



WORKPLACE INCIVILITY AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE AMONG PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR BANK EMPLOYEES OF TELANGANA STATE

G. SABITHA

Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Osmania University, Hyderabad-500 007

Prof. T. Krishna Kumar

Department of Commerce, Osmania University, Hyderabad-500 007

ABSTRACT

In this article, the researcher conducted a survey to know the significant difference of workplace incivility and sharing knowledge among public and private sector employees in Telangana state. The workplace incivility conducted in different types of organisations, however in banking sector there is a scanty research work. To measure incivility in the workplace, the Uncivil Workplace Behaviour Questionnaire (UWBQ) developed by Martin and Hine (2005) used. An instrument designed by Bock and Kim (2002) used to measure knowledge sharing behaviour. The survey method was used and participants contacted by making personal visits to the banks. The result shows that there is no significant difference was found among bank employees in workplace incivility and knowledge sharing.

Key words: workplace incivility, private sector, Public sector, Banking, UWBQ

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In recent past, the workplace incivility received the attention of various organizations - like banks, corporations, educational institutions, health care industry, etc., practitioners, researchers and scientists. There are number of research studies that are conducted to identify and to describe the causes and consequences of incivility among employees of organisations. The researchers thought that workplace incivility has become a serious concern (Lewis and Malecha, 2011; C. Pearson & Porath, 2009 and Cortina et al., 2001). This situation confirms that workplace incivility is an important problem that has to be addressed by human resource and organization professionals (Ghosh et al., 2013). According to a research study of Lynne M. Andersson and Christine M. Pearson (1999) the workplace incivility is a “low-intensity deviant behaviour with ambiguous intent to harm the target”.

In the contemporary scenario, knowledge management systems are an integral part of any organization. Knowledge sharing can be said as an intention of the employees to share their acquired knowledge in the organizations and it is specified by a voluntary behaviour and organizational intention to share knowledge (Sveiby and Simons, 2002). Several studies shows that knowledge sharing improves the organizational performance and innovation abilities in the organizations, such as bank, corporations and government organizations while lowering costs.

The findings of the study of Morteza Moosakhani, Mojtaba Hajizadeh, Ardalan Eyni, Mehrzad Sarfarazi (2012) indicated that the impact of dimensions of workplace incivility on knowledge sharing intention is significant.

The proposed study investigates the significant differences in the opinions of bank employees regarding workplace incivility and knowledge sharing intention.

Objectives of the Study

1. To find out significant difference in the opinions of banks employees on workplace incivility based on their demographic variables.
2. To find out significant difference in the opinions of banks employees on knowledge sharing based on their demographic variables.

Hypotheses:

- H₀₁ = There is no significant difference in the opinions of banks employees on workplace incivility based on their demographic variables.
- H₀₂ = There is no significant difference in the opinions of banks employees on knowledge sharing based on their demographic variables.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To know the workplace incivility among bank employees some of the following studies provided information on performance, effect of demographic variables, etc., of banks. Amna Hasnat, Sundas Naqeeb Khan, Shazeena¹ and Samrah Urooj Khan (2022) stated that the workplace incivility lead to decreased productivity and morale among the bank employees Jhelum and Sohawa districts of Pakistan. Further, the study also states that workplace adaptation adequate the effects of incivility and improve organizational performance. Richa Chaudhary, Madhu Lata and Mantasha Firoz (2021) revealed that employees' age, gender, educational qualification, position, nature of the organization, type of the organization and duration of working hours significantly predict the onset of workplace incivility. Naman Sharma and Singh V.K. (2016) established that moderate to high levels of workplace-incivility-related issues are present in India's restaurant industry. Regression analysis further revealed that workplace incivility is negatively related to job satisfaction and positively related to employee turnover in the Indian context as well. Past empirical studies have established that facing any kind of injustice or uncivil behaviour in the work place affects people's overall mental health (Rai, 2015). According a study conducted by Missy Sintiong and Azizan H Morshidi (2015) found that more than fifty per cent of the sample of bank employees in Sabah, Malaysia experienced uncivil behavior in the workplace. The analysis established a positive relationship between workplace incivility and turnover.

Similarly, on knowledge sharing among bank employees have revealed the intensity of knowledge sharing. Muhammad Bello Ibrahim, Asmat-Nizam Abdul-Talib and Mohd Haniff Jedin (2018) reviewed to construct and proposed a research model that determine sharing of knowledge among employees in banks and its effects on bank services innovation. In another study, Muhammad Rasyid Abdillah, Ching-Torng Lin, Rizqa Anita, Bambang Suroto and Hadiyati (2018) conducted on 200 employees working in banks of Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia with regard to personal attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control which lead to knowledge-sharing intention. The findings of the study of BharathVajan R. and Avinash C.V. (2017) demonstrated females' information sharing conduct is propelled solely by saw behavioural controls through behavioural expectation. Temtim Assefa, Monica Garfield and Million Meshesha (2013) identified a list of individual, organizational and technological factors that needs intervention to improve the knowledge sharing culture in commercial banks of Ethiopia. Sharing and

transferring knowledge is deemed vital for productive behaviour for fostering collective understanding in the organization (Serenko A. and Bontis N., 2013 and Mishra B. and Bhaskar U.A., 2011).

Research Gap: The results of the proposed study are expected to introduce the concept of workplace incivility among bank employees and to inform them of the need to actively manage it. The proposed research can produce rich information about knowledge sharing by revealing its potential barriers, as well as the effects of organizational climate and individual personality in bank professionals. The results of the study attract the attention of researchers, financial organisations and bank management alike as there is no study showing the ill effect of workplace incivility on any forms of organizational dynamics. The results of this study will also contribute to future studies involving workplace incivility and knowledge sharing among various public and private sector banks.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

A total of 209 bank executives and non-executives of State Bank of India, in Telangana state, India was participated in this survey. For this study, workplace incivility is taken as dependent variable and the independent variables is Knowledge sharing. The controlled variables: Gender, Age, Experience, Job Title, Education and Salary. To measure incivility in the workplace, the Uncivil Workplace Behavior Questionnaire (UWBQ) developed by Martin and Hine (2005) used. An instrument designed by Bock and Kim (2002) used to measure knowledge sharing behaviour. The survey method was used and participants contacted by making personal visits to the banks. The research questionnaire arranged to the executives and non-executives with a brief explanation regarding its purpose and objectives. The reliability study conducted using Cronbach's alpha for the workplace incivility scale and knowledge sharing intention scale. The validity is confirmed by the subject experts in psychology and management faculty in the level of professor rank. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient estimates and correlation coefficients were calculated. Student T-test and ANOVA and post-hoc tests were conducted to show group differences concerning perceptions of workplace incivility.

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Workplace Incivility

To know the significant difference among the employees on workplace incivility, the researcher conducted t-test and ANOVA based on different demographic variables such as gender, age, education levels, experience, income, respondent marital status, bank location and type of bank. The results are presented in the following Table 1.

Table 1
Showing the Mean, Standard Deviation, DF and t-test/F value on workplace incivility

Sl. No.	Variable		N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Sig.	Result
1.	Gender	Female	140	45.86	13.18	207	1.212	.227	Not Significant
		Male	69	48.17	12.48				
2.	Age	21-30 years	36	44.58	12.35	208	0.877	.454	Not Significant
		31-40 years	83	48.20	13.52				
		41-50 years	80	45.72	12.54				
		>50 years	10	48.10	14.13				
3.	Education	Intermediate	4	53.75	16.37	208	1.041	.375	Not Significant
		Graduation	116	46.00	11.96				
		PG	87	46.94	14.06				
		Other	2	56.00	13.21				
4.	Experience	Upto 5 years	43	45.51	12.01	208	0.927	.429	Not Significant
		5-10 years	101	45.70	13.50				
		11-20 years	54	48.53	12.33				
		>20 years	11	50.09	14.73				
5.	Income	< 4 lakhs	18	45.44	12.39	208	0.646	.586	Not Significant
		4-6 lakhs	75	45.48	14.58				
		6-8 lakhs	79	48.20	11.88				
		>8 lakhs	37	46.16	12.14				
6.	Location	Urban	139	46.82	12.88	208	0.046	.955	Not Significant
		Semi-urban	50	46.26	13.39				
		Rural	20	46.20	13.21				
7.	Marital status	Married	165	46.49	13.73	208	0.349	.706	Not Significant
		Unmarried	39	47.66	10.04				
		Divorced	5	42.80	5.71				
8.	Sector	Public	159	46.27	13.40	207	0.695	.488	Not Significant
		Private	50	47.74	11.55				

Source: Primary data.

From the above table, it is found that the mean workplace incivility value of the male beneficiaries is 44.86, standard deviation is 13.18, correspondingly the mean value of female is 48.17 and standard deviation value is 12.48. The t-value is found not to be significant ($t=1.212$, $p>0.05$). Hence, there is no significant difference in the opinions of the employees on the basis of gender.

The mean values of workplace incivility of 21-30 years age group employees is 44.58, standard deviation is 12.35; similarly the mean value of 31-40 years age group employees is 48.20 and standard deviation value is 13.52; the mean incivility value of 41-50 years age group employees is 45.72 and standard deviation value is 12.54 and the mean value of >50 years age group employees is 48.10 and standard deviation value was 14.13. Based on the ANOVA results, the F value is found not to be significant ($F=0.877$, $p<0.05$). The results of the research declares that there is no significant difference in the opinions of various age groups with regard to workplace incivility.

The mean workplace incivility of employees who have intermediate level of education is 53.75, standard deviation is 16.37; similarly the mean workplace incivility value of graduates is 46.00 and standard deviation is 11.96; the mean value of employees who have completed their post-graduation is 46.94 and standard deviation value is 14.06 and the mean workplace incivility value of other qualifications is 56.00 and standard deviation value was 13.21. The F value is found not to be significant ($F=1.041$, $p>0.05$). Hence, the study shows that there is no significant difference in the opinions of employees who possess different qualifications.

The mean workplace incivility value of employees who have 5 years' experience is 45.51, standard deviation is 12.01; similarly the mean value of employees who have 5-10 years' experience is 45.70 and standard deviation is 13.50; the mean workplace incivility value of employees who have 11-20 years' experience is 48.53 and standard deviation value is 12.33, the mean workplace incivility value of employees who have more than 20 years' experience is 50.09 and standard deviation value is 14.73. The F value is found to be not significant ($F=0.927$, $p>0.05$). This indicates that there is no significant difference in the opinions of employees based on their experience.

The mean workplace incivility value of employees whose income is less than Rs.4 lakhs is 45.44, standard deviation is 12.39. Again the mean value of respondents whose income ranged from 4-6 lakhs is 45.48 and standard deviation is 14.58 and the mean workplace incivility value of respondents whose income ranges from Rs.6-8 lakhs is 48.20 and standard deviation value is 11.88 and the income is more than Rs.8 lakhs the mean SD values are 46.16 and 12.14. The F value is found not to be significant ($F=0.646$, $p>0.05$). This findings reveals that there is no significant difference in the opinions of respondents of different income groups.

The mean workplace incivility value of urban employees is 46.82, standard deviation is 12.88; similarly the mean value of respondents who are from semi-urban area is 46.26 and standard deviation is 13.39 and the mean workplace incivility value of rural employees is 46.20 and standard deviation value is 13.21. The F value is found not to be significant ($F=0.046$, $p>0.05$). This findings reveals that there is no significant difference in the opinions of employees of various localities.

The mean workplace incivility value of married employees is 46.49, standard deviation is 13.73; similarly the mean value of unmarried respondents is 47.66 and standard deviation is 10.04 and the mean workplace incivility value of divorced employees is 42.80 and standard deviation value is 5.71. The F value is found not to be significant ($F=0.349$, $p>0.05$). So, it can be said that there is no significant difference in the opinions of employees based on their marital status.

The mean workplace incivility value of the public sector employees is 46.27, standard deviation is 13.40 and the mean value of private sector employees is 47.74 and standard deviation value is 11.55. The t-value is found not to be significant ($t=0.695$, $p>0.05$). Therefore, there is no significant difference in the opinions of the employees of both sectors.

4.2 Results on Knowledge sharing

To find out the significant difference among the employees on knowledge sharing, the researcher used t-test and ANOVA based on different demographic variables such as gender, age, education levels, experience, income, respondent marital status, bank location and type of bank and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Showing the Mean, Standard Deviation, DF and t-test/F value on Knowledge Sharing

Sl. No.	Variable		N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Sig.	Result
1.	Gender	Male	140	19.55	3.27	207	0.894	.372	Not Significant
		Female	69	19.97	2.85				
2.	Age	21-30 years	36	20.05	2.99	208	1.025	.383	Not Significant
		31-40 years	83	19.32	3.25				
		41-50 years	80	20.01	2.96				
		>50 years	10	18.90	4.06				
3.	Education	Intermediate	4	18.75	3.20	208	0.294	.830	Not Significant
		Graduation	116	19.62	2.99				
		PG	87	19.84	3.36				
		Other	2	18.00	3.12				
4.	Experience	Upto 5 years	43	19.00	3.76	208	2.948	.034	Significant
		5-10 years	101	20.34	2.48				
		11-20 years	54	19.20	3.33				
		>20 years	11	18.81	4.30				
5.	Income	< 4 lakhs	18	19.33	2.02	208	2.965	.033	Significant
		4-6 lakhs	75	20.49	2.98				
		6-8 lakhs	79	19.02	3.10				
		>8 lakhs	37	19.67	3.69				
6.	Location	Urban	139	19.66	3.04	208	0.021	.979	Not Significant
		Semi-urban	50	19.76	3.08				
		Rural	20	19.75	4.06				
7.	Marital status	Married	165	19.90	3.04	208	2.501	.084	Not Significant
		Unmarried	39	19.07	3.20				
		Divorced	5	17.40	4.92				
8.	Sector	Public	159	19.66	3.21	207	0.222	.825	Not Significant
		Private	50	19.78	2.95				

Source: Primary data.

The mean knowledge sharing value of male beneficiaries is 19.55, standard deviation is 3.27, correspondingly mean value of female is 19.97 and standard deviation value is 2.85. The t-value is found not to be significant ($t=0.894$, $p>0.05$). Hence, there is no significant difference in the opinions of the employees on gender basis.

The mean value of knowledge sharing of 21-30 years age group employees is 20.05, standard deviation is 2.99; similarly the mean value of 31-40 years age group employees is 19.32 and standard deviation value is 3.25; the mean value of 41-50 years age group employees is 20.01 and standard deviation value is 2.96 and the mean value of >50 years age group employees is 18.90 and standard deviation value was 4.06. Based on the ANOVA results, the F value is found not to be significant ($F=1.025$, $p>0.05$). The present results shows that there is no significant difference in the opinions of various age groups regarding knowledge sharing.

The mean knowledge sharing of employees who have intermediate level of education is 18.75, standard deviation is 3.2; similarly the mean value of graduates is 19.62 and standard deviation is 2.99; the mean value of employees who have completed their post-graduation is 19.84 and standard deviation value is 3.36 and the mean value of other qualified employee is 18.00 and standard deviation value was 3.12. The F value is found not to be significant ($F=0.294$, $p>0.05$). Hence, there is no significant difference in the opinions of employees who possess different qualifications on knowledge sharing.

The mean knowledge sharing value of employees who have 5 years' experience is 19.00, standard deviation is 3.76; similarly the mean value of employees who have 5-10 years' experience is 20.34 and standard deviation is 2.48; the mean value of employees who have 11-20 years' experience is 19.20 and standard deviation value is 3.33, the mean value of employees who have more than 20 years' experience is 18.81 and standard deviation value is 4.30. The F value is found to be significant ($F=2.948$, $p<0.05$). These results indicates that there is a significant difference in the opinions of employees on knowledge sharing.

The mean knowledge sharing value of employees whose income is less than Rs.4 lakhs is 19.33, standard deviation is 2.02. Similarly, the mean value of respondents whose income ranged from Rs.4-6 lakhs is 20.49 and standard deviation is 2.98 and the mean knowledge sharing value of respondents whose income ranges from Rs.6-8 lakhs is 19.02 and standard deviation value is 3.10 and whose income is more than Rs.8 lakhs the mean and SD values are 19.67 and 3.69. The F value is found not to be significant ($F=2.965$, $p<0.05$). This findings reveals that there is a significant difference in the opinions of respondents of different income groups.

The mean knowledge sharing value of urban employees is 19.66, standard deviation is 3.04; similarly the mean value of respondents who belong to semi-urban area is 19.76 and standard deviation is 3.08 and the mean value of rural employees is 19.75 and standard deviation value is 4.06. The F value is found to be not significant ($F=0.021$, $p>0.05$). The finding showing that there is no significant difference in the opinions of employees of various localities.

The mean knowledge sharing value of married employees is 19.90, standard deviation is 3.04; similarly the mean value of unmarried respondents is 19.07 and standard deviation is 3.20 and the mean value of divorced employees is 17.40 and standard deviation value is 4.92. The F value is found not to be significant ($F=2.501$, $p>0.05$). So, there is no significant difference in the opinions of employees based on their marital status regarding knowledge sharing.

The mean value of knowledge sharing of the public sector employees is 19.66, standard deviation is 3.21 and the mean value of private sector employees is 19.78 and standard deviation value is 2.95. The t-value is found to be not significant ($t=0.222$, $p>0.05$). Therefore, there is no significant difference in the opinions of the employees of both sectors regarding knowledge sharing.

5.0 FINDINGS

1. It is found that there is no significant difference in the opinions of banks employees on workplace incivility based on eight variables i.e., gender, age, education, experience, income, location, marital status and between public and private sector banks.
2. It is found that there is no significant difference in the opinions of banks employees on knowledge sharing based on eight variables i.e., gender, age, education, location, marital status and between public and private sector banks. However, there is a significant difference in the opinions of both type of employees based on their experience and income.

6.0 REFERENCES

1. Lewis, P. S. and Malecha, A. (2011). "The impact of workplace incivility on the work environment, manager skill, and productivity". *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 41(1), 41–47.
2. Pearson, C., and Porath, C. (2009). *The cost of bad behavior: How incivility ruins your business and what you can do about it*. Published by Portfolio, 224 p.
3. Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., and Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(1), 64–80.
4. Ghosh, R., Reio, T. G., Jr, and Bang, H. (2013). Reducing turnover intent: Supervisor and co-worker incivility and socialization-related learning. *Human Resource Development International*, 16(2), 169–185.
5. Lynne M. Andersson and Christine M. Pearson (1999). The Spiraling Effect of Incivility in the Workplace. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 452-471.
6. Sveiby KE, Simons R (2002). "Collaborative climate and effectiveness of knowledge work – An empirical study. *J. Knowl. Manag.*, 6(5):420- 433.
7. Morteza Moosakhani, Ardalan Eyni, Mehrzad Sarfarazi (2012). "The Impact of Workplace Incivility on Knowledge Sharing Intention". *J Am Sci.*, 8(9):157-159.
8. Amna Hasnat, Sundas and Samrah Urooj Khan (2022), "Testing Workplace Incivility with Adaptation Effects as Quantitative Research: A Case Study", *Strategies Account Manag.*, 3(4), 1-7.
9. Chaudhary, R., Lata, M. and Firoz, M. (2022), Workplace incivility and its socio- demographic determinants in India", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 33(3): 357-384.
10. Naman Sharma (2016), "Effect of workplace incivility on job satisfaction and turnover intentions in India", *SA Journal of Global Business Research*, 5(2): 234-249.
11. Rai S. (2015), "Organizational justice and employee mental health's moderating roles in organizational identification", *SAJG Business Research*, 4(1): 68-84.
12. Muhammad Bello Ibrahim, (2018). Determinants of Knowledge Sharing Among Banks Employees and Its Effect on Service Innovation: A Conceptual Framework, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 20 (5), 39-45.
13. Abdillah, M.R., Lin, C.-T., Anita, R., Suroto, B., & Hadiyati. (2018). Knowledge sharing behaviour among banking officers in Indonesia. *Journal of International Studies*, 11(2): 136-153.
14. Bharath Vajan R. and Avinash C.V. (2017). "Determinants of Knowledge Sharing Behaviour In Banking Industry", *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 116(17), 243-246.