Abstract

The present study aimed to investigate the impact of organizational socialization, psychological capital, knowledge sharing and trust on employees’ tendency to organizational innovation by path analysis. Thus, 197 managers and experts of standard organization participated in the present study. They responded the questionnaires of organizational socialization, psychological capital, knowledge sharing, trust and tendency to innovation. The results of path analysis showed that organizational socialization has directly positive and significant impact on psychological capital. The direct impact of psychological capital on trust and knowledge sharing is positive and significant. The direct impact of trust on knowledge sharing and tendency to innovation is positive and significant. Knowledge sharing has direct, positive and significant impact on tendency to innovation. Organizational socialization has indirect, positive and significant impact on tendency to innovation via psychological capital, knowledge sharing and trust on tendency to innovation. Indirect impact of psychological capital on tendency of employees via trust and knowledge sharing on tendency to innovation is positive and significant. Via knowledge sharing, trust has indirect, positive and significant impact on tendency to innovation. Thus, the findings emphasized on the role of organizational socialization, psychological capital, knowledge sharing and trust on tendency of employees to organizational innovation.
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Introduction

Innovation as an important issue for people, institutions and for all communities is of great importance due to its relation with flexibility and production (Runco, 2004). Kerr &Gagliardi (2003) believe the most important factor in human being progress is creativity and innovation in all fields. Thus, innovation is an important factor in organizations survival in the present competitive environment. Organizational innovation refers to the creation or selection of an idea or behavior and then its successful implementation in the organization (Tushman& O'Reilly, 2013).

We are living in the era in which innovation, creativity and problem solving ability are key skills of knowledge era (Monavarian and Asgari, 2009). Creativity and innovation are necessary for the durability of any organization and non-creative organizations are eliminated over time. The organization presenting new thoughts likes change and it also can act as a factor to create change (Fakhrian, 2002).

In the present era, this is an unavoidable reality that economic growth depends upon new and innovative ideas. The approaches of social structure consider an important index called innovation in their growing process and consider it as a preparation for the difference among the organizations (Jalis, 2010). Current organizations are encountered with considerable environmental complexities in global economy. Some challenges including flexibility in critical conditions, the speed to fulfill the customers and market needs, operational effectiveness to reduce the costs, environmental issues, labor force management mostly without high commitment and specialization and development of good work relations with various groups of stockholders and shareholders obliged the organizations to react to these challenges. Many researchers and authorities reacted to these challenges by considering innovation in the form of learning organization development and as an innovative and creative organization (Bavku, 2008).

The ability of an organization to create innovation is the prerequisite of successful use of new technologies and accepting a new technology creates complex challenges and opportunities for organizations and this changes the management procedures and new organizational forms (Lam, 2004). It is necessary that organizations apply creativity and innovation. Thus, the investigation of
effective variables on organizational innovation is necessary and the present study investigates the role of organizational socialization, psychological capital, trust and knowledge sharing in employees’ tendency to organizational innovation.

In human resources improvement process, familiarization and socialization of employees is the first step. It is assumed that each employee as considered new in organization should adjust his behavior to some extent and behave based on the rules, organizational norms and regulations and then by educational plans and improvement do some measurements to internalization of required education and provide the required conditions for the improvement of employees (Abasbour, 2008).

Organizational socialization is a process in which a new employee is turned from an external member to an internal member for organization. This is occurred when an employee enters an organizational area (Kammeyer-Mueller, Schilpzand & Rubensteins, 2013). Being internalized is familiarity with organization and belonging to organization. Organizational socialization is a process by which a person learns the values, norms and behaviors by which he is allowed to participate in affairs as a member of organization (Pitts, 2010). The researchers showed that the employees who cannot adapt with the internal organization processes or organizational socialization is not done appropriately for them don’t show any loyalty to organization (Walker, 2009) and they don’t have satisfactory responsibility (Pitts, 2010) and they don’t believe in goals and values of organization (Walker, 2009). Thus, negative outcomes including disorder of performance, demand for job turnover, absence, low efficiency lead to the lack of innovation in organization. Considering organizational socialization is vital as it can develop the opportunities of a person for success in job in work world (Jie & Derek, 2010). According to the theorists of human resources management organizational socialization is job rotation in academic learning and the organization can consider socialization process the cost of skillful management of organization (Gao, 2011). Thus, we can turn the people to active employees and this leads to the organization development providing suitable opportunities to increase competition (Hitsanen et al., 2011).

Taormina (2009) believes that socialization plays important role to help the people for self-adaptation with culture and employees of organization and it has facilitating role in providing the employee demands in an organization. Taormina (1997) states four dimensions for socialization: Learning job referring to the fact that how much an organization creates qualified skills to do the works and duties based on job features; the coworker support referring to the social relations of employee with the co-workers and how much a person is accepted by other employees in organization. It refers to understand the fact that how much the organization, procedures and policies are perceived and it refers to the future visions to the view the employees have to their job future in organization for themselves.

Organizational sociality based on turning the societies in the current era to knowledge-based communities and increasing complexity in organizations and the varied nature of their environment can help the organization for adaptation with these changes.

The new concept in the literature of organizational behavior is psychological capital. Psychological capital is rooted in positive psychology movement. Positive state psychology is the science of psychological positive experiences, individual positive features and positive-oriented organizations (Compton & Hoffman, 2012). Lutthans (2002) is the pioneer of positive organizational behavior, positive state application in work place is mostly considered to improve the capabilities of employees than their weakness management (Nelson and Cooper, 2007). Lutthans (2002) defined positive organizational behavior as the study and application of positive orientation in human resources capabilities and their psychological capacities. He believes that it includes the structures measured and developed and is applied to improve the performance. Positive organizational behavior presents four variables of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience as the potential resources of competitive advantage to invest on them. The empirical findings show that these four factors have high synergy in combination with each other. Thus, by their interaction, a concept is created as psychological capital. Self-efficacy refers to the belief to one’s ability to achieve success in doing the duties. Snyder (1991) defines hope as “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed energy), and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals)”. Optimism refers to the creation of positive documents regarding success in present and future. Resiliency refers to one’s resistance in facing with the problems, hardship, toleration and returning to the baseline to achieve success (Lutthans; Youssef M, Avolio, 2007). Quantitative researches investigate regarding the organizational sociality and psychological capital. In a study done by Jian & Hanling (2009), organizational sociality has positive and significant impact on psychological capital.

One of the effective factors on organizational innovation is knowledge management. Today, the major capital of organizations is their available knowledge. The organizations can be successful who can have the most useful,
valid and update knowledge in their business field and apply it usefully. According to the view of most of the successful managers in the world, the organizational knowledge is the most important capital of the 21st century companies. The surveys among 200 best firms in the world show that more than 88% of successful managers of the world consider organizational knowledge management as their second main priority (Shafia et al., 2007). The earliest definition for knowledge management is finding a way for creation, identification, catching, sharing and distribution of organizational knowledge to the people needing it (Shafia et al., 2007). Knowledge management is also defined as a strategy that should be developed in a company by which we can be sure the knowledge achieves appropriate poepel at appropriate time and they share knowledge and apply the information to improve the organization duties (O'Dell, C. and Grayson, 1998). Knowledge management means achieving and storage of specialization and collective intelligence in organization and using it to promote innovation via continual organizational learning (Meso, & Smith, 2000).

Knowledge sharing is one of the most important and common processes in various structures introduced for knowledge management and people motivation for knowledge sharing in organizations is one of the most important priorities of authorities of knowledge management in the world. One of the main goals of managers in using knowledge management in organizations is improving knowledge sharing among people in organization and among people and organization to create competitive advantage. The effective knowledge sharing among the organization members leads to the reduction of costs in knowledge production and guaranty of the best work methods in organization and the organization can solve its problems. As a complex but value creating activity, knowledge sharing is the basis of many strategies of knowledge management of organizations (Riege, 2005). Knowledge sharing means knowledge exchange and transfer of experience among various organizational units. Knowledge sharing is defined based on the theory of Davenport &Prusak (1998) “The knowledge exchange activities among the organizational units for current and future benefits”. Also, knowledge sharing in organization is occurred in various organizational levels and inside various units or among them as formal and informal (Keshavarzi, 2007).

The study of knowledge sharing is rooted in literature of innovation, technology transfer and strategic management. People power in knowledge sharing, experiences and their skills increases their new services and growth of productions. Thus, knowledge sharing is the pre-requrement of developing technology or new productions (Renzl, 2006). Jian&Hanling (2009) and Lin and Lee (2004) in their study found that psychological capital has positive and significant impact on knowledge sharing. In addition, some researches (Safarzade, Tadayon and HorMohammadi, 2012; Niazzari, Barimani and Haji Gholikhani, 2011; Ferraresi et al., 2012; Hind 2008; Wall (2005) investigated the knowledge sharing and organizational innovation and showed that knowledge sharing had positive and significant impact on innovation.

Trust is considered as another effective variable on knowledge sharing and organizational innovation in the present study. Trust is also an introduction for successful collective action and it also is the subfactor of successful collective action. The work groups finishing a project successfully can show high trust and this leads to the complex and more group efforts (Leana, & Van Buren). Such trust is created by personal interactions with other groups or organizations over time. Trust is created when a society or group shares a set of ethical values as expectation regarding orderly and appropriate behavior (Feldman and Assaf, 1999). Fukuyama (1995) established a link between historical accumulation of trust and productive social capital with organization performance levels (Patulny&Svendsen, 2007). Trust is defined as follows: willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party (Mayer et al., 1995).

Without considering the term trust, discussing about knowledge sharing is impossible. Without trust, most people don’t share their knowledge. Trust is based on two aspects: First aspect is the lack of trust of the knowledge owner to people due to the abuse or achieving illegal validity of shared value and second value of lack of trust of knowledge recipient is regarding the validity and qualification of the knowledge source. Both trust via the knowledge source is necessary as the knowledge recipient doesn’t abuse it and also trust of knowledge recipient regarding the validity of knowledge and information regarding the qualification of Knowledge owner (Keshavarzi, 2007). Most of the researchers believe that knowledge sharing depends upon the trust degree of the co-workers to knowledge recipients and its resources (Holst and Fields, 2010; Dilang and Fahi, 2000; Grober 2000; Lucas, 2005).

Based on the empirical background, a few researches have been conducted regarding the relationship between organizational socialization, psychological capital, trust, knowledge sharing and tendency to innovation in the causal model framework namely in Iran. Thus, the present study attempts to investigate the relationship
between these variables and the richness of the research literature in this regard and it can take a step for tendency to organizational innovation.

**Conceptual model of study**

Based on the theoretical and research literature, the conceptual model of study is shown in Figure 1. As shown, in this model skill learning is considered as an independent variable and the variables of tendency to innovation and knowledge sharing are considered as mediating variables. In addition, job performance is a dependent variable. The study hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Organizational socialization has impact on psychological capital.
Hypothesis 2: Psychological capital has impact on knowledge sharing and trust.
Hypothesis 3: Trust has impact on knowledge sharing.
Hypothesis 4: Knowledge sharing has impact on tendency to innovation.
Hypothesis 5: Trust has impact on tendency to innovation.

![Figure 1- Conceptual model of study](image)

**Method**

The study method is descriptive (non-experimental) and study design is correlation of path analysis. Because in this study, the relations between variables are investigated in the form of causal model.

**The study population and sample**

The study population is the managers and experts of standard organization and approximately 473 managers and experts work in this organization and 212 people were selected randomly based on Cochran’s formula and the study questionnaire is distributed among them. Of 212 questionnaires, 204 questionnaires are responded, 7 of which are excluded as most of the questions are not answered. Finally, 197 questionnaires were analyzed.

**Data collection measure**

Organizational socialization: To measure organizational socialization, the questionnaire designed by Haghhighatian, Hashemianfar and Moradi (2012) is applied. This questionnaire is based on 20 questions. The questions are measured based on five-item Likert scale (strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree =5). The internal consistency coefficient of this survey is 0.88 by Cronbach’s alpha. The indices of
confirmatory factor analysis GFI=0.97, RMSEA=0.028 and AGFI=0.95 showed the suitable fitness of model with the data.

Psychological capital: To measure psychological capital, a 24-item questionnaire designed by Luthans et al., (2007) is applied. The questions are scored based on five-item Likert scale (strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5). The internal consistency coefficient of this questionnaire is 0.86 by Cronbach’s alpha. The indices of confirmatory factor analysis GFI=93, RMSEA=0.063 and AGFI=0.90 showed the suitable fitness of model with the data.

Trust: To measure trust, a 4-item questionnaire designed by Leonidou et al., (2006) is applied. The questions are scored based on five-item Likert scale (strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5). The internal consistency coefficient of this questionnaire is 0.78 by Cronbach’s alpha. The indices of confirmatory factor analysis GFI=0.96, RMSEA=0.032 and AGFI=0.93 showed the suitable fitness of model with the data.

Knowledge sharing: To measure knowledge sharing, a 13-item questionnaire designed by Wang and Wange (2012) is applied. The questions are scored based on five-item Likert scale (strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5). The internal consistency coefficient of this questionnaire is 0.81 by Cronbach’s alpha. The indices of confirmatory factor analysis GFI=0.96, RMSEA=0.049 and AGFI=0.90 showed the suitable fitness of model with the data.

Tendency to innovation: To measure tendency to innovation, a 17-item questionnaire designed by Jimns-Jimns et al., (2008), Peniades (2006) and Projego and sohel (2006) is applied. The questions are scored based on five-item Likert scale (strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5). The internal consistency coefficient of this questionnaire is 0.78 by Cronbach’s alpha. The indices of confirmatory factor analysis GFI=0.94, RMSEA=0.041 and AGFI=0.91 showed the suitable fitness of model with the data.

**Data analysis method**

After calculation of descriptive indices, to evaluate the causal relation between variables, path analysis is used. Path analysis is applied for the first time by Sevil Right (1934) and multi-variate regression is regarding the formulation of causal models. Its purpose is achieving quantitative estimations of causal relation between a set of variables (Human, 2008). Spss and Lisrel software are used for data analysis.

**Findings**

As the analysis basis of causal models is correlation matrix, correlation matrix, mean and standard deviation of the variables are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Organizational sociality</th>
<th>Psychological capital</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Knowledge sharing</th>
<th>Tendency to innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational sociality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td><strong>0.70</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.42</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td><strong>0.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.67</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td><strong>0.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.51</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.49</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to innovation</td>
<td><strong>0.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.46</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, among the study variables psychological capital (r=0.49), organizational sociality (r=0.48), knowledge sharing (r=0.46) and trust (r=0.45) had the highest correlation coefficient with tendency to innovation. The correlation coefficient of organizational social is positive and significant with psychological capital (r=0.70), knowledge sharing (r=0.42) and trust (r=0.57) at the level p<0.01. Trust correlation with knowledge sharing (r=0.51) is positive and significant at the level p<0.01.
Figure 2 shows fitted model of study. The numbers on paths are standardized parameters. According to Figure 2, all paths are significant at the level $P<0.01$. Among the study variables in knowledge sharing model, the highest direct effect is on tendency to innovation (0.59).

As the present study aimed to investigate the mediating role of psychological capital, knowledge sharing and trust among the organizational sociality variables and tendency to innovation by path analysis, the coefficients of direct, indirect effect, total, determined variance and significance level among the study variables are shown in Table 2.

Table 2- The estimation of standardized coefficients of direct, indirect effect, total and determined variance of model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>Total effect</th>
<th>Determined variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On tendency to innovation from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td><strong>0.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.63</strong></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td><strong>0.59</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.59</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.58</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational sociality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.37</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Knowledge sharing from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td><strong>0.38</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.38</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td><strong>0.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational sociality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On trust from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td><strong>0.65</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.65</strong></td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational sociality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Psychological capital from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational sociality</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>0.68</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P<0.01$ ** $P<0.05$

As shown in Table 2, direct impact of knowledge sharing ($\beta=0.59$) and trust ($\beta=0.41$) on tendency to innovation at the level ($p<0.01$) is positive and significant. The direct impact of trust ($\beta=0.38$) and psychological capital
(β=0.29) on knowledge sharing is positive and significant at the level P<0.01. The direct impact of psychological capital on trust (β=0.65) is positive and significant at the level P<0.01. The direct impact of organizational sociality on psychological capital (β=0.68) is positive and significant at the level P<0.01. The indirect impact of trust on tendency to innovation via knowledge sharing is positive and significant at the level P<0.01. The indirect impact of psychological capital on tendency to innovation via trust and knowledge sharing is positive and significant at the level P<0.01. The indirect impact of organizational sociality via psychological capital on trust is positive and significant at the level P<0.01. The indirect impact of organizational sociality via psychological capital on trust is positive and significant at the level P<0.01. Totally, 52% of tendency to innovation variance, 32% of knowledge sharing variance, 42% of trust variance and 46% of psychological capital are determined by study model. The fitness features of path analysis model are shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>df/χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3, Chi-square ratio to degree of freedom (df/χ²=1.81) goodness of fit (GFI=1), Adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI=0.98) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA=0.037) are good. Thus, fitness of fitted model is suitable.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The present study aimed to investigate the impact of organizational socialization, psychological capital, knowledge sharing and trust on tendency of employees to innovation by path analysis. The results of path analysis showed that the proposed method has good fitness with the data of this study and can determined 52% of tendency to innovation.

The results of path analysis showed that organizational sociality has positive and significant impact on psychological capital. This finding is in line with the results of the study of Jian&Hanling (2009). This result shows that the more the organization creates qualified skills for duties based on job features, the people are accepted by other employees in organization and the more the employees perceive the organization, procedures and policies have positive view to the job future in the organization and their psychological capital is increased. Jian&Hanling (2009) based on this finding state that organizational sociality helps the employees to have much trust, suitable job attitude, healthy relations and more hope to future. Thus, by more adaptability in an organization, hope, optimism, resilience and self-efficacy of employees are improved.

Other path analysis results show that psychological capital has direct, positive and significant impact on knowledge sharing and trust of employees. This finding show that the more people believe in one’s ability to achieve more success, they have more motivation to achieve the goals and planning to achieve the goals and they can have positive attributions regarding success in present and future and resist more in facing with the problems and hardship and share their knowledge and information more as these people attribute their success and progress to ability, optimism to future and resiliency to the problems and they trust in other employees and don’t consider knowledge sharing as a barrier to their progress and success.

The results of path analysis showed that trust has direct, positive and significant impact on knowledge sharing. In other words, the more the trust, the more the knowledge sharing. This finding is in line with the results of the study of Holst and Filds (2010), Dilang and Fahi (2000), Groyer (2000) and Lucas (2005). This finding shows that tendency of organization members to knowledge sharing depends upon the trust of the co-workers to knowledge recipients and its resources. Trust leads to dividing information in organization and sharing all people in organizational information, organizational commitment, commitment to decisions, job satisfaction, management satisfaction, exchanges of leader-member and considering staying in organization. Thus, the higher the honesty in work team and the higher the trust of people to their co-workers, the higher the knowledge sharing in organization. Nonaka (1994) states that trust can be vital to achieve a knowledge sharing climate in teams and organizations. Nichani& Hung (2002) stated that trust links the member of an organization to each other to take the method of sharing with others and adaptability with others. Without trust, the members can store knowledge and experience and they don’t share it with others.
Other results of path analysis are as trust on tendency of employees to innovation has positive and significant impact. This finding shows that trust is necessary in an organization. If there is no trust in organization and people are not honest with each other, they envy to each other with their ideas, they flatter and don’t like their co-workers, thus in this way the entire creativity and innovation are finished. Hansen (1999) in the study found that personal strong relations in new product development projects are necessary to transfer implicit knowledge among the work units.

The results of path analysis showed that knowledge sharing has positive and significant impact on tendency to innovation. This finding is in line with the results of the study of Safarzade, Tadayon, Hormohammadi (2012), Niazzari, Barimani and Haji Golikhani (2011), Samadian and SeyedAlavi (2011), Fararesi et al., (2012), Hind (2008) and Wall (2005). This finding shows that knowledge sharing provides required ground for tendency to innovation. When innovation is created that organizations distribute power, information, knowledge and rewards in organization. Knowledge management facilitates knowledge integration among the groups and work units and it facilitates knowledge flow among the groups and the knowledge is integrated rapidly and effectively. Thus, it can be said without knowledge in organization, innovation is not possible. In other words, innovation and creativity are not created alone and they require necessary conditions and grounds.

The results of the study show that organizational sociality has significant impact on psychological capital and it affects knowledge sharing and tendency of employees to innovation by it. Thus, the mediating role of psychological capital regarding organizational sociality and knowledge sharing, trust and tendency of employees to innovation can be supported. In addition, the results showed that knowledge sharing and trust have mediating role in relationship between psychological capital and tendency of employees. This finding shows that organizational sociality is one of the main factors effective on tendency to innovation and it provides the ground for psychological capital, knowledge sharing and trust.

In the present study, only managers and experts of standard organization participated and generalizing it to other organizations is encountered with the limitation. The findings are achieved based on self-report tools. It is proposed that in further studies, qualitative and mixed study methods are used for better understanding of tendency to innovation.
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