The Impact of Workplace Incivility on Knowledge Sharing Intention

Morteza Moosakhani¹, Mojtaba Hajizadeh², Ardalan Eyni³, Mehrzad Sarfarazi⁴

1-Faculty of Management and Accounting, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran 2-MA Student of Management

3-Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khuzestan, Iran 4-Department of Public Administration, Larestan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Larestan, Fars, Iran babakhajizadeh 11@yahoo.com

Abstract: There are numerous studies investigating the destructive work behaviors. Among these behaviors, workplace incivility has become a concern for the scholars and the scientists of human resource management due to its growing pace. The current study investigated the impact of workplace incivility on intention to share knowledge amongst the staff of Namazi hospital in Shiraz, Fars, Iran. The sample included 115 employees selected using random sampling method. Regression coefficients using SPSS software showed that workplace incivility significantly influences the intention to share knowledge. The results also indicated that the impact of dimensions of workplace incivility (experienced workplace incivility and instigated workplace incivility) on knowledge sharing intention is significant.

[Morteza Moosakhani, Mojtaba Hajizadeh, Ardalan Eyni, Mehrzad Sarfarazi. **The Impact of Workplace Incivility on Knowledge Sharing Intention.** *J Am Sci* 2012;8(9):157-159]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). http://www.jofamericanscience.org. 23

Keywords: Incivility, Namazi, Hospital, Knowledge Sharing Intention

Introduction:

Incivility has become a growing problem at today's working conditions in Organizations (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Blau and Andersson, 2005; Cortina and Magley 2001). Anderson, Lynne, Pearson and Christine (1999) have defined workplace incivility as a "low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target". They have emphasized that uncivil work behaviors are distinct from the violence and they specifically are detectable by the lack of respect to the others. Samples of workplace incivility include insulting comments, denigration of the target's work, spreading false rumors, social isolation, and bad manners (Blau and Andersson, 2005).

The volume of studies that investigated workplace incivility is more focused on the causes of this behavior and merely investigated its outcomes. One of the most important consequences of workplace incivility may be the eliminations of collaborations in the organizations and voluntary behaviors (Taylor, 2010). As we know when collaborations among staff eliminate, there is a greater probability for the intention for knowledge sharing (Sveiby and Simons, 2002). Knowledge sharing intention is the willing of the employees for sharing acquired knowledge in the organizations and it is specified by voluntary behaviors and organizational Intention to share knowledge (Sveiby and Simons).

The current study investigates the impact of workplace incivility (with two dimensions

experienced incivility and instigated incivility) on knowledge sharing intention.

Methodology:

Sample:

The statistical population includes the staff of Namazi Hospital in Shiraz, Fars, Iran. Using Cochran formula a sample of 115 employees selected for the study randomly.

Measures:

For measuring workplace incivility the scale of Blau and Anderson (2005) and Cortina et al (2001) were employed. The scale of Blau and Andersson (2005) measures experience workplace incivility and the measure of Cortina and Colleagues (2001) measures imposed workplace incivility by the person.

For measuring the intention for knowledge sharing, the scale of Bock and Kim (2002) was used.

Procedure:

Initially, 30 questionnaires distributed and collected. The statistical tests showed low factor loadings for 3 items of experienced workplace incivility and two items of imposed workplace incivility and three items of knowledge sharing intention scale. So, these items deleted in the next stages of the assessments. Again 115 questionnaires distributed among 115 randomly selected staff and collected for further processing.

Reliability and Validity:

Validity confirmed by the two university faculty members by academic rank of assistant and associate professor. Reliability calculated using Cronbach's alpha and gained 0.86, 0.82, and 0.72 respectively for the experienced workplace incivility scale (Blau and Andersson, 2005), instigated workplace incivility scale (Cortina et al, 2001), and Knowledge Sharing intention scale (Bock and Kim, 2002).

Results:

The main hypothesis: Workplace Incivility has a significant impact on the employees' Intention to share knowledge in Namazi Hospital. For testing this hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table 1.

As we can see in the above table, the F=144.23 and P=0.001, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the Workplace Incivility has a significant influence on Intention to share knowledge. As beta level is -0.59 so this impact is negative. Also the level of R square is 0.38 showing that 0.38 of changes in intention to share knowledge will be predicted by Workplace Incivility.

Hypothesis 1-1: Experienced workplace incivility has a significant impact on the employees' Intention to share knowledge in Namazi Hospital. For testing this hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table2.

As we can see in the above table, the F=99.15 and P=0.001, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the organizational ethical climate has a significant influence on organizational Intention to share knowledge. As beta level is -0.54 so this impact is negative. Also the level of R square is 0.27 showing that 0.27 of changes in organizational Intention to share knowledge will be predicted by organizational ethical climate.

Hypothesis 1-2: instigated workplace incivility has a significant impact on the employees' Intention to share knowledge in Namazi Hospital. For testing this hypothesis, the simple regression employed. The results are appeared in Table 3.

As we can see in the above table, the F=79.07 and P=0.001, so the level of p is lower than alpha level (0.05). Therefore it should be concluded that the organizational supportive climate has a significant influence on organizational Intention to share knowledge. As beta level is -0.54 so this impact is negative. Also the level of R square is 0.29 showing that 0.29 of changes in Intention to share knowledge will be predicted by organizational supportive climate.

Discussion and Conclusion:

The current study investigated the impact of workplace incivility on knowledge sharing intention among the staff of Namazi Hospital. The results of analysis showed that workplace incivility has a negative impact on knowledge sharing intention. Also dimensions of workplace incivility had a negative significant influence on intention for knowledge sharing. The findings indicate that for having a suitable flow of knowledge in the hospital, we need to creative a positive collaborative climate for knowledge sharing. The enforcement of teamwork practices, the preparation of a transparent mission statement for the hospital with the clear emphasize on the knowledge sharing, conduction of educational courses about the importance of knowledge sharing, the emphasize on ethics and ethical codes, re-structuring the tasks organizational structure, and the emphasis on the free communications in the hospital can help to the improvement of knowledge sharing and the flow of knowledge in the hospital.

The current study investigated the impact of workplace incivility on knowledge sharing intention. Due to the critical role of knowledge sharing for making an organization more competitive, it is better to also investigate the impact of other destructive workplace behaviors on knowledge sharing intention. So, future studies may focus on such behaviors in detail. It is also should be mentioned that the most of studies conducted on knowledge sharing intention consider a friendly climate for the organizations. Our study is a distinct study due to the fact that investigated the knowledge sharing process from a different view.

Table 1- Regression coefficients for Workplace Incivility and Intention to share knowledge

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std.						
	В	Std. Coeff.	Coefficients	t	p	R	\mathbb{R}^2	F	P-value
Constant	-3.09	0.25		12.53	0.001				
Workplace	-0.61	0.05	-0.63	11.16	0.001	-0.61	0.38	144.23	0.001
Incivility									

Table 2- Regression coefficients for Workplace Incivility and organizational Intention to share knowledge

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std. Coefficients						
	В	Std. Coeff.		t	p	R	R^2	F	P-value
Constant	-3.39	0.26		13.24	0.001	-0.54			
Ethical Climate	-0.54	0.05	-0.54	9.34	0.001	0.001	0.27	99.15	0.001

Table3- Regression coefficients for Workplace Incivility and organizational Intention to share knowledge

Predictor	Non. Std. Coefficients		Std.						
	В	Std. Coeff.	Coefficients	t	p	R	\mathbb{R}^2	F	P-value
Constant	-3.57	0.25		14.50	0.001				
Workplace	-0.54	0.05	-0.54	9.28	0.001	-0.54	0.29	79.07	0.001
Incivility									

References:

- Andersson, Lynne M.; Pearson, Christine M. (July 1999). "Tit for Tat? The Spiraling Effect of Incivility in the Workplace". *The Academy of Management Review* 24 (3): 452–471
- 2. Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452-471.
- 3. Blau, G. & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 595-614.
- 4. Bock GW, Kim Y (2002). Breaking the myths of rewards: An exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing. Inf. Resour. Manag. J., 15(2): 14-21.
- 5. Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1), 64-80.
- 6. Sveiby KE, Simons R (2002). Collaborative climate and effectiveness of knowledge work an empirical study. J. Knowl. Manag., 6(5): 420-433.

7/22/2012