

---

**COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE THROUGH KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF HOTELS IN MAKURDI METROPOLIS, BENUE STATE, NIGERIA**

**Kenneth Chukwujioko Agbim,**

Business Administration Department, College of Management Sciences, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Nigeria

**Adama J. Idris,**

Department of Business Administration and Management,  
Federal Polytechnic, Nasarawa, Nasarawa State, Nigeria

---

**ABSTRACT:** *Strategic management researchers have alluded to the fact that tangible/intangible assets and intangible capabilities contribute to the achievement of organization's competitive advantage. Thus, this study was conducted owing to the increase in the employment of knowledge workers, the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in service delivery, and the upsurge in the number of hotels in the hospitality industry in Makurdi metropolis. The aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between knowledge dissemination and Competitive Advantage (CA). The study adopted ex-post-facto research design and purposive sampling technique. Questionnaire were employed to collect data from employees of selected hotels. Chi-square statistical method was employed to test the research hypothesis. It was found that knowledge dissemination is significantly related to CA. The researchers recommend increased knowledge dissemination via knowledge sharing and transfer among employees and between departments.*

**KEYWORDS:** Knowledge dissemination, Knowledge sharing, Knowledge transfer, Competitive advantage, Knowledge management

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

The saturation in many markets and the changes created by the information age has engendered the quest by organisations to differentiate themselves from their competitors within the same markets through the exploitation of tangible and intangible assets so as to attain core competencies and achieve sustainable competitive advantage. Researchers (Grant, 1996; Spender & Grant, 1996; Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Foss & Pedersen, 2002) have alluded to the fact that knowledge is a critical organizational resource that provides a sustainable competitive advantage in a competitive and dynamic economy. It is necessary but insufficient for organizations to rely on staffing and training systems that focus on selecting employees who have specific knowledge, skills, abilities or competencies to gain competitive advantage (Brown & Duguid, 1991). To gain competitive advantage, organizations must also consider how to enhance knowledge sharing among employees (Wang & Noe, 2010) and the transfer of expertise or knowledge from experts who have it to novices who need to know (Hinds et al., 2001). In the present knowledge-based economy, people are regarded as the most important assets (Fang et al., 2005) and the ultimate knowledge inventors and owners (Alvesson, 1993).

Therefore, the key objective of management should be to improve the process of knowledge dissemination within the organisation and between the organisation and other organisations. This is because according to Sundiman et al. (2013), the creation and diffusion of knowledge are essential elements in competitiveness. As products and services become more similar in the

market, it is the intangible nature of knowledge, its rareness, valuable and non-imitable characteristics that can create a differential satisfaction in the market place (Sharkie, 2003; Barney, 2007). Knowledge creates sustainable superior customer value by leveraging both tangible and intangible assets (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Hall, 1992; Amit & Shoemaker, 1993; Sveiby, 1997; Teece, 2000; Conner, 2002; Teece, 2007; Conner, 2007; Ambos & Schlegelmilch, 2009), fostering the acquisition and dissemination of tacit and explicit knowledge (Polyani, 1966; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Once knowledge is disseminated, it is expected that the organization will respond by utilizing it (Kamya et al., 2010). Therefore, owing to the upsurge in the number of small and medium sized hotels in Makurdi metropolis, competitive environment created by the upsurge, and the contribution of tangible/intangible assets and intangible capabilities to sustaining competitive advantage, this study sought to investigate the relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage with respect to hotels in Makurdi metropolis, Benue State, Nigeria.

### **Research Question**

What is the relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage?

### **Research Hypothesis**

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW/THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

Related literature in this study are reviewed under the subheadings knowledge dissemination, competitive advantage, and relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage. Also, knowledge-based view and resource-based view are reviewed as underpinning theories for this study.

### **Knowledge Dissemination**

Based on the definition of Knowledge Management (KM) by Darroch (2003), knowledge dissemination is one of the dimensions of KM (i.e., knowledge acquisition, knowledge dissemination and responsiveness to knowledge). Since KM is a process that transforms individual knowledge into organizational knowledge (Rasula et al., 2012), the dimensions of KM allow organizations to learn, reflect, unlearn, relearn, build, maintain and replenish its core competencies (Bhatt, 2001). Knowledge dissemination, also known as the sharing and transferring of knowledge represent the exchange of information, expertise or knowledge between members within the firm (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; Li, 2007). In other words, knowledge sharing represents the convenience of accessing knowledge among the employees. Knowledge sharing contains two portions; knowledge donating and knowledge collecting. Knowledge donating indicates offering knowledge; whilst knowledge collecting refers to the process of collecting knowledge among the employees (Van den Hooff & Van Weenen, 2004; Li, 2007).

More so, knowledge sharing refers to the provision of task information and know-how to help others and to collaborate with others to solve problems, develop new ideas or implement policies or procedures (Pulakos et al., 2003; Cummings, 2004). Knowledge sharing can occur via written correspondence or face-to-face communications through networking with other experts or documenting, organizing and capturing knowledge for others (Pulakos et al., 2003; Cummings, 2004).

Knowledge transfer typically has been used to describe the movement of knowledge between different units, divisions or organizations rather than individuals (Szulanski et al., 2004). Knowledge transfer occurs when experience in one unit of an organization affects another unit. Knowledge transfer can occur explicitly when, for example, a unit communicates with another unit about a practice that it has found to improve performance. Knowledge transfer can also occur implicitly without the recipient unit being able to articulate the knowledge it has acquired (Argote & Ingram, 2000). Argote & Ingram further noted that if an individual uses a tool that has been modified to improve its performance, the individual can benefit from the productivity enhancement in the tool without necessarily understanding the modifications or being able to articulate why the modifications improved the tool's performance. Similarly, norms or routines can be transmitted to group members without the members being able to articulate why the modifications improved the tool's performance or being aware of the knowledge embedded in it.

The knowledge acquired by an organization becomes useful when it is disseminated among employees and decision-makers in the organization. Knowledge dissemination is critical to the success of any organization. This is because it further encourages members of the organization to share their knowledge (Al-Alawi et al., 2007). Rosa & Spanjol (2005) observed that consumers and producers share knowledge through interactions and conversations around product offerings. Dissemination of knowledge enable the existing knowledge to be accessible and exploited in order to apply it to solve specific tasks cheaply, faster, much better and finally perform better than rivals in the market place. Nonaka et al. (2000) developed a spiral model (SECI) to explain knowledge dissemination in an organization. This spiral model has four modes of knowledge conversion: socialization (from tacit knowledge to tacit knowledge); externalization (from tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge); combination (from explicit knowledge to explicit knowledge); and internalization (from explicit knowledge to tacit knowledge).

Knowledge created through this spiral process can trigger a new spiral of knowledge creation, expanding horizontally and vertically across organizations. This interactive spiral process take place both intra- and inter-organizationally. One example is the articulation of tacit knowledge possessed by customers that they themselves have not been able to articulate. A product works as the trigger to elicit tacit knowledge when customers give meaning to the product by purchasing, adapting, using or even not purchasing it. Their actions are then reflected in the innovation process of the organization and a new spiral of organizational knowledge creation begins again (Nonaka, 1991; Nonaka et al., 2000). Senker (1995) noted that substantial codification of knowledge in the twentieth century has not diminished the contribution of tacit knowledge to innovation and argued that the tacit component of innovation can only evolve through practical experience (learning by doing) or personal interaction with experts who possess the relevant experience or knowledge, in or outside the organization and social networks, meaning the "know-who". These thoughts on the evolution of tacit knowledge were further explored by Kikoski & Kikoski (2004) who supported the statement that all knowledge is either tacit knowledge or is rooted in tacit knowledge, meaning that explicit knowledge depends on or is encompassed by tacit knowledge, whereas tacit knowledge "possesses" itself.

Interaction with others, as opposed to isolation is important if knowledge conversion is to take place (Stover, 2004). Rudiger & Vanini (1998) maintained that the only way to recognize the subject of tacit knowledge is via personal contacts with external organizations or inside organizations and it is therefore the duty of the management to support and afford these

contacts. According to Alwis & Hartmann (2008) a climate of openness and trust amongst organization members is the basic condition that allows tacit knowledge to be created, shared and used in the innovation process. Sharing tacit knowledge will be more successful in informal settings than in formal ones. Therefore, it is important for the management of organizations to cultivate a commitment to motivate the creation of tacit knowledge, and to create an atmosphere in which organization members in an organization will feel safe in sharing their knowledge and responding to such shared and/or disseminated knowledge so as enhance the achievement of competitive advantage in the organisation.

### **Competitive Advantage**

The world is changing more rapidly than ever before. Hence, managers and other employees throughout an organization must perform at higher and higher levels. In the last 20 years, rivalry between organizations competing domestically and globally has increased dramatically. Today, managers who make no attempt to learn from and adapt to changes in the global environment find themselves reacting rather than innovating and their organizations often become uncompetitive and fail (Jones & George, 2008).

Conversely, managers who learn and adapt to changes in the global environment and who effectively and efficiently manage their knowledge-base achieve competitive advantage. Competitive advantage is the ability of one organization to outperform other organizations because it provides desired goods and services more efficiently and effectively than they do (Jones and George, 2008). From the customers' point of view, competitive advantage is a company's attractiveness to its customers in comparison to their rivals (Chan et al., 2004). It is also viewed as diversity of features or any company's dimensions that enables it to perform better services to customers in comparison with rivals (Hao, 1999).

However, Macky & Johnson (2003) opined that there is a difference between competitive advantage and "sustained" competitive advantage. Macky & Johnson described sustained competitive advantage as occurring when competitors are incapable of duplicating the benefits of a firm's competitive advantage and cease their attempts to do so. It is the "cease" period in the firm's attempts at duplication that signify a "sustained" competitive advantage. According to Chan et al. (2004), some researchers agree that there are two main criteria by which firms can achieve this sustainability of advantage: firstly, given the dynamic environment, they need to be able to continuously identify, upgrade, rejuvenate and reinvent resources. Secondly, they need to have the ability to create an environment in which they can be self-reinforcing and enhancing in value and strength, thus causing sustained major cost disadvantages to imitating firms.

### **Relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage**

Dissemination of salient knowledge is surmised to impact the formation of competitive advantage. The two most cited mediating factors for ensuring proper dissemination of knowledge are communication facilitation and organizational culture development (Gupta & McDaniel, 2002). Knowledge dissemination makes a company's impacting decisions ability to increase dramatically, because individuals throughout the firm gain access to each other, rather than going through vertical channels of upper management. Those with the most current knowledge can share it with those who will benefit from it (DeTienne & Jackson, 2001). This improves the organization's ability to make rapid decisions and execute them effectively (Gupta & McDaniel, 2002). Pfeffer & Sutton (2000) maintained that to create a culture appropriate for transforming tacit knowledge into communal, explicit knowledge, fear-based

approaches to management must be abandoned. Despite the burgeoning literature within the field of leadership about the need to reconceptualise the control orientation of management and replace it with one that emphasizes facilitation and coaching, management practice remains dominated by control and impulses (Beech & Crane, 1999).

A key to overcoming tendencies of employees to hoard knowledge or to remain cautious in sharing ideas with others is for management to take the lead in creating an environment of understanding, shared control, compassion and learning. All ideas set forth in good faith and backed by rational analysis should be reinforced as beneficial to the company's efforts to create a cauldron of strategic innovation, even if such shared knowledge does not immediately produce resounding results (Gupta & McDaniel, 2002). Good communication and interaction between organizational members can enhance knowledge sharing (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Hence, the success of knowledge sharing depends on the individual's willingness to share knowledge (Chen & Huang, 2009), which is used to generate mutual learning and value creation. Consequently, effective conversion of organizational members' knowledge and expertise into explicit products or services (Nonaka & Konno, 1998; Yang, 2008) stimulates innovations (Chen & Huang, 2009). Knowledge transfer in organizations is the process through which one unit (e.g., group, department or division) is affected by the experience of another. Although knowledge transfer in organizations involves transfer at the individual level, the problem of knowledge transfer in organizations transcends the individual level to include transfer at higher levels of analysis, such as the group, product line, department or division. Knowledge transfer in organizations manifests itself through changes in the knowledge or innovation performance of the recipient units (Argote & Ingram, 2000).

Despite the fact that memory dispersion which represents sharing of organizational knowledge among members, distracts creativity or inhibits new ideas during a high degree of changes in technological environment (Moorman & Miner, 1997), and as noted by Jantunen (2005), knowledge dissemination does not have a significant relationship with innovation performance, the ability to share and store knowledge by KM tools have been found to provide the potentials to improve innovative performances (Ng et al., 2012). Al-Busaidi et al. (2010) noted that information technology, service quality and peers trustworthiness are not significant motivators of an individual's knowledge sharing behaviour. Rather, since an individual gain several benefits by sharing his or her knowledge to a repository KMS, such individual's knowledge sharing behaviour to KM System (KMS) is motivated by organizational culture dimensions (such as management support and rewards policy) and the system technical characteristics (such as system quality). Thus, employing IT does increase knowledge transfer and sharing among organizational members, in particular those beyond the formal interaction process (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Knowledge sharing is positively related to the firm's capability to innovate (Calatone et al., 2002; Lin, 2007; Ng et al., 2012).

Similarly, Spencer (2003) found that firms that practice knowledge sharing have higher innovation performance than firms that do not practice knowledge sharing. These firms will be able to generate more value when they share Research and Development (R & D) knowledge together. Lin (2007) concluded that both components of knowledge sharing, which are knowledge collecting and donating are positively related to the firm's innovative capability which contributes to innovative performance. Firms with effective knowledge gathering and integration will be more distinctive in nature and pose a greater difficulty for competitors to duplicate, thus upholding the higher firm innovation performance potential and competitive advantage (Argote & Ingram, 2000; Lin, 2007; Ng et al., 2012).

**Knowledge-based view**

The Knowledge-Based View (KBV) states that the success of an organization that is involved in producing, integrating and distributing knowledge is measured by the organization's ability to develop new knowledge based on its own resources. Thus, the core resource of the organization is knowledge (Grant, 1996). Previous researches (Bierly & Chakrabati, 1996; Davenport & Prusak, 1998) suggest that knowledge-based organizations are more creative, efficient and effective than any other organizations. This therefore implies that knowledge is the only source of sustainable competitive advantage. To achieve superior performance, with the necessary resources and superior capabilities (Davenport & Prusak, 1998), the organization needs tacit knowledge to integrate and coordinate other resources and capabilities (Grant, 1996). Organizational knowledge has an important position as a major source of organizational competence. This is because knowledge is contextual information, experiences, values and opinions of experts (Davenport & Prusak, 1998).

There is a debate about what "knowledge as resource" means. One strand argued that "knowledge as resource" focuses on knowledge per se, meaning that knowledge is something that can be transferred, recombined, licensed, codified and put into a computer-based knowledge repository, and used to create value for a firm (Carlsson, 2004). Carlsson further stated that another strand argued that it is not knowledge per se that should be in focus, but "knowing". This means an emphasis on the context where knowledge is created, shared, integrated and put to use. The later view has primarily a process and flow view, which means that the design, structuring of knowledge processes and flows form the basis for achieving competitive advantage. Furthermore, since competitive advantage is based on knowledge and the ability to continually develop new knowledge; this knowledge element is an important factor and resource in the success of the organization (Bierly & Chakrabati, 1996).

**Resource-based view**

The Resource-Based View (RBV) was put forward by Wernerfelt (1984) based on the earlier work of Penrose (1959). The RBV stresses the importance of internal idiosyncratic resources in explaining the differences in success levels amongst firms when competing in the same industry (Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1991). Resource-based is defined as the resources and capabilities possessed by competing firms that may differ, and these differences may be long lasting (Rumelt, 1984; Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1991). The RBV is the first stream in the field of strategic management that has significantly grounded the understanding of the variations of success levels in firms. However, the literature suggests that not all resources contribute equally to a firm's success (Barney, 1991; Petraf, 1993; Adner & Zemsky, 2006; Moliterno & Wiersema, 2007). The resources that contribute to a firm's success are valuable, rare, inimitable, non-substitutable, appropriable, and specialized capabilities that bestow the firm's competitive advantage. These resources are intangible in nature and include staff know-how, organizational culture and reputation. These resources are called strategic assets (Itami & Roehl, 1987; Hall, 1992; Amit & Shoemaker, 1993; Barney, 2001; Ray et al., 2004; Newbert, 2007).

The RBV has gained importance in the field of strategic management. Specifically, during the 1990s, the RBV gained much attention in explaining why some firms outperformed others (Barney, 1991; Ray et al., 2004). Within the RBV, capabilities are referred to as being the most important contributor to a firm's success (Charan, 1991; Day, 1994; Grant, 1996; Teece et al., 1997; McEvily & Chakravarthy, 2002; Grant, 2002; Teece, 2007; Moliterno & Wiersema, 2007), and are ultimately reflected in managers and staff know-how (Grant, 2002).

Capabilities can be considered a superior resource in a firm's resource pool as a result of being dynamic. This assists the firm in acquiring and developing all other assets (Itami & Rochi, 1987).

The main proposition of the RBV is that competitive advantage is based on valuable and unique internal resources and capabilities that are costly for competitors to imitate (Wernerfelt, 1984; Burney, 1991). This implies that competitive advantage is an outcome of resources and capabilities residing within the firm, but these capabilities can be "directed" towards the environment of the firm. Thus, if the firm is able to exercise this capability faster than its competitors it can give the firm a competitive advantage (Eisenhardt & Schoonhoven, 1996; Choudhury & Xia, 1999).

## METHODOLOGY

Ex-post-facto research design was adopted for this study. Purposive sampling technique was employed to collect data using questionnaire from 279 employees from a population of 922 employees spread across 96 hotels. The relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage was measured in terms of changes in knowledge or innovation performance, service quality, system quality, management support, rewards policy, peers trustworthiness, individual benefits, industry position, and difficulty in service duplication. This variable was measured on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from very high (4) to very low (1). The result of the validation of the questionnaire by selected lecturers showed that the questionnaire is significant, while for the Pearson Product Moment Correlation test, the result showed 0.96 which is greater than the minimum threshold of 0.70 required for reliability. Out of the 279 copies of the questionnaire that were administered, 264 copies were retrieved back, while only 243 were properly completed and used for data analysis. The generated data were analysed at 0.05 level of significance using Chi-square statistical method through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 21.0 for Windows). Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected if the critical level or P-value is less than 0.05 and accepted otherwise.

## RESULTS/FINDINGS

**Research Question:** What is the relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage?

The frequencies and percentages of the degree of responses [i.e., Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD)] and item statements with respect to the relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage are presented in Table 1. Based on aggregate responses, Table 1 showed 788(46.3%) responses for strongly agree, 635 (37.3%) for agree, 179 (10.5%) for disagree and 99 (5.8%) for strongly disagree. This implies that information and communication system, intangible capabilities that will be difficult and expensive for rivals to duplicate, general manager's support, innovation practices, trust and creativity among employees, rewards, skills of co-workers, and use of ICT tools enhances knowledge dissemination and performance.

**TABLE 1: Coded Responses on the Relationship between Knowledge Dissemination and Competitive Advantage**

Item Statement	Degree of Response								
	SA		A		D		SD		Total
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Our organisation is equipped with modern gadgets that enhances effectiveness of storage/uphold function of our information and communication system.	99	12.6	96	15.1	29	16.2	19	19.2	243
Our service quality is enhanced with intangible capabilities, modern/reliable information system and IT support staff that will be difficult and expensive for rivals to duplicate.	122	15.5	91	14.3	17	9.5	13	13.1	243
The general manager supports employees to achieve their respective goals at reduced cost.	99	12.6	92	14.5	36	20.1	16	16.2	243
In our organisation, innovative practices are rewarded accordingly.	105	13.3	92	14.5	29	16.2	17	17.2	243
In this organisation, employees generally trust each other; in their work they easily rely on the knowledge and skills of co-workers.	95	12.0	103	16.2	32	17.8	13	13.1	243
Employees are encouraged to be creative and make additional efforts through the provision of individual benefit.	127	16.1	73	11.5	27	15.1	16	16.2	243
The use of ICT tools has increased our knowledge, performance and position in the industry.	144	17.9	88	13.9	9	5.1	5	5.0	243
<b>Total</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>37.3</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>1,701</b>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2014

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage.

The result of the Chi-Square test on the relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage is presented in Table 2. Table 2 showed that the result is significant ( $\chi^2 = 66.152$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $P = 0.018$ ) since  $P < 0.05$ . Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected and we conclude that there is a significant relationship between knowledge dissemination and competitive advantage among hotels in Makurdi metropolis, Benue State, Nigeria.

**TABLE 2: Result of the Chi-Square Test on the Relationship between Knowledge Dissemination and Competitive Advantage**

Chi-square	66.152
Df	4
Sig.	0.018

**Source:** Field Survey, 2014/SPSS (Version 21.0 for Windows) Output

## DISCUSSION

This study revealed that knowledge dissemination is significantly related to competitive advantage. Knowledge dissemination, also known as the sharing and transferring of knowledge, represents the exchange of information, expertise or knowledge between members within a firm (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002, Li, 2007). Knowledge sharing represents the provision of task information and know-how to help others and to collaborate with others to solve problems, develop new ideas or implement policies or procedures. Knowledge sharing and the ability to transfer knowledge from one unit to another have been found to contribute to organizational performance and competitiveness of firms in both the manufacturing and services sectors (Galbraith, 1990; Darr et al., 1995; Epple et al., 1996; Baum & Ingram, 1998; Ng et al., 2012).

Competitive advantage is increasingly found in knowing how to do things, rather than in having special access to resources and markets. Knowledge and intellectual capital have become both the primary basis of core competencies and the key to superior performance (Lubit, 2001). In the literature of strategic management, there is a shift from less emphasis on tangible assets to more emphasis on intangible assets as a way of achieving and/or maintaining competitive advantage. Intangible resources are divided into two categories: assets and capabilities (skills). According to Hall (1992), intangible assets refer to “what a firm has” such as intellectual property, organizational assets and reputation assets, while intangible resources, classified as skills (capabilities), are a firm’s skills or “what a firm does”, namely its managers, staff and firm know-how, and these skills are also referred to as competencies. According to Cavusgil et al. (2003), increase in this capability and competence will increase the innovative performance and competitive advantage of the firm.

Knowledge sharing can occur via written correspondence or face-to-face communication through networking with other experts or documenting, organizing and capturing for others (Pulakos et al., 2003; Cummings, 2004). Knowledge transfer occurs when experience in one unit of an organization affects another unit (Argote & Ingram, 2000). The knowledge acquired by an organization becomes useful when it is disseminated among employees and decision-makers in the organization. Knowledge dissemination is critical to the success of any organization to share their knowledge (Al-Alawi et al., 2007) and to transfer their knowledge between different units, divisions or organizations (Szulanski et al., 2004) so as to gain competitive advantage (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000; Ng et al., 2012).

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has empirically established that knowledge dissemination is significantly related to competitive advantage among hotels in Benue State, Nigeria. Thus, the sustained competitiveness among the hotels in Benue State could be attributed to the prevalence and unprecedented increase in the sharing and transfer of knowledge among well motivated knowledge workers within and between departments in the hotels, and between hotels through the use of ICT gadgets. Based on the findings of the study, the following are recommended:

- i. hoteliers and hotel managers should employ ICT systems and skilled knowledge workers that will further help to enhance knowledge sharing and transfer so as to sustain their competitive advantage. At every point in time, efforts should be made to acquire modern and latest systems and to improve employees’ skills through training and retraining;

- ii. sharing and transfer of information/knowledge among employees, between departments and between employees/departments and the organization should be encouraged. This is to ensure that all created relevant knowledge by knowledge workers are frequently made organizational knowledge;
- iii. a cordial relationship between employees/managers and customers/the general public should be encouraged to ensure free flow of relevant information/knowledge from the customers/public to the organization; and
- iv. owing to the dynamism in the present knowledge economy, employees/managers must learn to respond to technological, service and knowledge-based environmental changes frequently and with the desired urgency so as to enhance and sustain competitive advantage at all time.

### LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

The interpretation of the results of this study should be restricted in the light of three limitations. First, the study covered only the hospitality sector- hotels. Thus, findings of this study should be limited to this sector. Further studies in this area should endeavour to include other sectors like, manufacturing, services, trading and marketing as they are also very important in the economy. Second, the study was limited to employees as the single informants. Thus, further studies should include customers, managers and suppliers as informants so as to have a broader response concerning knowledge dissemination in organizations. Third, this study was conducted in a problematic environment like that of Nigeria which may limit the findings of the study. Therefore, further studies in knowledge dissemination should be conducted in similar or different environment so as to validate and generalise the findings of this study.

### References

- Adner, R. & Zemsky, P. (2006). A demand-based perspective on sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 621-636.
- Al-Alawi, A., Al-Marzooqi, N. & Mohammed, Y. (2007). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: Critical success factors. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(2), 22-42.
- Al-Busaidi, K.A., Olfman, L., Ryan, T. & Leroy, G. (2010). Sharing knowledge to a knowledge management system: Examining the motivators and the benefits in an Omani organization. *Journal of Organizational Knowledge Management*, 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.inimapublishing.com/journals/JOKM/jokm.html> on 20/4/2014.
- Alvesson, M. (1993). Organizations as rhetoric: Knowledge-intensive firms and the struggle with ambiguity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(6), 997-1015.
- Alwis, R.S. & Hartmann, E. (2008). The use of tacit knowledge within innovative companies: Knowledge management in innovative enterprises. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 12(1), 133-147.
- Ambos, T.C. & Schlegelmilch, B.B. (2009). Managing knowledge in international consulting firms. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 13(6), 491-508.
- Amit, R. & Shoemaker, P. (1993). Strategic assets and organizational rent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(1), 33-46.
- Argote, L. & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision processes*, 82(1), 150-169.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Barney, J. (2001). Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management*, 17, 643-650.

- Barney, J. (2007). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.
- Bartol, K.M. & Srivastava, A. (2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: The role of organisational rewards systems. *Journal of Leadership and Organisation Studies*, 9(1), 64-76.
- Baum, J.A.C. & Ingram, P. (1998). Survival-enhancing learning in the Manhattan hotel industry, 1898-1980. *Management Science*, 44, 996-1016.
- Beech, N. & Crane, O. (1999). High performance team and a climate of community. *Team Performance Management*, 5(5), 87-103.
- Bhatt, G.D. (2001). Knowledge management in organizations: Examining the interaction between technologies, techniques and people. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(1), 68-75.
- Bierly, P. & Chakrabati, A. (1996). Generic knowledge sharing in the U.S. pharmaceutical industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 123-126.
- Brown, J.S. & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40-57.
- Calantone, R.J., Cavusgil, S.T. & Zhao, Y. (2002). Learning orientation firm innovation capability and firm performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 31(6), 515-524.
- Carlsson, S.A. (2004). *Enhancing knowledge acquisition through the use of ICT*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Decision Support in an Uncertain and Complex World (The IFIP TC8/WG8.3), Lund, Sweden.
- Cavusgil, S.T., Calantone, R.J. & Zhao, Y. (2003). Tacit knowledge transfer and firm innovation capability. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18(1), 6-21.
- Chan, L.L.M., Shaffer, M.A. & Snape, E. (2004). In search of sustained competitive advantage: The impact of organizational culture, competitive strategy and human resource management practices on firm performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(1), 17-35.
- Charan, R. (1991). How networks reshape organizations for results. *Harvard Business Review*, September/October, 104-115.
- Chase, R. (1997). The knowledge-based organization: An international survey. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 1(1), 38-49.
- Chen, C.J. & Huang, J.W. (2009). Strategic human resources practice and innovation practice and innovation performance – the mediating role of knowledge management capacity. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(1), 104-114.
- Chouldhury, V. & Xia, W. (1999). A resource-based theory of network structures. In N. Venkatramann and J.C. Henderson (Eds.), *Research in strategic management and information technology*. Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.
- Conner, T. (2002). The resource-base view of strategy and its value to practicing managers. *Strategic Change*, 11, 307-316.
- Conner, T. (2007). Research notes and commentaries, market orientation and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 957-959.
- Cummings, J.N. (2004). Work groups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organisation. *Management Science*, 50(3), 352-364.
- Darr, E., Argote, I. & Epple, D. (1995). The acquisition, transfer and depreciation of knowledge in service organisations: Productivity in franchises. *Management Science*, 41, 1750-1762.
- Darroch, J. (2003). Developing a measure of knowledge management behaviours and practices. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(5), 41-45.

- Davenport, T. & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Day, G. (1994). The capabilities of market-driven organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 37-52.
- DeTienne, K.B. & Jackson, L.A. (2001). Knowledge management: Understanding theory and developing strategy. *Competitiveness Review*, 11(1), 1-11.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. & Schoonhoven, C.B. (1996). Resource-based view of strategic alliance formation: Strategic and social effects in entrepreneurial firms. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 136-150.
- Epple, D., Argote, L. & Murphy, K. (1996). An empirical investigation of the micro structure of knowledge acquisition and transfer through learning by doing. *Operations Research*, 44, 77-86.
- Fang, S.C., Tsai, F.S. & Chang, K.C. (2005). Knowledge sharing routines, task efficiency and team quality in instant service-giving settings. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 6(1), 62-67.
- Foss, N.J. & Pedersen, T. (2002). Transferring knowledge in MNCs: The role of sources of subsidiary knowledge and organisational context. *Journal of International Management*, 8(1), 49-67.
- Galbraith, C.S. (1990). Transferring core manufacturing technologies in high technology firms. *California Management Review*, 32(4), 56-70.
- Grant, R. (1996). Towards a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 109-122.
- Grant, R. (2002). *Contemporary strategy analysis*. Boston: Blackwell.
- Gupta, A. & McDaniel, J. (2002). Creating competitive advantage by effectively managing knowledge: A framework of knowledge management. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, October, 1-7.
- Hall, R. (1992). The strategic analysis of intangible resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 135-144.
- Hao, M. (1999). Anatomy of competitive advantage. *Management decision*, 37(9), 709-718.
- Hinds, P.J., Patterson, M. & Pfeffer, J. (2001). Bothered by abstraction: The effect of expertise on knowledge transfer and subsequent novice performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1232-1243.
- Itami, H. & Roehl, T.W. (1987). *Mobilizing invisible assets*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jantuen, A. (2005). Knowledge-processing capabilities and innovative performance: An empirical study. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 8(3), 336-349.
- Jones, G.R. & George, J.M. (2008). *Contemporary Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kamya, M.T., Ntayi, J.M. & Ahiauzu, A. (2010). Knowledge management and competitive advantage: The interaction effect of market orientation. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(14), 2971-2980.
- Kikoski, C.K. & Kikoski, J.F. (2004). *The inquiring organization: Tacit knowledge, conversation and knowledge creation skills for 21<sup>st</sup> century organizations*. London: Praeger.
- Lin, H.F. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: An empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 315-332.
- Lubit, R. (2001). Tacit knowledge and knowledge management: The key to sustainable competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(1), 164-178.
- Macky, K. & Johnson, G. (2003). *Managing human resources in New Zealand*. Auckland: McGraw-Hill.

- McEvily, S. & Chakravarthy, B. (2002). The persistence of knowledge-based advantage: An empirical test for product performance and technology knowledge. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 285-305.
- Moliterno, T.P. & Wiersema, M.F. (2007). Firm performance, rent appropriation and the strategic resource divestment capability. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 1065-1087.
- Moorman, C. & Miner, A.S. (1997). The impact of organisational memory on new product performance and creativity. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(1), 91-106.
- Newbert, S.I. (2007). Empirical research on the resource-based view of the firm: An assessment and suggestions for future research. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 121-146.
- Ng, Y., Lee, V., Foo, A.T. & Gan, P. (2012). The relationship between knowledge management practices and technological innovation: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Management, Knowledge and Learning*, 1(1), 71-89.
- Nonaka, I. (1991). The knowledge-creating company. *Harvard Business Review*, November/December, 96-104.
- Nonaka, I. & Konno, N. (1998). The concept of “ba”: Building a foundation for knowledge creation. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 40-54.
- Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R. & Konno, N. (2000). SECI, ba and leadership: A unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long Range Planning*, 33, 4-34.
- Penrose, E. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Peteraf, M. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14, 179-191.
- Pfeffer, J. & Sutton, R.I. (2000). *The knowing-doing gap: How smart companies turn knowledge into action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.
- Prahalad, C. & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, May/June, 79-91.
- Pulakos, E.D., Dorsey, D.W. & Borman, W.C. (2003). Hiring for knowledge-based competition. In S.E. Jackson, M.A. Hitt & A.S. Denisi (Eds.). *Managing knowledge for sustained competitive advantage: Designing strategies for effective human resource management* (pp. 155-176). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rasula, J., Vuksic, V.B. & Stemberger, M.I. (2012). The impact of knowledge management on organizational performance. *Economic and Business Review*, 14(2), 147-168.
- Ray, G., Barney, J. & Muhanna, W. (2004). Capabilities, business processes and competitive advantage: choosing the dependent variable in empirical tests of the resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 23-37.
- Rosa, J. & Spanjol, J. (2005). Micro-level product-market dynamics: Shared knowledge and its relationship in market development. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 33(2), 197-125.
- Rumelt, R. (1984). Towards a strategic theory of the firm, In R.B. Lamb (Ed.), *Competitive strategic management* (pp. 82-114). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Senker, J. (1995). Tacit knowledge and models of innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 2, 425-447.
- Sharkie, R. (2003). Knowledge creation and its place in the development of sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of Knowledge management*, 7(1), 20-31.
- Spencer, J.W. (2003). Firm's knowledge-sharing strategies in the global innovation system: Empirical evidence from the flat panel display industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(3), 217-233.

- Spender, J.C. & Grant, R.M. (1996). Knowledge and the firm: Overview. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 5-9.
- Stevens, J. (2001). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Stover, M. (2004). Making tacit knowledge explicit. *Reference Services Review*, 32(2), 164-173.
- Sundiman, D., Idrus, M.S., Troena, E.A. & Rahayu, M. (2013). The role of knowledge management in individual, the community and the organization. *International Organization of Scientific Research Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 47-54.
- Sveiby, K.E. (1997). *The new organizational wealth: Managing and measuring knowledge-based assets*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Szulanski, G., Cappetta, R. & Jensen, R.J. (2004). When and how trustworthiness matters: Knowledge transfer and the moderating effect of causal ambiguity. *Organization Science*, 15, 600-613.
- Teece, D. (2000). Strategies for managing knowledge assets: The role of firm structure and industrial context. *Long Range Planning*, 33, 35-54.
- Teece, D. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and micro-foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 1319-1350.
- Teece, D., Pisano, G. & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, 509-533.
- Van den Hooff, B. & Van Weenen, F.D.L. (2004). Committed to share: Commitment and CMC use as antecedents of knowledge sharing. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 11(1), 13-24.
- Wang, S. & Noe, R.A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 115-131.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Yang, J. (2008). Managing knowledge for quality assurance: An empirical study. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 25(2), 109-124.
- Yang, J. (2008). Managing knowledge for quality assurance: An empirical study. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 25(2), 109-124.