Pearson Correlation	.574**	1	.450**	.666**	.423**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270	270
Knowledge Sharing	Pearson Correlation	.397**	.450**	1	.488**	.355**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	270	270	270	270	270
Knowledge Utilization	Pearson Correlation	.642**	.666**	.488**	1	.564**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	270	270	270	270	270
Organizational resilience	Pearson Correlation	.540**	.423**	.355**	.564**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	270	270	270	270	270

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 shows a positive and significant relationship between knowledge acquisition and organizational resilience ($r = 0.540$), a positive and significant relationship between knowledge storage and organizational resilience ($r = 0.423$), a positive and significant relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational resilience ($r = 0.355$) and a positive and significant relationship between knowledge utilization and organizational resilience ($r = 0.564$) there. However, This confirmed hypothesis 1,2,3 and 4.

Discussion of Findings, conclusions and recommendations

The findings of this study revealed a positive and significant relationship between knowledge acquisition and organizational resilience ($r = 0.540$, $p < 0.01$). Similarly, a positive and significant relationship was revealed between knowledge storage and Organizational resilience ($r = 0.423$, $p < 0.01$). A positive and significant relationship between knowledge sharing and organizational resilience ($r = 0.355$, $p < 0.01$). The findings of this study also revealed a positive and significant relationship between knowledge utilization and organizational resilience within public organizations of Iran ($r = 0.564$, $p < 0.01$). Based on these findings, we conclude that knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization, increases organizational resilience within public organizations in Iran. These findings suggest that the fact that public organizations efforts in knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization to increase their organizational resilience.

From the discussion above, we conclude that knowledge management of help on public organizations of Iran to increase organizational resilience. Also, help enterprise and organizations managers to develop new opportunities, create value, gain competitive advantages and improve performance to attain the organizations objectives and emerging needs (Anand, 2011).

Based on the findings and conclusion above, recommendations that firstly, Iranian public organizations continue to strengthen their knowledge management practices especially knowledge acquisition, knowledge storage, knowledge sharing and knowledge utilization in their everyday activities as this is a sure guarantee for their resilience. Also, pay attention to organizational learning. Because organizational learning conceal in the nature knowledge management and effective role had in the organizations long-term performance. Through learning new skills, increase self-awareness and ensure that the strategies companies can develop resilience to overcome challenging times, organizations can resilient and overcome on everyday challenges. Organizational culture is the fiber and sinew of all organizations (de Oliveira Teixeira, 2013). There is agreement that internalizing a culture of resilience at all levels is critical, championed by executive leadership (Boin & Lagadec, 2000; Brazeau, 2008; Coutu, 2002; Curtis, 2008; Pearson & Clair, 1998). Because Organizational culture is believed to be the key to managing crisis, and makes it crisis prone or crisis prepared (Mitroff et al, 1989; Omer, 2014). However, resilience requires a culture change. Identify factors motivating employees. Because a person to

be the motivation in the face of adversity, to resilient the spring. Thus, the now motivation may be independent of resilience, but Resilience depends on the individual that has motivation for the reintegration success. Others researches perform can useful including; cognition block increase resilience in organization, the survey effect government, rules and public political for increase organizational resilience, the survey effect that others country used for increase organizational resilience.

References

- Abel Ouedraogo, K. & Enjalbert, S. & Vanderhaegen, F. (2013). How to learn from the resilience of Human–Machine Systems? *Journal of Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 26, pp. 24–34.
- Aguirre, B. (2007). Dialectics of vulnerability and resilience. *Georgetown Journal of Poverty Law and Policy*, 14(39), pp.1–18.
- Alavi, M. & Leidner, D. E. (2001). *Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems*. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), pp.107–136.
- American Psychological Association. (2006). *The road to resilience*. Retrieved, from <http://www.apa.org/helpcenter/road-resilience.aspx>.
- Anand, A. (2011). Understanding Knowledge Management: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*. 3 (2). p. 937
- Baer, M. and Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 24 (1), pp. 45-68.
- Benard, B. (2004). *Resiliency: What we have learned*. San Francisco, CA: West Ed.
- Beunza, D. & Stark, D. (2004). *Survival and Sensemaking: Organizational Resilience in a Wall Street Trading Room After 9/11*. Universitat Pomeu Fabra, Department of Economics and Business, Barcelona, Spain.
- Beveren, J.V. (2002). A model of knowledge that refocuses knowledge management. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6 (1), pp. 18-22.
- Bhatt, G., (2001). Knowledge Management in Organizations: Examining the Interaction Between Technologies, Thechniques, and People, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(1), pp. 75-98.
- Boin, A., & Lagadec, P. (2000). Preparing for the future: critical challenges in crisis management. *Journal of Contingencies & Crisis Management*. 8(4), pp. 185-191.
- Bonanno, G. (2004). *Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events?* *American Psychologist*, 59, pp.20–28.
- Bose, R. (2004). *Knowledge management metrics*, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 104 (6), pp. 457-468.
- Brazeau, P. (2008). *Holistic Protection*. Canadian Underwriter.
- Brown, J., D’Emidio-Caston, M. & Benard, B. (2001). *Resilience education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Chandler, A.D. (2001). *Inventing the Electronic Century: The Epic Story for The Consumer Electronics and Computer Industries*. New York: Free Press.
- Chen, M. & Chen, A. (2005). Integrating option model and knowledge management performance measures: an empirical study. *Journal of Information Science*, 31 (5), pp. 381-393.
- Choi, B. & Lee H, (2003). An empirical investigation of KM styles and their effect on corporate performance. *Elsevier. Information and management Journal*. 40.
- Cicchetti, D., & Tucker, D. (1994). *Development and self-regulatory structures of the mind*. *Development and Psychopathology*. 6, pp. 533-549.
- Cocchiara, R. (2007). *Beyond disaster recovery: Becoming a resilient business*. IBM Global Services, pp.1-24.
- Comfort, L. K. (1994). Risk and resilience: Inter-organizational learning following the Northridge earthquake of 17 January 1994. *Journal of Contingencies & Crisis Management*, 2(3), p. 157.
- Coutu, D. (2002). *How Resilience Works*, *Harvard Business Review*, 80(5), pp. 46–55.
- Crichton, M. T., Ramsay, C. G., & Kelly, T. (2009). Enhancing organizational resilience through emergency planning: Learnings from cross-sectoral lessons. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 17(1), pp. 24–37.
- Curtis, G. (2008). *Beyond Disaster Recovery (Special Report: Risk Management. Directorship*, pp. 38-43.
- Darroch, J. (2003). Developing a measure of knowledge management behaviors and practices. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7 (5), pp. 41-54.
- Davenport, T.H., (1998), *Building Successful knowledge management projects*, *Sloan Management Review*, 39(2), pp. 43-57.
- Davenport, T.H. and Prusak, L. (2000). *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

- Davenport, T. & Volpel, S.C.(2001). The rise of Knowledge towards attention management. *Journal of Knowledge management*. PP. 212-221.
- Dentz, E & Baillii, G. (2005). *La resilience dans l'entreprise apres le choc, disparaître ou rebondir*, Edition Lavoisier, p, 237.
- De Oliveira, E. & William, B. & Werther, Jr. (2013). *Resilience: Continuous renewal of competitive advantages Business Horizons*. 56,pp. 333-342.
- Devargas, M. (1999). *Survival is not compulsory: An introduction to business continuity planning. Computers & Security*, 18(1), pp.35-46.
- Drucker, P. (1993). *Postcapitalist society*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Earl, M. (2001). Knowledge management strategies: toward a taxonomy. *Journal of Management Information System*. 18 (1), pp. 215- 233.
- Fernandez, I.B. & Sabherwal, R. (2001). Organizational Knowledge Management: A Contingency Perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems* 18(1), pp. 23-55.
- Fraser, M. W., Richman, J. M., & Galinsky, M. J. (1999). *Risk, protection, and resilience: Toward a conceptual framework for social work practice*. Social Work Research, 23 (3).
- Garmezy, N. (1973). *Competence and adaptation in adult schizophrenic patients and children at risk*, in Dean, S. R. (Ed.), *Schizophrenia: The first ten Dean Award Lectures*. NY: MSS Information Corp. pp. 163–204.
- Gold, A.H., Malhotra, A. and Segars, A.H. (2001), Knowledge management: an organizational capabilities perspective, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18 (1), pp. 185-214.
- Gu, Q., & Day, C. (2007). *Teachers resilience: a necessary condition for effectiveness*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23, pp.1302-1326.
- Haggerty, R. J., Sherrod, L. R., Garmezy, N. & Rutter, M. (Eds.) (1996). *Stress, Risk, and resilience in children and adolescents: Processes, mechanisms, and interventions*. Cambridge, UK: University Press.
- Halawi, L., Aronson, J. & McCarthy, R. (2005). Resource-Based View of Knowledge Management for Competitive Advantage. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 3 (2), pp. 75-86.
- Hamel, G. and Valikangas, L. (2003). *The Quest for Resilience*, Harvard Business Review, 81(9), pp.52–63.
- Hansen, M., Nohria, N. & Tierney, T. (1999). *Whats your Strategy for managing Knowledge?* Harvard Business Review.
- Hassler,U. & Kohler,N (2014) *Resilience in the built environment*. Building Research & Information,42(2), pp. 119-129.
- Hind, P., Frost, M., & Rowley, S. (1996). The resilience audit and the psychological contract. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 11(7), p. 18.
- Holling, C.S., (1996). *Engineering resilience versus ecological resilience*. In: Schulze, P. (Ed.), *Engineering Within Ecological Constraints*. National Academy Press, Washington, DC, USA. pp. 31–44.
- Holling, C. S. (1973). *Resilience and stability of ecological systems*. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4, pp.1–23.
- Hollnagel, E., Woods, D. D., & Leveson, N. (2006). *Resilience engineering: concepts and precepts*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hollnagel, E., 2007. <https://www.sites.google.com/site/erikhollnagel2/resilience_engineering/>. (22.11.2012).
- Irvine, W. & Anderson, A. (2004). Small tourist firms in rural areas: agility, vulnerability and survival in the face of crisis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 10(4), pp.229-246.
- Jackson, D., Firtko, A., & Edenborough, M. (2007). Personal resilience as a strategy for surviving and thriving in the face of workplace adversity: A literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60(1), pp.1-9.
- Johnston, R. and Blumentritt, R. (1998), Knowledge moves to centre stage , Science Communication. 20 (1), pp. 99-105.
- Jorna, R. (2001). *Knowledge Type and organizational Forms in Knowledge Management*, ISMICK.
- Kendra, J. & Wachtendorf, T. (2001). *Elements of Community Resilience in the World Trade Center Attack*. University of Delaware, Disaster Research Center, Newark, DE.
- Kidwell, J. J. Vander Linde, K.M. and Sandra J., (2001). *Tacit Knowledge, Innova on and Technology Transfer*, in: technology Analysis & Strategic Management.,4, pp.28- 33.
- King, W., & Marks, P. (2008). *Motivating knowledge sharing through aknowledge management systems*. Omega, 36, pp.131-146.
- Koninck, G. Teneau, G. (2010). *Resilience organizational: Rebondir face aux Turbulences*. Editions De Boeck Universite. p. 295.

- Koontz H. & Weihrich, H., (1999). *Management: A Global Perspective*, 11th Edition. Mc. Graw Hill, Mexico.
- Laporte, T.R. & Consolini, P.M. (1991). Working in Practice but Not in Theory: Theoretical Challenges of High-Reliability Organization. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1(1), pp. 19-48.
- Lawson, S. (2003). *Examining the relationship between organizational culture and knowledge management*. Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University.
- Lee, S.M. and Hong, S., (2002), *An enterprise wide knowledge management system infrastructure*, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 102(1), pp. 66-81.
- Lee, H. & Chio, B. (2003). Knowledge Management Enablers, Processes, and Organizational Performance: An Integrative and Empirical Examination. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20 (1), pp.179-228.
- Lengnick-Hall, C.A. & Beck, T. E. & Lengnick-Hall M. L. (2011). *Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, pp.243–255.
- Liao, S. H., & Wu, C. C. (2010). *System perspective of knowledge management, organizational learning, and organizational innovation*. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37, pp.1096–1103.
- Lucier, C., (2003). *When knowledge adds up to nothing: Why knowledge management fails and what you can do about it*. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 17(1), pp. 32-35.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, pp.695-706.
- Luthar, S. S. (2003). *Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversities*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Mafabi, S. Munene, J. & Ntayi, J. (2012). Knowledge management and organisational resilience Organisational innovation as a mediator in Uganda parastatals. *Journal of Strategy and Management*. 5 (1). Pp. 57-80.
- Maddi, S.R. (1987). *Hardiness training at Illinois bell telephone*. In: J.P. Opatz (Ed.), *Health Promotion Evaluation*. Stevens Point, WI: National Wellness Institute.
- Mallak, L. (1998). *Resilience in the Healthcare Industry*. Paper Presented at the 7th Annual Industrial Engineering Research Conference, Banff, Alberta, Canada.
- Marquardt, M.J. (1996). *Building the Learning Organization*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Mallak, L. (1998). *Resilience in the Healthcare Industry*. Paper Presented at the 7th Annual Industrial Engineering Research Conference, Banff, Alberta, Canada.
- Marwa, S. & Zairi, M. (2008). *An exploratory study of the reasons for the collapse of contemporary companies and their link with the concept of quality*. *Management Decision*, 46(9), pp.1342-1370.
- Masten, A. (1997). *Resilience in children at-risk*. University of Minnesota, Center for applied research and educational improvement, *Research/Practice*, 5(1).
- Masten, A. S., Best, K. M., & Garmezy, N. (1990). *Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity*. *Development and Psychopathology*, 2, pp.425-444.
- McAllister, M., & McKinnon, J. (2009). *The importance of teaching and learning resilience in the health disciplines: A critical review of the literature*. *Nurse Education Today*, 29, pp. 371-379.
- McManus, S.T. (2008). *Organisational resilience in New Zealand*, PhD thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Meyer, A.D. (1982). *Adapting to environmental jolts*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, pp. 515-537.
- Mitroff II, Pauchant T, Finney M, Pearson C. (1989). *Do (some) organizations cause their own crises? The cultural profiles of crisis-prone vs. crisis-prepared organizations*. *Organ. Environ.* 3(4), pp.269–83.
- Morel, G., Amalberti, R., Chauvin, C., (2009). *How good micro/macro ergonomics may improve resilience, but not necessarily safety*. *Saf. Sci.* 47, pp. 285–294.
- Neenan, M. (2009). *Developing Resilience A Cognitive Behavioural Approach*. This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Nevis, E.C., DiBella, A.J., Gould, J.M., 1995. *Understanding organizations as learning systems*. *Sloan Management Review* 36,pp.73–85.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). *A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation*. *Organization Science*, 5 (1), pp. 14-37.
- Nonaka, I., Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., Konno, (2000). *SECI, Ba and Leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation*, *Long Range Planning*, 33(4), pp. 4-34.
- Novianto, O. Puspasari, D. (2012). *Knowledge Management System Implementation in a Company with Different Generations: A Case Study*. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 65, pp. 942 – 947.

- OECD, (2003). Conclusions from the results of the survey of knowledge management practices for ministries/departments/agencies of central government in OECD member countries.
- Oliveira Teixeira, E. & Werther, W.B. (2013). *Resilience: Continuous renewal of competitive Advantages*. Business Horizons. 56, pp. 333-342
- Omer, M. & Mostashari, A. & Lindemann, U. (2014). *Resilience Analysis of Soft Infrastructure Systems*. Conference on Systems Engineering Research The Aerospace Corporation Redondo Beach, CA.
- Parsons, D. (2007). *National Organizational Resilience Framework Workshop: The Outcomes*, National Organizational Resilience Framework Workshop, 5-7th. pp. 15
- Pearson, C.M. & Clair, J.A. (1998). *Reframing crisis management*. The Academy of Management Review, 23(1), pp. 59-76.
- Pearson, C. M., & Mitroff, I. I. (1993). *From crisis prone to crisis prepared: A framework for crisis management*. Academy of Management Executive, 7(1),pp. 48-59.
- Polanyi, M. (1965). *The tacit dimension*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Reich, B.H., Gemino, A., Sauer, C., (2012). *Knowledge management and project-based knowledge in it projects: a model and preliminary empirical results*. Int. J. Proj. Manag. 30 (6), 663–674.
- Resnick, B. Lisa, P. Gwyther Karen, A. (2011). *Resilience in Aging Concepts, Research, and Outcomes*. Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London.
- Rivest, R. (2010). *La resilience: apprendre a rebondir*. Revue, Effectif, septembre/octobre, pp. 28-30.
- Rutter, M. (1979). *Protective factors in children's responses to stress and disadvantaged*.
- Sabherwal, R. and Becerra- Fernandez, I. (2003). *An empirical study of the effect of Knowledge Management Processes at individual, group, and organizational levels*. Decision Sciences, 34(2). pp. 225-260.
- Saleebey, D. (Ed.). (2001). *The strengths perspective in social work practice* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn Bacon.
- Schein, E. H. (1988). *Organizational Psychology*, NJ: Prentice Hall, Englewood cliffs.
- SchWeber, C. & Bouchard, M. (2011). *Organizational Resilience: Is There Evidence for What Works to Support Business Continuity?* Paper for the 2011 Conference.
- Shapiro, C. and Varian, H. (1999). *Information Rules: A Strategic Guide to the Network Economy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Somers, S. (2009). Measuring resilience potential: An adaptive strategy for organizational crisis planning. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 17(1), 12–23.
- Stephenson, A. (2010). *Bench Marking of Organizations*. A PhD Thesis in the Department of Civil and Natural Resources Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Canterbury.
- Storey, J., & Barnett, E. (2000). Knowledge management initiatives: Learning from failure. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 4(2), pp.145–156.
- Sutcliffe, K.M. & Vogus, T.J. (2003). *Organizing for Resilience*. In Cameron, K., Dutton, J.E., & Quinn, R.E. (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler. Chapter 7. pp. 94-110.
- Thurow, L.C. (2003). *Fortune Favors the Bold: What We Must Do to Build a New and Lasting Global Prosperity*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Trivedi, M. (2007). Knowledge Management in health science libraries. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*, 8 (2).
- Umoh, G. Amah, E. (2013). Knowledge Management and Organizational Resilience in Nigerian Manufacturing Organizations. *Journal of Developing Country Studies*. Vol.3, No.9, pp.104-120.
- Vicari, S. & Troilo, G. (2000). *Organizational Creativity: a New Perspective from cognitive Systems Theory*. In Knowledge Creation: A Source Value, pp.63-88.
- Wang, W. T., and S. Belardo. (2005). *Strategic integration: a knowledge management approach to crisis management*. 38th Hawaii International Conference on System Science, HICSS'05. System sciences: 8. P.252
- Werner, E. & Smith, R. (1977). *Kauai's children come of age*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press
- Werner, E., (1993). *Risk, resilience, and recovery: Perspective from the Kauai Longitudinal Study*. Development and Psychopathology, 5, pp. 503-515.
- Weick, K. (1993), *The Collapse of Sensemaking in Organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38(4), pp. 628–652.
- Wildavsky, A. (1988). *Searching for safety*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Wing, D. (2004). *capacity building with people*. P. 13

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library , NewJour, Google Scholar

