The study of the relation between organizational justice and knowledge management

Sholeh Mohammadi and Mostafa Emami

University of Applied Science, Industrial Management, Institute of Kermanshah, Iran.

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this study is analysis of relationship between organizational justice and knowledge management. This analysis is based on descriptive analysis and from survey branch. Information gathering means is questionnaire, and in order to organizational justice analysis Chester and Ted (2007) 20 scores questionnaire is used and for knowledge management evaluation is the 21 questions questionnaire of Proset *et al*. For determining acquired data Kolmogorov -Simonov test is used and results confirm data normality. Used test in this analysis are correlation spearman test, line regression test, T-test and Friedman test and with using related test confirmed research propositions; results shows that in the aim community with improving organizational justice and knowledge management in staffs is increased too, line-regression results between organizational justice and knowledge management shows that between inter organizational justice as a independent variable and knowledge management there is linearity relationship.

Introduction

Effective human labor is credit for every organization. Almost all of analyst state that human resources is very basic for organization and they believed that this resource should be improved and with using proper policies we can induce for work in staff, Caldron believes that having qualities human resources in one of competitive advantages not just as a asses, Technology or product with long life cycle. In fact, staffs are potential value of one company,(Chan & Thomas,2003) in contemporary world. Human labor is one the important factor to grow and reliability of organizations. But what kind of human resources? Consumptive human resources, and unpleasant or egar and responsible.

Understanding of role and the actual position of organizations always helps to find an answer for the question that why some of organizations are always successful. Realization of this problem that what factors makes such continuity that it create the possibility of a allegro survival for organizations, depends closely to understanding of knowledge concept and method of application and use of that in the organization (Davoport et al., 2001).

So managers of the organizations with emphasis to smart wisdom can pursue more reasonable decisions in important topics and they can improve performances based on knowledge. Therefore, wisdom managing is more important category than wisdom and it follows how to transfer information and individual and organization learning to knowledge and individual and group skills (Probdt, 2000).

Organizational justice has relationship with proper behavior of staff, so we can interfere it as a part of limited social justice; this concept with philosophers was challenged many years ago. Organizational justice it is a beneficial concept for board spectrum of organizational subjects test. Stated that justice is the first characteristic of social institutes.(mehdad, 2007).

Organizational justice

Organizational justice considers staffing understanding from industries in payment and business relationship in organization environment. Although challenges and study in justice at organization environment has long history and go back to Adams theory in 1960s, researches in this field after 1990s increased, such that important findings captured related to organizational justice. (Cherish & Spector, 2001).

In 1980s considering to researches on justice on trends with such outcomes Tibat and Walker(1975) and Lontal (1980) are important researcher in procedural justice domain, they show that in many cases, such procedures that we allocate outcomes has more important effect than outcome itself, and maybe a person can't receive good outcomes. But they believed that this procedures for allocating outcomes are according to justice and base on correct principles, and they have pleasant sense from outcomes (Charash, Spector, 2001).

In 90s studies on social aspect of justice began. Baiz and Movag (1986) introduce interactional justice that show relationship and interaction quality between decision makers in organizations with staff in conducting organizational procedures. Like distributive justice and procedural justice there are some documents related to interactional justice on view and behavior of staff. There are many challenges on interactional justices and some people know it as a procedural justice and other know it as a independent part of procedural justice, so we summary outcome in table 1. (Chester & Todd, 2007).

Greenburg (1993) introduce some grouping for kind of justice he believed that each of them have determinants on structures and society.

Structural determinant consider to interactions between people and consider to people behaviors with social justice. So interactive relation determine as a dominant in justice so, treat with other peoples is based on open and trust social justice.

Tele:
E-mail addresses: emamemostafa12@yahoo.com

Distributionaljustice : suitable outcome
• Equality:distribution bases of people's cooperation
• Equity: equal distribution between people
• Need: distribution need people
-Procedural justice: suitable distributional procedures
• Consistency: the function of similar procedures for all people
• lack of bias :not considering exceptions in exerting procedures for some people or groups
• accuracy: deciding based on accurate information
• representation of all concerns: considering benefits of all indorse groups in exerting procedures
• correctionability: correctionability of procedurs, if they are wrong
• ethics: based on ethics and accepted norms
-interactional justice: suitable interactions
• interpersonal justice: polite behavior, respectful and based on people's status
• informational justice: giving enough information and explanations to people

Table (1): dimensions and the basis organizational justice (Chester &Todd,2007:724-751)

The major determiner	procedural	distributional
structural	Systematic justice	Seeming justice
social	Informational justice	Interpersonal justice

Table (2) classification Greenburg in organizational justice(Kottraba,2003:45)

1-Systematic justice: consider to structural aspect of procedures. According to this and one decision making procedure in organization, structures are justice if 1) are in according with people and time 2) lack of bias. 3) Decisions make an correct information's. 4) There is a chance for change and correctness in decisions and 5)decisions shows benefits of all beneficial groups.

2-Configure justice: configure justice is one aspect of distributive justice and consider to distribution pattern and outcomes and understanding of that in different conditions. Distribution of bonus is according to needs, industry and equality that contain in this kind of justice.

3-Informational justice: consider to social aspect of organization and means giving knowledge and information to people and prove this subject that concerns and tendencies have been considered.

4-Interpersonal justice: consider to interpersonal justice and social aspects of distributive justice. Interpersonal justice can receive to some results with considering to people. Polite configure behavior and respect to rights of citizens, understanding of people and justice behavior like police and judicial force will increase. (Kottraba, 2003).

With disagreement upon justice structure and division of it, researcher agree upoun, it effects and people's views. When peoples in an organization feels that they receive unfair behavior; so they answer to this situations. (Ambrose ,2002)

Research shows that organizational justice has relationship with important factors such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. (Mcfarlin & Sweeny ,19920; Naami & Shekarshekan, 2001), organizational citizen behaviour (Moorman ,1991; Williams, Pitre & Zainub, 2002). Organizational trust (Sounders and thornhill, 204; Hoy and Tarter ,2004), social asset (Amirkhani and Pourezad, 2000), giving up job and transformation (Parker and and Kohlmeyer,1998) stree and security of staff (Tepper ,2001;

Judge and Colquitt ,2004; Greenberg ,2006) and aggressive behaviors (Jawahar, 2000).

Knowledge management

In the early 1990, knowledge management seriously entered topics of organization, although discussion and negotiation about knowledge had started from a long time ago; in 1965 Marshall claims that a major part of capital includes knowledge. Also, he believes that knowledge is the most powerful engine of generation, so the organizations should increasingly focus on its management. Kohn (1970) insists that knowledge is per see the capital of a group. In 1972, Hubremass points to this matter that knowledge should not beconsidered as a abstract existence, but it's a product based on volition and sometimes non conscious activities of human. (Radding, 1998).

Complexity and breadth of the concept of knowledge management has led that the same attitudes about knowledge management don't be formed. Therefore, different experts have seen that from different angles and paid to define it. Despite this fact, some of the most common definitions of knowledge management are expressed here:

Knowledge management refers to a series of regular and systematic activities of organization that is performed to obtain the larger value trough the available knowledge. The available knowledge includes all experiences and learning of organization persons and all documents and reports inside an organization (Marwick, 2001).

Knowledge management includes behaviors of human, attitudes and capabilities of human, philosophies of business, patterns, operations, procedures and complex technologies (Wiig, 2002).

In another definition, knowledge management is considered as a commercial process with two basic aspects (Future Development consults, 2007) :

- Considering of the element of knowledge in commercial processes: so that the element of knowledge displays prominently itself in all of strategies, lines and employing these principles.

- Creation of intellectual capitals of organization: that includes both explicit capitals(registered) and implicit capitals(individual knowledge) and it takes positive results of that.

- In practice, knowledge management is proposed to identify and characterize intellectual capitals and creating new knowledge to prefer competitive in the global scene outside the organization and to facilitate data availability, share appropriate processes, and obtain information and communication technology inside the organization(Barclay& Murray, 2000).

- Knowledge management is knowledge creating and sharing, transferring and retention process so that it can effectively apply it in the organization(Hoffman, Holster & Sheriff, 2005)

- Knowledge management means improving knowledge word processes. Improving knowledge word requires reduction of top-down interferences. Staff should have freedom and necessary independence in their work until they can utilize their knowledge in problem solving and decision making.

Perost and Rebb and Romhard(2000) designed a model called " The model of cornerstones of knowledge management building" for knowledge management. The designers of this model see knowledge as a dynamic cycle that it is in constant rotation. The steps of this model includes eight subsets consisting of two outer and inner cycles.

Outer cycle:

1.   Determination of knowledge aims: the aims of knowledge management should rise the main aims of organization and should be characterize in two strategic and operational levels.

2.   Knowledge evaluation: the method to achieve specific aims and use of its results as feedback, to aim determination or modification, relates to this section.

Inner cycle:

1.   Identification of knowledge: outer knowledge is analyzing and explaining of environmental knowledge. Lack of transparency, leads to effectiveness of decisions and cause errors to be repeated.

2.   Knowledge acquisition: many companies import a significant part of their knowledge from external resources. Communication with customers, suppliers, competitors and partners in cooperative and collaborative work is a considerable potential for providing knowledge.

3.   Knowledge development: How to create a new specialty? Knowledge development is a cornerstone that it is the processor of process of knowledge acquisition. Its main focus is on developing new skills, new products, and better ideas and more efficient processes.

4.   Knowledge sharing and distribution: How knowledge can be put in place right? Fundamental requirement for data conversion and individual experiences is something that organization will be able to use it. In this stage. the necessary preconditions are:

-Everyone should know how much and with what level of knowledge about a problem and be able to do it.

-How to facilitate knowledge sharing?

It's not necessary that everyone know everything. Therefore, the principle of dividing the people capability in the range of distribution and sharing of knowledge should be defined as significant. Here, the most important step is analysis of how knowledge transfer from individual to group and organization.

5.   Applying the knowledge: How can we ensure that knowledge is used? Concept of knowledge management is to ensure that current knowledge in an organization be used to benefit the entire organization effectively and productively.

6.   Preservation of knowledge: How can we ensure that we do not lose knowledge? Obtained abilities will not be forever available. Preservation and selection of information, documents and experiences require management. Organization have often complained of the fact that reorganization has caused them to lose a part of their memory, hence the selection process, the processes of storing and updating the knowledge that will be valuable in future should be organized with complete accuracy. If this is not done, valuable expertise will be unintentionally abandoned, (Probst,Raub& Romhardt, 2000).

Research hypothesis

According to above aim of research for basic hypothesisare:

•   There is a meaning full relationship between staff understanding from organizational justice and their knowledge management in public organization in Kermanshah.

According to basic hypothesis, 3 sub hypothesisintroduce:

1- There is a meaning full relationship between understanding of staff from distributive justice and knowledge management in public organizations in Kermanshah.

2- There is a meaning full relationship between understanding of staff from procedural justice and knowledge management in public organization of Kermanshah.

3- There is meaning full relationship between interactional justice and knowledge management in official organization in Kermanshah.

Finding and conclusion

Today human power is one of most valuable asset for each organization, so having creative and loyal human resource is one of important competitive advantages for each organization and valuable source for utilizing organizations, meanwhile fair behavior with staff in organization is one of most important effective factors on motivation.

The current period of human life is associated with amazing developments and changes. Organizations as a subset of human life, should be ready to deal with these major developments (Druker, 2002). Knowledge management is a process which helps organizations to find important information, select, organize and publish them and it is a proficiency which is necessary for activities such as problem solving, dynamic learning and decision making. Knowledge management can improve a range of organizational performance features with enabling the company to function more intelligently (Wiig, 1999).

According to article and importance of organizational justice, researcher in this analysis study public organization in Kermanshah and its relationship with Knowledge management of staff.

Therefore analysis of understanding organizational justice and analysis of Knowledge management are aims of this research so with regard to aim of research one main hypothesis and three sub hypothesis gad been tested so H finding is as below.

Finding of first analysis on main hypothesis there is a meaningful relationship between organizational justice and Knowledge management in public organization of Kermanshah. With superman correlation coefficient rate of understanding of staff from organizational justice and Knowledge management is 0.263 and this correlation is meaningful variable and this amount shows that understanding of staff from organizational justice can improve Knowledge management .

Finding of first sub-branch of hypothesis:

There is meaningful relationship between distributive justice and Knowledge management in Kermanshah. Findings from spearman correlation coefficient are that understanding of distributive justice has meaningful level in1% and its correlation coefficient is 0.249, so has direct and meaningful relationship with Knowledge management.

Finding of second sub-branch of hypothesis:

There is a meaningful relationship between procedural justice and Knowledge management in official organization of Kermanshah.

Results from Spearman correlation coefficient are 1% meaning fullness for procedural justice and correlation coefficient is 0.297, and there is a direct and meaningful with Knowledge management of staff.

Finding of third sub-branch of hypothesis:

There is a meaningful relationship between interactional justice and Knowledge management of staff in official organization in Kermanshah.

Result from Spearman correlation coefficient is that understanding of interactional justice is 1% meaningful and correlation coefficient is 0.328, so has direct and meaningful with Knowledge management. Finding of liner regression between variable of organization justice and Knowledge management shows that between organizational justice an independence variable and Knowledge management there is a liner relationship, from 3 dimension of organization justice just interactional justice can analysis and anticipates.

Dependent variable means Knowledge management and this shows that interactional justice in organization is considered so results shows that interactional justice can show 41% changes.

Ordering results for Friedman confirm our understanding and between 3 dimension of justice, interactional justice has 2.89 mean and high rate is for distributive with 2.54 and procedural score is 3.01 is in second row so, ordering results for Freidman shows that mean score for Knowledge management is 2.80 and mean score for all of dimension are emotional Knowledge management (2.91), continuous Knowledge management (2.78) and normal Knowledge management is (2.56) that allocate higher and lower rate to themselves, so all of them are above mean level.

Reference:
1. Charash,V.C & Spector, P.E (2001)."The Role of Justice in Organizations.a Meta- Analysis", Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,Vol 80,278.
2. Chester S. Spell, Tood J. Arnold (2007). "Amulti – level analysis of organizational justice climate, structure and employ mental health", Journal of Management, Vol.33, No.5, pp.724-751.
3. Filipo, Edwin. B(1987),"personnel management", sixth edition, Mcgrow-hill, international edition.
4. Fields, Mitchell W & Thacker, James W(2009):" Influence of Quality of Work Life on Company and Union Commitment" Academy of Management Journal.
5. Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(1): 58-69.
6. Hian, C. C, and Enstein, W.O (1990): " Quality of Work Life: What can Unions Do?" Advanced Management Journal, Vol 55, No 2.
7. Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., Hayes, T.L., (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology 87 (2), 268–279.
8. Kottraba, carin (2003) "the relationship between organizational justice, employee absenteeism and rele stress", A dissertation presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree doctor of philosophy of faculty of the California.
9. Moorman, R.H., (1991). "Relationship between organizational justice and workplace mediation: a six-factor model" International Journal of Conflict Management Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 148-174.
10.Nonaka, I; Takeuchi, H,(1995)"The Knowledge- Creating Company", Oxford University Press, Oxford.
11.Wiig, Karl M,(2000)" New generation knowledge management": What may we expect?" knowledge Research Institute Inch. Pp. 1-9.