

Exploring the Impact of Resources Fluidity on the Performance of Manufacturing Firms in Nigeria

Dr Ubong A. Akpaetor^{1*}

¹Department of Business Administration, Akwa Ibom State University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36347/sjebm.2026.v13i09.005> | Received: 19.07.2026 | Accepted: 16.09.2026 | Published: 21.09.2026

*Corresponding author: Dr Ubong A. Akpaetor
Department of Business Administration, Akwa Ibom State University

Abstract

Original Research Article

This study examined the impact of resources fluidity on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The study was motivated by the increasing need for manufacturing firms to respond rapidly to changes in technology, customer preferences, market conditions, and competitive pressures through the effective movement and transformation of organisational resources. Specifically, the study examined the influence of resource redeployment and resource reconfiguration on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. A cross-sectional survey research design was adopted for the study. The population comprised 1,200 employees and managers of selected manufacturing firms in Nigeria, from which a sample of 300 was determined using Taro Yamene's formula for sample size determination. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire designed on a five-point Likert scale. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistical techniques. The findings revealed that resource redeployment has a significant positive influence on the performance of manufacturing firms. The findings also indicated that resource reconfiguration significantly enhances firm performance by enabling manufacturing firms to modify, combine, and transform existing resources in response to changing business conditions. It was therefore concluded that resources fluidity is an important organisational capability for sustaining and improving the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. As recommendation, management of manufacturing firms should develop flexible resource allocation systems, invest in employee skills and technological capabilities, and continuously reconfigure their resources to respond effectively to changes in the business environment.

Keywords: Resources Fluidity, Resource Redeployment, Resource Reconfiguration, Firm Performance, Manufacturing Firms.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The contemporary business environment is characterized by rapid technological advancement, changing customer preferences, intensified competition, globalization, economic uncertainty and frequent disruptions. These conditions have made it increasingly difficult for firms to depend solely on established routines, fixed resource allocations and traditional sources of competitive advantage. Firms are therefore required to develop capabilities that enable them to respond quickly to environmental changes while maintaining operational effectiveness and competitive position. One capability that has attracted increasing attention in strategic management is resource fluidity, which concerns an organisation's ability to free, reallocate, redeploy and reconfigure its resources in response to changing strategic priorities and emerging opportunities. Doz and Kosonen (2020) identify resource

fluidity as one of the three major meta-capabilities underlying strategic agility, alongside strategic sensitivity and leadership unity.

Resource fluidity is particularly important because the mere possession of valuable resources does not automatically translate into superior organisational performance. What matters increasingly is the ability of the firm to move resources from less productive or declining activities to areas where they can generate greater value. Resource fluidity therefore encompasses the flexible utilisation of financial, human, technological, informational and organisational resources. Doz and Kosonen (2020) describe it as the capability to rapidly redeploy resources and reconfigure business systems, thereby allowing firms to respond more effectively to market changes and emerging opportunities. In practical terms, a firm with high resource fluidity can shift employees between functions,

Citation: Akpaetor, U. A. (2026). Exploring the Impact of Resources Fluidity on the Performance of Manufacturing Firms in Nigeria. Sch J Econ Bus Manag, 13(9), 461-471. <https://doi.org/10.36347/sjebm.2026.v13i09.005>

redirect financial investments, deploy technology to new activities, transfer knowledge across organisational units and modify business processes without excessive bureaucratic delays.

Firm performance refers to the extent to which a manufacturing organisation achieves its financial, operational and strategic objectives. Performance can be assessed using indicators such as profitability, productivity, sales growth, market share, product quality, innovation, customer satisfaction, cost efficiency and competitive advantage.

The relationship between resource fluidity and firm performance can therefore be understood through the firm's ability to achieve both adaptability and efficiency. Firm performance encompasses the extent to which an organisation achieves its predetermined objectives through financial and non-financial outcomes such as profitability, sales growth, market share, productivity, customer satisfaction, service quality, innovation and competitive advantage. In volatile markets, firms that can quickly reallocate resources toward profitable products, emerging markets, new technologies or changing customer needs are more likely to maintain or improve their performance.

Statement of the Problem

The manufacturing sector remains an important component of economic development because of its contribution to employment generation, income creation, industrialisation, technological development and the provision of goods and services. However, manufacturing firms in Nigeria continue to operate in a highly uncertain and competitive business environment characterised by fluctuations in the cost of raw materials, inadequate infrastructure, unstable electricity supply, exchange-rate volatility, changing government policies, high operating costs, technological disruptions and changing consumer preferences. These challenges have created significant difficulties for firms in maintaining consistent levels of productivity, profitability, market share, product quality and overall performance. In such an environment, the ability of firms to deploy and redeploy resources efficiently and rapidly has become increasingly important.

A major problem confronting manufacturing firms in Nigeria is resource rigidity, where financial, human, technological, physical and knowledge resources may remain tied to existing products, processes, departments or business activities even when environmental conditions have changed. Manufacturing firms may possess considerable resources but fail to obtain corresponding performance outcomes because such resources are not sufficiently flexible or cannot be rapidly transferred to areas where they are most needed. For instance, funds may remain committed to less productive activities, employees may be restricted to specialised functions despite emerging skill

requirements, and production equipment may become underutilised when market demand changes. Such rigidity can increase operating costs, reduce productivity and limit the ability of firms to respond to emerging opportunities.

The situation is further complicated by the dynamic nature of the Nigerian manufacturing environment. Changes in consumer preferences, technological advancement, competition, supply-chain disruptions and fluctuations in input prices require firms to continuously adjust their resource configurations. However, some manufacturing firms may lack the organisational structures, managerial capabilities and flexible processes required to reallocate resources quickly. Consequently, resources may not flow efficiently from declining or less productive activities to emerging and potentially more profitable areas. This inability to achieve resource fluidity may contribute to delayed decision-making, inefficient resource utilisation, slow innovation and difficulties in responding to market opportunities.

Although previous studies have examined resources, dynamic capabilities, strategic agility and organisational performance, relatively limited attention has been devoted to the specific relationship between resource fluidity and the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Existing evidence suggests that resource fluidity can enhance organisational performance, but the extent to which the flexible deployment of resources contributes to productivity, profitability, innovation, market competitiveness and other dimensions of manufacturing performance requires further empirical examination within the Nigerian context. Efeomo, Salau, Moyosore and Bolodeoku (2022), for instance, reported a positive relationship between resource fluidity and organisational performance in Nigeria, providing a basis for further investigation among manufacturing firms.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study was to examine the influence of resources fluidity on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Specific objectives include;

- i. To examine the influence of resource redeployment on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.
- ii. To examine the influence of resource reconfiguration on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

Research Question

- i. What is the influence of resource redeployment on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria?
- ii. What is the influence of resource reconfiguration on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated in line with the objective;

H01: There is no significant influence of resource redeployment on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

H02: There is no significant influence of resource reconfiguration on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Conceptual Framework

Concept of Resources Fluidity

Resource fluidity refers to the ability of a firm to rapidly redeploy, reconfigure and recombine its available resources in response to changes in the business environment and emerging strategic opportunities. It emphasizes flexibility in the movement and utilization of organisational resources rather than allowing resources to remain permanently committed to particular products, departments, markets or activities. Resources may include financial capital, human resources, technology, knowledge, equipment, managerial capabilities and organisational processes. Doz and Kosonen (2018) identify resource fluidity as an important component of strategic agility because it enables organisations to shift resources from declining or less productive activities toward emerging opportunities. It is the internal ability to quickly transfer resources to investment areas in order to support competitiveness (Oventhal, 2022).

Resource fluidity is particularly important in manufacturing because manufacturing firms operate through complex combinations of people, machinery, materials, technology, finance, information and production processes. Changes in customer preferences, input prices, technology, government policies and competitive conditions can make existing resource allocations less effective. A manufacturing firm that possesses the capacity to move its resources quickly can adjust production volumes, introduce new products, adopt new technologies and respond to changes in demand more effectively than a rigid organisation.

According to Teece, Pisano and Shuen (2024), firms operating in changing environments require dynamic capabilities that enable them to integrate, build and reconfigure internal and external competencies. Resource fluidity is consistent with this perspective because it allows a firm to continuously adjust the configuration of its resources as environmental conditions change. Thus, the competitive value of resources depends not only on their availability but also on the firm's ability to deploy them in the right combination, at the right time and for the right strategic purpose.

Concept of Firm Performance

Firm performance is a wide term that measures how well a business accomplishes its objectives. It includes non-financial criteria like customer happiness, innovation, and environmental responsibility as well as financial indicators like profitability and market value. Since many stakeholders have distinct requirements and wants that must be satisfied independently, it is crucial to assess performance using both financial and non-financial data to obtain a comprehensive picture. In other words, firm performance is a measure of a company's performance that may be influenced by both the market in which it operates and the company's own efficiency. It is often referred to as financial stability or financial health in the financial industry. A company's performance can be assessed using a variety of financial metrics. Revenue, return on equity, return on assets, profit margin, sales growth, capital sufficiency, liquidity ratio, and stock prices are a few examples of common financial metrics (Akpogheli and Okolie, 2026)

According to Richard, *et al.*, (2009), organisational performance represents the overall outcomes of an organisation's activities and can be assessed from several dimensions rather than through a single indicator. Thus, firm performance encompasses both financial and non-financial outcomes, including profitability, productivity, sales growth, market share, innovation, customer satisfaction and competitive position.

Resources fluidity and the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria

Firm performance refers to the extent to which an organisation achieves its financial, operational, market and strategic objectives. It can be measured using indicators such as profitability, productivity, market share, product quality, customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, sales growth and innovation.

Resource fluidity can influence these dimensions of performance through several mechanisms. First, flexible resource deployment can improve productivity because resources can be moved toward activities where they are most efficiently utilised. Second, it can improve product quality by enabling firms to deploy appropriate technological and human resources to production activities. Third, it can increase market share because firms can respond rapidly to changing customer needs. Fourth, resource fluidity can improve customer satisfaction by enabling firms to adjust products and services in response to market expectations.

Empirical evidence from Nigeria provides strong support for this relationship. Efeomo, Salau, Moyosore and Bolodeoku (2022) investigated resource fluidity and performance in selected Nigerian manufacturing firms using data from 161 respondents and PLS-SEM. Their study found that resource fluidity had a positive and significant effect on firm performance. Their measurement of firm performance incorporated

market share, employee satisfaction, product quality and customer satisfaction. The researchers concluded that manufacturing firms should develop resource-fluid strategies to improve organisational agility and performance.

Evidence from the aluminium manufacturing industry also supports the importance of resource fluidity. Red-Well, Hamilton and Bayo (2021) examined resource fluidity and competitiveness among aluminium manufacturing firms in Nigeria, focusing on competitiveness measures including product quality and delivery reliability. Their study demonstrates the relevance of flexible resource deployment to manufacturing competitiveness.

Theoretical Framework

These are the Dynamic Capabilities Theory and the Resource-Based View (RBV) Theory.

Dynamic Capabilities Theory

The Dynamic Capabilities Theory was originally developed by Teece, Pisano and Shuen (1997). The theory emerged as an extension of the Resource-Based View and was developed to explain how firms can achieve and sustain competitive advantage in environments characterised by rapid technological, competitive and market changes. Teece *et al.* (1997) define dynamic capabilities as the firm's ability to integrate, build and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments.

The central argument of the theory is that possessing valuable resources is not enough to guarantee superior performance. Rather, firms must have the capability to continuously modify, integrate and reconfigure their resource base as environmental conditions change. Teece (2007) subsequently conceptualised dynamic capabilities around three broad activities: sensing opportunities and threats, seizing opportunities, and transforming or reconfiguring the firm's resource base.

Resource fluidity is closely related to this third dimension. Resource fluidity involves the ability of a firm to move resources from one activity to another, recombine existing resources and reconfigure organisational processes in response to changing strategic requirements. A manufacturing firm, for example, may redeploy employees from a declining product line to a new product, redirect financial resources toward new technology, or reorganise production facilities to respond to changes in customer demand. These activities represent practical manifestations of dynamic capabilities.

The theory is particularly relevant to manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Nigerian manufacturers operate in an environment characterised by changing customer preferences, technological developments,

exchange-rate fluctuations, rising input costs, infrastructure challenges, regulatory changes and intense competition. Under such conditions, firms cannot depend entirely on static resource configurations. They need to continuously adjust their human, financial, technological and physical resources to remain competitive.

The Dynamic Capabilities Theory is considered the principal theory for this study because resource fluidity is fundamentally concerned with the firm's capacity to reconfigure and redeploy resources in response to environmental changes. It provides a direct theoretical explanation of how resource fluidity can improve the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

Resource-Based View Theory

The Resource-Based View (RBV) is another important theory for explaining the relationship between resource fluidity and manufacturing firm performance. The foundations of RBV can be traced to Penrose (1959), while Barney (1991) provided one of its most influential formulations. The theory argues that firms can achieve sustained competitive advantage by possessing and effectively utilising resources and capabilities that are valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and non-substitutable.

According to Barney (1991), organisational resources include assets, capabilities, organisational processes, information, knowledge and other resources controlled by the firm that enable it to conceive and implement strategies that improve efficiency and effectiveness. Firms differ in the resources they possess and, in their ability, to utilise those resources. These differences can therefore explain variations in firm performance.

The RBV categorises resources broadly into physical, human and organisational resources. Physical resources may include plant, equipment and technology; human resources include employees' skills, experience and expertise; while organisational resources include structures, planning systems, coordination mechanisms and organisational culture. Manufacturing firms depend heavily on all three categories for effective production and competitive performance.

Resource fluidity extends the RBV perspective by emphasising that resources should not merely be possessed but should be flexibly deployed and reconfigured. A manufacturing firm may have modern machinery, skilled employees and substantial financial resources, but these resources may not generate superior performance if they are locked into inefficient activities. The ability to redeploy and recombine these resources can therefore determine how effectively the firm converts its resource base into performance outcomes.

The RBV is also relevant to the Nigerian manufacturing context because manufacturing firms often operate under resource constraints. Such firms may not always have the financial capacity to acquire new resources whenever market conditions change. Consequently, the ability to maximise, redeploy and recombine existing resources becomes strategically important. Firms that can make more effective use of their existing resources may achieve better productivity and competitiveness than firms that simply accumulate additional resources.

The RBV supports the argument that human, financial, technological, physical and knowledge resources constitute important foundations of manufacturing firm performance. Resource fluidity enhances the value of these resources by allowing firms to redeploy and recombine them according to changing strategic requirements.

Empirical Review

Efeomo, *et al.*, (2022) examined resource fluidity and organisational performance in Nigeria. The researchers adopted a quantitative research approach and obtained data from employees of selected organisations in Nigeria. Using structural equation modelling, the study assessed whether the ability of firms to deploy resources flexibly could improve organisational performance. The findings revealed that resource fluidity had a positive and significant effect on organisational performance. The study indicated that organisations that are capable of moving resources in response to changing business requirements are more likely to achieve improved outcomes. The authors therefore recommended that Nigerian organisations develop mechanisms that facilitate flexible resource deployment. The study is particularly relevant to the present research because it provides direct empirical evidence of the relationship between resource fluidity and performance within the Nigerian environment.

Ofoegbu and Akanbi (2022) investigated the influence of strategic agility on the perceived performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The study examined strategic agility through dimensions including strategic sensitivity, collective commitment and resource fluidity. Data were collected from selected manufacturing firms and analysed using appropriate statistical techniques. The findings showed that strategic agility significantly influenced perceived organisational performance. In particular, the study demonstrated the importance of the capacity of firms to respond rapidly to environmental changes through flexible resource deployment. The study concluded that manufacturing firms could improve their performance by developing strategic agility capabilities that enable them to respond effectively to changes in the competitive environment. This study is highly relevant because it provides empirical evidence from the Nigerian manufacturing

sector and establishes a link between resource fluidity as a component of strategic agility and firm performance.

Red-Well, Hamilton and Bayo (2021) examined resource fluidity and competitiveness of aluminium manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The study was motivated by the need for manufacturing firms to remain competitive in an increasingly turbulent business environment. Resource fluidity was examined in relation to competitiveness, with particular attention to outcomes such as product quality and delivery reliability. The researchers collected empirical data from aluminium manufacturing firms in Nigeria and analysed the responses using statistical methods. Their findings indicated that resource fluidity was important for enhancing the competitiveness of manufacturing firms. Firms that were able to flexibly deploy and adjust their resources were better positioned to respond to customer requirements and improve operational outcomes. The study is relevant to the present research because competitiveness, product quality and delivery reliability are important dimensions of manufacturing-firm performance.

Eletu, Akhigbe and Nwuche (2021) investigated organisational dynamic capability and non-financial performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The study was based on the argument that firms operating in dynamic environments require capabilities that enable them to adapt their resources and organisational processes. The researchers examined dynamic capability in relation to non-financial performance indicators. Their findings established a significant relationship between organisational dynamic capabilities and the performance of manufacturing firms. The study demonstrated that the ability to adapt organisational resources and capabilities can improve outcomes such as operational effectiveness, customer-related performance and other non-financial indicators. Although the study did not focus exclusively on resource fluidity, its findings are relevant because resource fluidity constitutes an important mechanism through which dynamic capabilities are translated into organisational outcomes. The study therefore supports the argument that manufacturing firms need flexible and adaptive resource-management capabilities to achieve superior performance.

Eisenhardt and Martin (2020) examined dynamic capabilities and their role in creating competitive advantage. The authors conceptualised dynamic capabilities as identifiable organisational processes through which firms integrate, reconfigure, gain and release resources in response to market changes. Their analysis showed that dynamic capabilities are particularly important in environments characterised by rapid technological and competitive changes. Resource reconfiguration and redeployment allow firms to adjust their resource base and respond to changing market requirements. For manufacturing firms, these capabilities may involve new product development,

strategic decision-making, technology integration, resource allocation and knowledge transfer. The study concluded that dynamic capabilities can contribute to competitive advantage, although the sources of advantage may differ according to the degree of environmental dynamism. Its findings support the argument that resource fluidity can contribute to manufacturing-firm performance by enabling firms to rapidly reconfigure resources and respond to environmental opportunities.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The research design used was cross sectional survey research. The design was suitable because it allowed the researcher to gather the first-hand information from the employees of the selected banks in the same way without changing any of the study variables.

Population of the Study

The population of the study comprises 1,200 management and senior employees of selected manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The respondents are drawn from production, human resources, finance, marketing, operations and strategic-management departments because these employees possess relevant knowledge of resource fluidity and firm performance.

Sample Size Determination

In order to determine the appropriate sample size for the study, the Taro Yamane's sampling size determination technique was applied as shown:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where: n = sample size

N = total number of employees

e = allowable level of error

Thus:

$$n = \frac{1,200}{1+1200(0.05)^2}$$

$$\frac{1200}{1 + 1200(0.0025)}$$

$$\frac{1200}{4}$$

$$n = 300$$

Sampling Technique

Simple random sampling was employed to provide the opportunity for selection to eligible permanent employees while convenience sampling was used when administering the questionnaires to obtain employees who were available and willing to cooperate at the selected branch locations.

Sources of Data

Primary source was used for the information for the study. A structured questionnaire was used to collect primary data from permanent staff members of the selected manufacturing firm and the filled questionnaire was used for the statistical analysis.

Data Collection Instrument

The researcher had used a structured questionnaire with close-ended questions designed to obtain data from the respondents. Responses were obtained on a five-point Likert-type scale with ordinal level of measurement: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Disagree (3), Strongly Disagree (2) and Undecided (1).

Model Specification

$$\text{PERF} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{RRED} + e_1 \quad \text{Equation 3.1}$$

$$\text{PERF} = \beta_0 + \beta_2 \text{RREC} + e_2 \quad \text{Equation 3.2}$$

Where:

PERF = Performance

RRED = Resource Redeployment

RREC = Resource Reconfiguration

β_0 = Regression constant

β_1 - β_2 = Direct-effect regression coefficient

e_1 - e_2 = Stochastic error terms.

Data Analysis

The answers of the questionnaires were summarised using descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage). Simple linear regression testing was appropriate for the hypotheses one and two. The hypotheses were tested at 5% level of significance. If $p < 0.05$, rejected the null hypothesis; if $p \geq 0.05$, retain the null hypothesis. The analyses were carried out using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Data Presentation

Table 1: Percentage analysis of the Responses on Resource Redeployment

Resource Redeployment Dimensions	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
Our firm can quickly transfer employees from one department or production unit to another when the need arises.	57(25.3%)	93(41.3%)	44(19.6%)	15(6.7%)	16(7.1%)	225(100%)
Our firm can redirect financial resources from less productive activities to areas with greater strategic importance.	70(31.1%)	65(28.9%)	53(23.6%)	31(13.8%)	6(2.2%)	225(100%)

Our firm can redeploy machinery and other production equipment to meet changes in production requirements.	78(34.7%)	40(17.8%)	45(20.0%)	27(12.0%)	35(15.6%)	225(100%)
Our firm promptly reallocates resources when there are significant changes in customer demand.	36(16.0%)	52(23.1%)	74(32.9%)	34(15.1%)	29(12.9%)	225(100%)
Management can easily shift organisational resources from declining products or markets to more promising ones.	85(37.8%)	50(22.2%)	38(16.9%)	35(15.6%)	17(7.6%)	225(100%)

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026)

For the statement that the firm can quickly transfer employees from one department or production unit to another when the need arises, 57 respondents (25.3%) strongly agreed, while 93 respondents (41.3%) agreed. Thus, 66.6% of respondents expressed agreement with the statement. Conversely, 15 respondents (6.7%) disagreed and 16 respondents (7.1%) strongly disagreed, while 44 respondents (19.6%) were undecided.

Regarding the statement that the firm can redirect financial resources from less productive activities to areas with greater strategic importance, 70 respondents (31.1%) strongly agreed and 65 respondents (28.9%) agreed, giving a combined positive response of 60.0%. Meanwhile, 53 respondents (23.6%) were undecided, 31 respondents (13.8%) disagreed, and 6 respondents (2.2%) strongly disagreed.

The third statement examined whether the firm can redeploy machinery and other production equipment to meet changes in production requirements. The result shows that 78 respondents (34.7%) strongly agreed and

40 respondents (17.8%) agreed, representing a combined agreement of 52.5%. On the other hand, 45 respondents (20.0%) were undecided, 27 respondents (12.0%) disagreed, and 35 respondents (15.6%) strongly disagreed.

For the statement that the firm promptly reallocates resources when there are significant changes in customer demand, 36 respondents (16.0%) strongly agreed and 52 respondents (23.1%) agreed, producing a combined positive response of 39.1%. However, 74 respondents (32.9%) were undecided, while 34 respondents (15.1%) disagreed and 29 respondents (12.9%) strongly disagreed.

Concerning the statement that management can easily shift organisational resources from declining products or markets to more promising ones, 85 respondents (37.8%) strongly agreed and 50 respondents (22.2%) agreed, resulting in a combined positive response of 60.0%. In contrast, 38 respondents (16.9%) were undecided, 35 respondents (15.6%) disagreed, and 17 respondents (7.6%) strongly disagreed.

Table 2: Percentage analysis of the Responses on Resource Reconfiguration

Resource Reconfiguration Dimensions	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
Our firm can modify its existing resources to respond effectively to changes in the business environment.	57(25.3%)	93(41.3%)	44(19.6%)	15(6.7%)	16(7.1%)	225(100%)
Our firm regularly reorganises its production resources to improve operational efficiency.	70(31.1%)	65(28.9%)	53(23.6%)	31(13.8%)	6(2.2%)	225(100%)
Our firm can combine existing human and technological resources in new ways to improve production.	78(34.7%)	40(17.8%)	45(20.0%)	27(12.0%)	35(15.6%)	225(100%)
Our firm can quickly adjust its organisational processes when new production technologies are introduced.	36(16.0%)	52(23.1%)	74(32.9%)	34(15.1%)	29(12.9%)	225(100%)
Our firm continuously restructures its resource base to meet changing customer and market requirements.	85(37.8%)	50(22.2%)	38(16.9%)	35(15.6%)	17(7.6%)	225(100%)

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026)

For the statement that the firm can modify its existing resources to respond effectively to changes in

the business environment, 57 respondents (25.3%) strongly agreed, while 93 respondents (41.3%) agreed.

This gives a combined positive response of 66.6%. In contrast, 44 respondents (19.6%) were undecided, 15 respondents (6.7%) disagreed, and 16 respondents (7.1%) strongly disagreed.

Regarding the statement that the firm regularly reorganises its production resources to improve operational efficiency, 70 respondents (31.1%) strongly agreed and 65 respondents (28.9%) agreed, giving a combined positive response of 60.0%. Meanwhile, 53 respondents (23.6%) were undecided, 31 respondents (13.8%) disagreed and 6 respondents (2.2%) strongly disagreed.

The third statement assessed whether the firm can combine existing human and technological resources in new ways to improve production. The results show that 78 respondents (34.7%) strongly agreed, while 40 respondents (17.8%) agreed, representing a combined agreement of 52.5%. However, 45 respondents (20.0%)

were undecided, 27 respondents (12.0%) disagreed and 35 respondents (15.6%) strongly disagreed.

For the statement that the firm can quickly adjust its organisational processes when new production technologies are introduced, 36 respondents (16.0%) strongly agreed and 52 respondents (23.1%) agreed, resulting in a combined positive response of 39.1%. On the other hand, 74 respondents (32.9%) were undecided, 34 respondents (15.1%) disagreed and 29 respondents (12.9%) strongly disagreed.

The statement that the firm continuously restructures its resource base to meet changing customer and market requirements attracted 85 respondents (37.8%) who strongly agreed and 50 respondents (22.2%) who agreed. Together, these represent 60.0% agreement. Conversely, 38 respondents (16.9%) were undecided, 35 respondents (15.6%) disagreed and 17 respondents (7.6%) strongly disagreed.

Table 3: Percentage analysis of the Responses on Firm Performance

Firm Performance	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
Our firm has experienced improvement in profitability in recent years.	83(36.9%)	56(24.9%)	17(7.6%)	43(19.1%)	26(11.6%)	225(100%)
Our firm's productivity has improved over time.	75(33.3%)	59(26.2%)	17(7.6%)	29(12.9%)	45(20.0%)	225(100%)
Our firm has experienced growth in its market share.	108(48.0%)	60(26.7%)	16(7.1%)	17(7.6%)	24(10.7%)	225(100%)
Our firm has improved the quality of its products in recent years.	67(29.8%)	101(44.9%)	6(2.7%)	35(15.6%)	16(7.1%)	225(100%)
Our firm has improved its ability to introduce new or improved products and production processes.	105(46.7%)	58(25.8%)	8(3.6%)	29(12.9%)	25(11.1%)	225(100%)

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026)

Regarding the statement that the firm has experienced improvement in profitability in recent years, 83 respondents (36.9%) strongly agreed, while 56 respondents (24.9%) agreed. The combined positive response was therefore 61.8%. On the other hand, 17 respondents (7.6%) were undecided, 43 respondents (19.1%) disagreed, and 26 respondents (11.6%) strongly disagreed.

For the statement that the firm's productivity has improved over time, 75 respondents (33.3%) strongly agreed and 59 respondents (26.2%) agreed, producing a combined positive response of 59.5%. Meanwhile, 17 respondents (7.6%) were undecided, 29 respondents (12.9%) disagreed, and 45 respondents (20.0%) strongly disagreed.

Concerning the statement that the firm has experienced growth in its market share, 108 respondents (48.0%) strongly agreed and 60 respondents (26.7%) agreed, giving a combined positive response of 74.7%. Only 16 respondents (7.1%) were undecided, while 17

respondents (7.6%) disagreed and 24 respondents (10.7%) strongly disagreed.

For the statement that the firm has improved the quality of its products in recent years, 67 respondents (29.8%) strongly agreed and 101 respondents (44.9%) agreed. The combined agreement was 74.7%. In contrast, 6 respondents (2.7%) were undecided, 35 respondents (15.6%) disagreed, and 16 respondents (7.1%) strongly disagreed.

Regarding the statement that the firm has improved its ability to introduce new or improved products and production processes, 105 respondents (46.7%) strongly agreed and 58 respondents (25.8%) agreed, resulting in a combined positive response of 72.5%. Conversely, 8 respondents (3.6%) were undecided, 29 respondents (12.9%) disagreed, and 25 respondents (11.1%) strongly disagreed.

Testing of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

H₀₁: There is no significant influence of resource redeployment on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

Table 4: Linear regression analysis showing influence of resource redeployment on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square		Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.803 ^a	.644	.642		.36308	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Resource redeployment						
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	53.198	1	53.198	403.549	.000 ^b
	Residual	29.397	223	.132		
	Total	82.596	224			
a. Dependent Variable: Prof						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Resource redeployment						
Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.593	.106		5.575	.000
	Resource redeployment	.769	.038	.803	20.089	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Prof						

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026)

The model summary shows an R-value of 0.803, indicating a strong positive relationship between resource redeployment and the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The R² value of 0.644 indicates that resource redeployment explains 64.4% of the variation in firm performance (profitability). The remaining 35.6% of the variation in profitability is attributable to other factors not included in the model.

The ANOVA result provides evidence regarding the overall significance of the regression model. The analysis produced an F-value of 403.549 with a significance value of 0.000. Since the p-value is less than the conventional significance level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), the regression model is statistically significant. This means that resource redeployment significantly influences the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Therefore, the null hypothesis that resource redeployment has no significant influence on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria is rejected.

The coefficient table provides further information about the direction and magnitude of the influence of resource redeployment on firm

performance. Resource redeployment has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.769, a standard error of 0.038, a standardized beta coefficient of 0.803, and a t-value of 20.089, with a significance value of 0.000. The positive coefficient of 0.769 indicates that resource redeployment has a positive influence on firm performance. Specifically, a one-unit increase in resource redeployment is associated with an estimated 0.769-unit increase in profitability, holding other factors constant. The standardized beta coefficient of 0.803 further indicates a strong positive contribution of resource redeployment to firm performance. The t-value of 20.089 and significance level of 0.000 provide strong statistical evidence that this positive relationship is not due to random sampling variation. Thus, manufacturing firms that are more capable of transferring employees, redirecting financial resources, redeploying machinery and reallocating resources toward emerging opportunities are likely to achieve better performance outcomes.

Hypothesis Two

H₀₂: There is no significant influence of resource reconfiguration on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

Table 5: Linear regression analysis showing influence of resource reconfiguration on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.555 ^a	.308	.305	.50634
a. Predictors: (Constant), Resource reconfiguration				

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.422	1	25.422	99.155	.000 ^b
	Residual	57.174	223	.256		
	Total	82.596	224			
a. Dependent Variable: Prof						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Resource reconfiguration						

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.836	.188		4.451	.000
	Resource reconfiguration	.624	.063	.555	9.958	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Prof						

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026)

The model summary reports an R-value of 0.555, indicating a moderate positive relationship between resource reconfiguration and firm performance. The R Square (R^2) value of 0.308 indicates that resource reconfiguration explains 30.8% of the variation in the profitability of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The remaining 69.2% is attributable to other factors not captured in the model.

The ANOVA result shows a Regression Sum of Squares of 25.422, a Residual Sum of Squares of 57.174, and a Total Sum of Squares of 82.596. The regression model produced an F-value of 99.155 with a significance value of 0.000. Since the significance value ($p = 0.000$) is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the regression model is statistically significant. This implies that resource reconfiguration makes a significant contribution to explaining variations in the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.

The coefficient results indicate that resource reconfiguration has an unstandardized coefficient (B) of 0.624, a standard error of 0.063, a standardized beta coefficient of 0.555, a t-value of 9.958, and a significance value of 0.000. The positive coefficient ($B = 0.624$) indicates that resource reconfiguration has a positive influence on firm performance. Thus, a one-unit increase in resource reconfiguration is associated with an estimated 0.624-unit increase in profitability, all else being equal. The standardized beta coefficient of 0.555 further indicates a moderate positive contribution of resource reconfiguration to firm performance. The t-value of 9.958 and the significance value of 0.000 demonstrate that the effect is statistically significant at the 5% level.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the study concludes that resources fluidity has a significant and positive influence on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. In an increasingly competitive and uncertain business environment, manufacturing firms cannot rely solely on

their existing resource arrangements. Their ability to continually adjust, redeploy and reconfigure resources is essential for maintaining operational efficiency, responding to market changes and achieving sustainable performance. As such, the following recommendations are made:

1. Management should establish flexible systems that enable employees, financial resources, machinery and other productive assets to be moved quickly from declining or less productive areas to activities with greater strategic value.
2. Regular training, job rotation and multi-skilling programmes should be encouraged so that employees can effectively perform different functions when changing production requirements necessitate their redeployment.

REFERENCES

- Akpogheli M.S., and Okolie A.K. (2026) Capital Structure and Firms' Performance in Nigeria, *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research*, 14(1),38-57
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Doz, Y. L., and Kosonen, M. (2018). The dynamics of strategic agility: How to leverage the strategic momentum of a firm. *California Management Review*, 50(3), 95–118.
- Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2020). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 370–382.
- Efeomo, I. S., Salau, O. P., Moyosore, K. T., and Bolodeoku, B. P. (2022). Demystifying performance within the context of resource fluidity in Nigeria. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 21(2), 1–9.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2020). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121.

- Eletu, I. T., Akhigbe, O. J., & Nwuche, C. A. (2021). Organisational dynamic capability and nonfinancial performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, 12(4).
- Ofoegbu, O. E., & Akanbi, P. A. (2022). The influence of strategic agility on the perceived performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 11(2), 153–160.
- Oventhal, D. G. (2021). Stuck in neutral: The effect of strategic agility within the US powersports industry. Capella University.
- Red-Well, E. E., Hamilton, D. I., and Bayo, P. L. (2021). Resource fluidity and competitiveness of aluminium manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*, 2(3), 302–308.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., and Shuen, A. (2024). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of sustainable enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.