

The Impact of Organizational Justice on Knowledge Sharing Intention

Samad Ranjbar Ardakani

Department of Management, Gachsaran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Gachsaran, Iran

Maghjour11@gmail.com

Abstract: The current study investigated the relationship between organizational justice and intention to share knowledge in Fars Petrochemical Company (FPC), Iran. Using stratified random sampling method, a sample of 242 employees selected for further analysis. The analysis of the data showed that the perception of organizational justice has a positive impact on intention to share knowledge. The results also indicated that dimensions of organizational justice (distributive justice, informational justice, interpersonal justice and procedural justice) have significant and positive impacts on intention to share knowledge.

[Samad Ranjbar Ardakani. **The Impact of Organizational Justice on Knowledge Sharing Intention**. Journal of American Science 2012;8(2):337-340]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). <http://www.americanscience.org>.48

Keywords: Organizational justice, Knowledge, Knowledge Sharing, Climate

Introduction:

Knowledge sharing is the activity of sharing components of knowledge (i.e. information, expertise and skills) amongst members of a community. It has been regarded mostly in the organizations for the making organizational competitiveness (as a competitive advantage) in today's turbulent business. While issues such as regarding knowledge as a personal property (Dalkir, 2005) reduce the propensity for sharing it amongst the organizational members, it is very useful to have an organizational climate that motivates the individuals for sharing knowledge.

Many researchers have emphasized on the perceptions of work climate on knowledge sharing intention amongst employees within the organization (Blackler, 1995; Bok and Kim, 2002; Davenport and Prusak, 1998) and amongst all, the impact of organizational justice is rarely investigated on knowledge sharing intention. *Organizational climate* refers to shared and agreed perceptions of employees of their work environment. In fact, organizational climate is an interpretation of organizational messages by the organization members.

The term organizational justice was coined by Greenberg (1987) and is defined as an individual's perception of and reactions to fairness in an organization. Justice or fairness refers to the idea that an action or decision is morally right, which may be defined according to ethics, religion, fairness, equity, or law. People are naturally attentive to the justice of events and situations in their everyday lives, across a variety of contexts (Tabibnia, Satpute, & Lieberman, 2008). Individuals react to actions and decisions made by organizations every day. An individual's perceptions of these decisions as fair or unfair can influence the individual's subsequent attitudes and behaviors. Fairness is often of central interest to

organizations because the implications of perceptions of injustice can impact job attitudes and behaviors at work. Justice in organizations can include issues related to perceptions of fair play, equal opportunities for promotion, and personnel selection procedures. Organizational justice is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct. The four proposed components are distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. Research also suggests the importance of affect and emotion in the appraisal of the fairness of a situation as well as one's behavioral and attitudinal reactions to the situation (e.g., Barsky, Kaplan, & Beal, 2011). A myriad of literature in the industrial/organizational psychology field has examined organizational justice as well as the associated outcomes. Perceptions of justice influence many key organizational outcomes such as motivation (Latham & Pinder, 2005) and job satisfaction (Al-Zu'bi, 2010).

Distributive justice is conceptualized as the fairness associated with decision outcomes and distribution of resources. The outcomes or resources distributed may be tangible (e.g., pay) or intangible (e.g., praise). Perceptions of distributive justice can be fostered when outcomes are perceived to be equally applied (Adams, 1965). **Procedural justice** is defined as the fairness of the processes that lead to outcomes. When individuals feel that they have a voice in the process or that the process involves characteristics such as consistency, accuracy, ethicality, and lack of bias then procedural justice is enhanced (Leventhal, 1980). **Interpersonal justice** "reflects the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities and third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes". **Informational justice** "focuses on explanations provided to people that convey information about

why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion”

According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), if the staff perceive the organization as a supportive organization, based on a reciprocity rule, they tend to be more effective in the organization. Based on the above statements and based on Blau 's perspective the current study examined the impact of organizational justice on knowledge sharing intention in Fars Petrochemical Companies, Iran. So, the main question was that how is the impact of organizational justice on knowledge sharing intention? For answering this question, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H: Organizational justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company

H1-1: Distributive justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company.

H1-2: Informational justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company

H1-3: Interpersonal justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company

H1-4: Procedural justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company

Methodology:

Sample

A sample of 242 employees including (62%) males and (38%) females working in different branches of Fars Petrochemical Company (FPC) were selected using stratified random sampling method.

Measures:

For assessing the organizational justice, Colquitt's questionnaire was used. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient estimates calculated for this instrument showed internal reliability; its value was 0.84.

Also knowledge sharing behavior was assessed by the instrument of Bock and Kim (2002). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient calculated for this instrument showed the internal consistency of the measure (0.82).

Results:

The main hypothesis: Organizational justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company. For testing this

hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table1.

Table 1- Regression coefficients for organizational justice and knowledge sharing intention

As we can see in the above table, the $F=124.63$ and $P=0.001$, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the organizational justice has a significant influence on knowledge sharing intention. As beta level is +0.56 so this impact is positive. Also the level of R square is 0.38 showing that 0.38 of changes in knowledge sharing intention will be predicted by organizational justice.

Hypothesis 1-1: Distributive justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company. For testing this hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table2.

Table 2- Regression coefficients for distributive justice and knowledge sharing intention

As we can see in the above table, the $F=87.25$ and $P=0.001$, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the distributive justice has a significant influence on knowledge sharing intention. As beta level is +0.45 so this impact is positive. Also the level of R square is 0.27 showing that 0.27 of changes in knowledge sharing intention will be predicted by distributive justice.

Hypothesis 1-2: Informational justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company. For testing this hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table3.

Table3- Regression coefficients for informational justice and knowledge sharing intention

As we can see in the above table, the $F=86.07$ and $P=0.001$, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the informational justice has a significant influence on knowledge sharing intention. As beta level is +0.46 so this impact is positive. Also the level of R square is 0.29 showing that 0.29 of changes in knowledge sharing intention will be predicted by informational justice.

Hypothesis 1-3: Interpersonal justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company. For testing this hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table4.

Table4- Regression coefficients for interpersonal justice and knowledge sharing intention

As we can see in the above table, the $F=95.17$ and $P=0.001$, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the interpersonal justice has a significant influence on

knowledge sharing intention. As beta level is +0.52 so this impact is positive. Also the level of R square is 0.35 showing that 0.35 of changes in knowledge sharing intention will be predicted by interpersonal justice.

Hypothesis 1-4: Procedural justice has a positive impact on the knowledge sharing intention in Fars petrochemical company. For testing this hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table5.

Table5- Regression coefficients for procedural justice and knowledge sharing intention

As we can see in the above table, the $F=106.07$ and $P=0.001$, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the procedural justice has a significant influence on knowledge sharing intention. As beta level is +0.56 so this impact is positive. Also the level of R square is 0.41 showing that 0.41 of changes in knowledge sharing intention will be predicted by procedural justice.

Discussion and Conclusion:

The current study investigated the impact of organizational justice on intention to share knowledge amongst staff of Fars Petrochemical Company (FPC). The results of hypotheses indicated

that, the impact of perceptions of organizational justice has a significant and positive impact on intention to share knowledge in the organization. The result shows that when the employees perceive the organization more in justice climate, they will tend to share knowledge more and more. Therefore for having a good rate of knowledge sharing in the organization, all managerial actions should be organized toward creation of organizational justice perception amongst staff. Managerial activities like open communication space, innovative friendly organization, and reward system optimization, using transformational leadership styles, management by objective, and quality of work life, compensations, bonus, coupons, and supervisions are all necessary features of creating organizational justice.

Results showed that the dimensions of organizational justice have different effects on knowledge sharing intention. This means that knowledge sharing intention cannot be predicted completely by a specific type of justice. Also the results indicated that generally, 0.38 of changes in intention for knowledge sharing can be predicted by organizational justice. Therefore it should be concluded that other variables also participate interactively with organizational justice to predict intention for knowledge sharing.

Table 1- Regression coefficients for organizational justice and knowledge sharing intention

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std. Coefficients	t	p	R	R ²	F	P-value
	B	Std. Coeff.							
Constant	3.09	0.25		12.53	0.001				
Organizational justice	0.53	0.05	0.63	11.16	0.001	0.61	0.38	124.63	0.001

Table 2- Regression coefficients for distributive justice and knowledge sharing intention

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std. Coefficients	t	p	R	R ²	F	P-value
	B	Std. Coeff.							
Constant	3.43	0.26		13.24	0.001				
Distributive justice	0.45	0.05	0.54	9.34	0.001	0.54	0.27	87.25	0.001

Table3- Regression coefficients for informational justice and knowledge sharing intention

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std. Coefficients	t	p	R	R ²	F	P-value
	B	Std. Coeff.							
Constant	3.57	0.25		14.50	0.001				
informational justice	0.46	0.05	0.54	9.28	0.001	0.54	0.29	86.07	0.001

Table4- Regression coefficients for interpersonal justice and knowledge sharing intention

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std. Coefficients	t	p	R	R ²	F	P-value
	B	Std. Coeff.							
Constant	4.57	0.35		14.50	0.001				
informational justice	0.52	0.05	0.59	9.28	0.001	0.59	0.35	95.17	0.001

Table5- Regression coefficients for procedural justice and knowledge sharing intention

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std. Coefficients	t	p	R	R ²	F	P-value
	B	Std. Coeff.							
Constant	3.77	0.28		16.50	0.001				
informational justice	0.56	0.05	0.64	9.65	0.001	0.64	0.41	106.07	0.001

References:

1. Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A study of relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109.
2. Barsky, A., Kaplan, S.A., & Beal, D.J. (2011). Just feelings? The role of affect in the formation of organizational fairness judgments. *Journal of Management*, 37, 248-279.
3. Blau, P.M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life, New York: Wiley
4. Blackler, F. (1995). Knowledge, knowledge work and organizations: An overview and interpretation. *Organization Studies*, 16(6), 16-36.
5. Bock, G.W. & Kim, Y. (2002). Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing, *Information Resources Management Journal*, 15(2), 14-21.
6. Dalkir, K. (2005). Knowledge Management in Theory and Practice, Jordan Hill, Oxford: Elsevier Inc: 132 -133
7. Davenport, T. H. & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
8. Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
9. Latham, G.P., & Pinder, C.C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 485-516
10. Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationship In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
11. Ohlinger, J., Brown, M.C., Laudert, S., Sue, S., & Fofah, O. (2003). Development of potentially better practices for the Neonatal intensive care unit as a culture of collaboration: communication, accountability respect, and empowerment. *Pediatrics*, 111(4), 471-482.
12. Sveiby, K. E., & Simons, R. (2002). Organizational justice and effectiveness of knowledge work—an empirical study, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(5), 420-433.
13. Shim, J. (2010). The relationship between workplace incivility and intention to share knowledge: the moderating effects of organizational justice and personality traits. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, U.S
14. Tabibnia, G., Satpute, A.B., & Lieberman, M.D. (2008). The sunny side of fairness: Preference for fairness activates reward circuitry (and disregarding unfairness activates self-control circuitry). *Psychological Science*, 19, 339-347.

1/25/2012