

# Effect of Servant Leadership on Knowledge Sharing: The Role of Job Crafting and Proactive Personality

Maria Anser<sup>a</sup>, Muhammad Anwar ul Haq<sup>b</sup>, Nazar Hussain Phulpoto<sup>c</sup>, Shaista Khalid<sup>d</sup>, Mirza Ashfaq Ahmed<sup>e</sup>, <sup>a,b,c</sup>Department of Management Sciences, University of Gujrat, Hafiz Hayat Campus, Pakistan, <sup>c</sup>Department of Public Administration SALU Khairpur-Mirs, <sup>d</sup>Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Pakistan, Email: <sup>b</sup>[anwar.haq@uog.edu.pk](mailto:anwar.haq@uog.edu.pk)

The purpose of this paper was to find out the effect of servant leadership (SL) on knowledge sharing (KS). Job crafting (JC) was proposed to mediate between SL and KS, whereas, proactive personality (PP) was hypothesised to moderate the effect. Knowledge is an important asset for organisations in order to gain competitive advantage. Although the telecommunication sector of Pakistan is progressing well there is still need of innovation in this sector. As cellular companies are facing major issues regarding KS, managerial level employees of mobile companies from the telecommunication sector of Pakistan were the target population. A total of 420 questionnaires were distributed among managerial level staff. After initial data screening only 267 questionnaires were left for further analysis. Structural Equations Modelling, two-step approach, was used to perform the confirmatory factor analysis and test the hypotheses. Results revealed that SL has a positive effect on KS, and JC partially mediates the effect of SL and KS. PP strengthened the effect of SL on JC and KS. This study has important implications for the literature on SL, KS, JC and PP and gives insight into the relationship between JC and PP. Findings guide the managers to practice SL in order to create a KS climate in their organisations. Moreover, encouragement for JC would also have important implications.

**Key words:** *Servant Leadership, Knowledge Sharing, Job Crafting, Proactive personality.*

## Introduction

It is important for organisations to promote a KS environment in order to survive as well as flourish in a competitive environment (Chen, Chen & Li, 2013). In order to achieve the competitive edge and to become innovative, organisations should make sure that employees

share their knowledge with one another. According to Bartol & Srivastva (2002), KS takes place when employees share their information, experiences and ideas, relevant to their organisation, with one another.

Leadership plays a central role in creating a KS environment in an organisation, and one way to influence employees for sharing their knowledge is practicing a SL style. A servant leader is the one who ethically and humbly serves his/her followers, instead of having expectations of being served by his followers (Ehrhart, 2004). The SL paradigm draws upon a social exchange perspective which states that people favour those who work for their interest (Blau, 1964). When employees are served by their leaders they reciprocate by transcendent contributions, these contributions might involve employee engagement, loyalty to the organisation and KS etc., (Tuan, 2017). Therefore, a SL style might be instrumental in inducing a KS culture in the organisation.

Leaders, who practice SL, can also encourage their followers to share their valuable knowledge by allowing them to craft their jobs. JC means allowing workers to design their jobs in a way which is comfortable to them (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Although all the workers can design their jobs, if the workers have the potential to challenge the status quo they might craft their jobs more effectively. People who challenge the status quo usually hold PP. According to (Bateman & Crant, 1993) proactive people do not get constrained by situational factors and makes environmental changes. Proactive employees are typically involved in JC behaviour in order to make the best match of their needs with that of their job demands (Tims et al., 2012). So they avail the opportunity to behave and act according to their perspective at the work place. So, when there are proactive employees, they make changes in their jobs in a way which best suits them instead of adopting the job as it is.

The telecom sector of Pakistan is facing issues in terms of innovativeness (Hamna & Mahreen, 2011) and the main reason of this problem is the lack of KS behaviour, so this study investigates the mechanism through which a culture of KS can be promoted in organisations by leaders. In this regard, this study attempts to explore the intervening role of JC and moderating role of PP between the relationship of SL and KS. Studies have been conducted in aspect of SL but to the best of researchers' knowledge, no attempt has been made taking JC as a mediator between the relationship of SL and KS, and PP a moderator between the relationship of SL and KS as well as between the relationship of SL and JC.

Furthermore, no evidence is available regarding the effect of JC on employee's KS behaviour (Tuan, 2017). This study not only contributes to the literature on SL and KS, but also investigates JC as a mediator. It also explores the mediation and moderation effect of JC and PP respectively. Moreover, this study might be useful for practitioners because it suggests to improve the current practices and to promote KS culture in the organisations.

---

## Literature Review and Hypotheses

### *Servant Leadership*

Greenleaf (1970) was the first to propose the idea of SL. SL is not just a technique of management but it is a life style that encompasses a natural desire to serve others, that is to serve first (Parris & Peachey, 2013). SL refers to the leaders who ethically and humbly serve their followers, instead of having expectations of being served by their followers (Ehrhart, 2004). The main goal of a servant leader is to serve the employees because they want their employees to feel inspired in serving one another as well as in serving their customers (Boone & Makhani, 2012). Servant leaders strongly focus on personal needs of followers, setting goals and in helping the followers to develop (Sihombing, Astuti & Musadieq, 2018). It could be further defined as an ethical atmosphere that demands leaders to focus on the needs of the subordinates. In organisational context, servant leaders emphasise establishing an organisational climate that helps with growth as well as the development of the followers (Hale & Fields, 2007).

Servant leaders have the potential to enhance the performance of the organisation, as the personal commitment of the leader with his/her subordinates encourages them to achieve organisational goals in the best possible way (Winston & Fields, 2015). This style of leadership greatly focuses on the followers' needs in most reliable and empowering manner, so it is the most suitable style for today's innovation-intensive and knowledge-rich organisations which are concerned with maximising the creative potential of their employees (Williams & Antic, 2017).

### *Knowledge Sharing*

Knowledge is "justified true belief" (Nonaka, 1994). It is the ideas, expertise as well as information which is relevant to the tasks which have to be performed by the individuals, work units, teams and organisations as a whole (Rutten et al., 2016). Knowledge can be viewed as significant and organised information which is collected through communication, interference and experience (McInerney, 2002). In this era, knowledge is as important for the organisation as oil and coal were important during the industrial age (Oye, Salleh & Noorminshah 2011). In fact, knowledge is the lifeblood of any organisation (Asrar & Anwar, 2016), which helps to achieve a competitive edge (Wang & Noe, 2010). Therefore, it is imperative that knowledge be exchanged among all organisational entities (Searle et al., 2017).

KS behaviour of employees depends upon employees' interest. The individual differences among employees related to KS behaviour are influenced by behavioural as well as psychological outcomes (Constant et al., 1994). Tuan (2016) states that knowledge is an important and powerful assets of any organisation and KS is the most suitable way by which

employees increase their organisational knowledge, so it is imperative for the organisations to promote the culture of KS (Tuan, 2016).

### ***Job Crafting***

According to Wezesniewski & Dutton (2001) JC involves all the physical as well as cognitive modification which employees introduce to their tasks while being at their work place. In JC, individuals make all the changes in their work by assuming the risk at the individual level (Tims, Bakker & Derks, 2012).

Tims & Bakker (2012) proposed JC on the base of a Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model. According to this model all the aspects of any job are either demands or the resources of that job: job demands include all the physical, social, psychological and organisational facets of a job which require continuous cognitive as well as emotional effort (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Job resources involve all the social, psychological and physical organisational facets of a job that: (a) not only lessen the job demands but also reduce the physiological as well as psychological cost; (b) are useful for fulfillment of work goals; and (c) encourage learning, growth and advancement in a job (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

There are three ways through which individuals can craft their jobs: (a) increase in job resources; (b) increase in stimulating demands of job; as well as (c) decreasing obstructing jobs (Tims et al., 2012). Increase in the job resources involves obtaining additional resources for the job e.g. feedback or any piece of advice from others, colleagues or the manager. Increase in stimulating job demands refers to pursuing challenging tasks at the workplace and demanding more responsibilities in the case when one has accomplished the tasks which were assigned to him. Decreasing obstructing jobs refers to the reduction of tough and high jobs e.g. work load and emotionally concentrated work (Bakker et al., 2012).

JC helps employees with satisfying these needs as it directly correlates to the fulfilment of all three primary needs which include autonomy, relatedness and competence. Hence, when employees engage themselves in JC their basic needs are satisfied and they are also able to perform their tasks in a better way (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2018).

### ***Proactive Personality***

PP is “a dispositional construct that identifies differences among people in the extent to which they take action to influence their environment” (Bateman & Crant, 1993). PP can also be stated as the extent to which an individual holds a dynamic role orientation (Bauer et al., 2006). A proactive person uses his/her personal initiative to influence the environment (Crant, 2000). Proactive individuals are self-starters (Frese et al., 1996) and future oriented (Bauer et al., 2006). They persist with their activities until they achieve their objectives (Crant, 2000).

People who hold PP are not in control of situational forces and they have motivation to change their environment. So, in order to improve performance, proactive individuals bring changes to their environment through the improvement of the current situation or through the creation of new situations (Crant, 2000). Proactive individuals not only challenge the status quo but they also obtain new information along with practices in order to perform their tasks and to get improvement in their performance. This motivates the employees not only to learn new things but also to promote their skills (Parker & Collins, 2010).

Studies have shown that proactive personalities bring about positive outcomes both for organisational and for other employees. These positive outcomes might include: innovation in term of performance (Chen et al., 2013); organisational citizenship behaviour (Jawahar & Liu, 2016); job satisfaction (Liao, 2015); career success (Seibert et al., 1999); and career adaptability (Jiang, 2017).

### ***Servant Leadership and Knowledge Sharing***

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) provides the base for the relationship of SL and KS. According to the phenomenon of social exchange, the behaviour of an employee is a reflection of social exchange with that of a leader's behaviour (Blau, 1964). With reference to the social exchange theory, people give favours to those who act in their interest (Blau, 1964). Servant leaders are those leaders who give preference to employee's interests instead of their own self-interest (Tuan, 2017). Therefore, when employees observe that they are given importance by their leaders they naturally reciprocate. When employees are led by servant leaders, employees reciprocate in different ways in response to the favours they receive from their leaders. This reciprocation can take place in many ways such as by being loyal and committed to the organisation as well as by sharing knowledge. Hence, employees are involved in KS behaviour as a result of the favours which they get from their leader because they want to support and maintain the serving behaviour of the leader. Based on the above discussion:

H1: SL has positive effect on KS.

### ***Servant Leadership and Job Crafting***

Social learning theory states that people learn different types of behaviours by observing the behaviours of their role models (Bandura, 1971). According to social learning theory, servant leaders, being a role model of their followers, have the ability to consciously or unconsciously encourage the followers to behave in a service-oriented way (Liden et al., 2014). According to Brown & Treviño (2006), servant leaders influence their subordinates to make them perceive their leader as desired role models by demonstrating striking characteristics and qualities. When the employees are inspired by their servant leaders, they try to imitate their leader in order to perform their job. Hence, the social learning theory

provides that servant leaders promote employees' behaviour of JC, since employees would like to modify their jobs in order to accomplish it the way their leaders do.

According to Chen & Zhu (2015), servant leaders make great efforts to offer their resources as well as to assist their employees to learn novel skills and to achieve work goals. This concern of servant leaders helps employees seek more resources in order to handle their job in a better way (Liden et al., 2008). Employees visualise the servant leaders as their role models in order to resemble the appropriate and desired work behaviour (Mayer, Aquino, Greenbaum & Kuenzi, 2012). Servant leaders hold different qualities that might include care for community, selflessness and integrity (Liden et al., 2008). Servant leaders inspire their followers to organise their social and structural resources in a proactive manner in order to resolve different constraints of environment and to restore their psychological engagement through increased job resources (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Hence, under the command of a servant leader, followers may attain same skills and strategies which their leaders own to achieve goals and to accomplish tasks (Szpunar, 2010). So, it is proposed that:

H2: SL has positive effect on employee's JC.

### ***Job Crafting and Knowledge Sharing***

Relationship between JC and KS behaviour can be viewed in the light of theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Ajzen (1991) proposes that people get engaged in any kind of behaviour due to three main beliefs: (a) behavioural, (b) normative and (c) control.

Behavioural beliefs refer to the feelings of a specific behaviour; these feelings could be positive or negative (Bandura, 1977). When employees redesign their jobs, they experience positive feelings about this experience because they were empowered to craft their job (Bavik et al., 2017). By following this positive feeling, they will share their experience of JC with others, hence, will be engaged in KS. The second reason due to which people engage in any behaviour is that of normative beliefs (Ajzen, 1991). Normative beliefs or social norms involve the expectations which society has from a person. When employees are allowed to craft their jobs, they are expected by the leaders to share the consequences of this experience of JC (Bavik et al., 2017). Because of social norms, employees share their experiences and contribute toward KS. Thirdly, behavioural control is inspired by one's confidence in his/her ability to perform any task (Bandura, 1971). Usually, proactive employees tend to have high self confidence and are willing to redesign their jobs according to their own ways, and this confidence enables them to share experience as well as knowledge of JC with others in the organisation. So, it is proposed that:

H3: JC has positive effect on KS.

### ***Mediating role of Job Crafting***

A servant leader gives more preference to his/her employees and they are more concerned for the wellbeing of their employees (Bavik et al., 2017). Servant leaders encourage the behaviour of KS among employees (Bavik et al., 2017). When employees craft their jobs, they can raise the demand for more resources along with the demand for challenging job tasks (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) which might establish the relationship between SL and KS. As employees craft their jobs they share their experiences of redesigning the job, and through this employee promote KS culture in the organisation.

Blau (1964) states that people give favours to those who act in their interest or who give favours to them. Servant leaders want their followers to share their knowledge with others in return of the favours which they received from their leader. Similarly, servant leaders give empowerment to employees due to which they can craft their jobs. The empowerment given to employees by leaders to redesign their jobs positively influences them to share their knowledge with others (Tims, Bakker & Derks, 2015). JC enables employees to do their work in more efficient way. JC makes employees more satisfied, because employees perform better when they perform their tasks in accordance to the ways which suit them (Tims et al., 2015). Evidence confirms the role of JC as: a mediator between employee motivation and job performance (Laurence et al., 2019); between meaningfulness and engagement (Wingerden et al., 2018); engagement and job performance; and satisfaction (Robledo, Zappalà, & Topa, 2019). It is therefore proposed that:

H4: JC mediates the relationship between SL and KS.

### ***Moderating role of Proactive Personality***

SL emphasise that employees share their knowledge but if employees have a PP they share their knowledge more efficiently. As, according to Web (1998), a strong proactive as well as outgoing personality facilitate KS and it is more important to be a proactive person than to be qualified and having experience in order to share the knowledge. Therefore, when employees have a PP they will not only share their work related knowledge with each other but will also moderate the relationship between SL and KS.

Proactive individuals take much interest in learning new things and they like to engage in activities which nourish their skills and knowledge (Major, Turner & Fletcher, 2006). With reference to the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991), people get engaged in the behaviour of sharing knowledge because of the behavioural beliefs and the attitude of a person toward that specific behaviour. Attitude toward specific behaviour refers to the feelings of a specific behaviour, these feelings could be positive or negative (Bandura, 1977). As servant leaders allow their workers to learn new things, this learning will definitely arouse positive feelings about this new experience of learning and these positive feelings will lead them to share their knowledge. Moreover, proactive person are mostly extroverts by nature

and literature has proved that extroverts hold positive emotions and they feel more satisfied when they work in groups so they arouse KS between group members to enhance work efficiency (Anwar, 2017). In addition, proactive people take the initiative to create the resources in order to influence valuable change. Such employees increase the intellectual resources by exchanging different kinds of information. Moreover, they create social support through their interaction with one another (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Frese & Fay (2001) state that proactive employees capture the preferences of individuals for promoting constructive results through interaction with others in order to exchange knowledge and to figure out the opportunities for future improvements. So, it is hypothesised that:

H5: PP strengthens the effect of SL on KS.

Self-determination theory states that employees can cater for their major psychological needs by attaining and pursuing the significant outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2000). When the workers redesign their jobs, they actually change the job boundaries in order to create a person- job fit (Demerouti, 2014). So, while crafting the job, employees should show reactive behaviour in order to influence the work environment effectively. This indicates that employees who have PP play a more proactive part in adapting their jobs. They adjust their tasks with their personal interests and strengths (Bakker et al., 2012). Other studies have also found that employees who hold PP influence the environment (Seibert et al., 2001) as JC is a way of influencing the environment. So, it is stated that proactive individuals are highly likely to craft their jobs (Bakker et al., 2012). The following hypothesis is proposed:

H6: PP moderates the relationship between SL and JC.

## **Methodology**

### ***Participants***

The population for this research was employees, managerial only, working in cellular companies in Pakistan. We selected the sample from outlets in Lahore, Islamabad, Rawalpindi, Gujrat and Gujranwala. Since cellular companies have unified policies operated from their head offices, their practices and culture across the country are similar. Therefore, the selected sample was deemed demonstrative of the whole population of managerial employees of the cellular sector. For data collection, a questionnaire consisting of two sections, one on demographics and the other on main constructs, was distributed both personally and by using electronic means. We distributed 420 questionnaires randomly, only 315 were returned. The questioners received back contained outliers and missing values. So, after initial screening, only 267 valid questionnaires were left for the purpose of data analysis. A brief sample profile is: males 74%, females 26%, average age 36.7 years, and average experience 5 years.

## Measures

All measures were adopted, and were based on a 5-point Likert scale. SL was measured through a fourteen item scale developed by Ehrhart (2004). KS was measured using a 5-item scale established by Bock et al., (2005). JC was measured through a thirteen item scale which is the edited version of Tims et al., (2012). PP was measured by using a 10 item edited scale of Bateman & Crant (1993).

## Results

### Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the correlations among study constructs. Table 1 shows that SL is significantly correlated with PP ( $r = 0.335$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), with KS ( $r = 0.501$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and JC ( $r = 0.492$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Similarly, PP is significantly correlated with KS ( $r = 0.411$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and with JC ( $r = 0.399$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The variable KS is significantly correlated with JC ( $r = 0.441$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Table 1 also indicates the reliability of all the measures used in this study, which is fairly above 0.70.

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Gender	Age	Exp	Qualif.	SL	PP	KS	JC	Cronbach $\alpha$
Gender	1								
Age	0.134**	1							
Exp.	0.114**	0.443**	1						
Qualif.	0.156*	0.241*	0.121	1					
SL	0.353	0.397	0.312	0.343	1				0.819
PP	0.329	0.236	0.273	0.291	0.335**	1			0.837
KS	0.331	0.369	0.319	0.268	0.501**	0.411**	1		0.789
JC	0.364	0.318	0.281	0.301	0.492*	0.399**	0.441**	1	0.901
Stdev	0.355	0.731	2.561	0.837	0.997	1.278	1.117	0.891	
Mean	2.373	25.802	5.41	2.883	3.67	3.41	3.891	3.901	

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to assess the fitness of measurement model. Following the recommendations of Shah & Goldstein (2006), apart from the hypothesised model, two alternative CFA models were also assessed. In alternative model 2, JC was converted into a single order construct. In model 3, all factors were loaded onto a single construct. Table 2 shows that alternative models had a poor fit, whereas the hypothesised model shows a good fit with data as all of its values falls in the acceptable range ( $\chi^2/df = 1.379$ , CFI = 0.941, TLI = 0.924, RMSEA = 0.043). So, all the fitness measures of this study fall in acceptable range and as a result the proposed measurement model provides a suitable fit. Furthermore, all loadings were significant and above 0.50.

**Table 2:** Measurement model fit

Model	Structure	$\chi^2/df$	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Model 1	Hypothesised	1.379	0.941	0.924	0.043
Model 2	JC as 1 <sup>st</sup> order constrcut	3.671	0.833	0.809	0.01
Model 3	Single factor model	4.210	0.841	0.811	0.066

### *Reliability and Validity*

Table 2 depicts the composite reliability of all measures. Composite reliability of SL is 0.949. Similarly, the composite reliability of PP is 0.938 and the composite reliability of KS is 0.860. JC has three dimensions, the overall composite reliability of JC is 0.947, whereas its dimensions have a reliability of 0.882, 0.804 and 0.862 respectively and all of them were in accordance with the threshold value.

Further, the convergent validity was assessed. We used Average Variance Extracted (AVE) scores. It should be above 0.50 (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2010). For discriminant validity, the square root of average scores of all variables must be above the correlations with any other constructs in the model (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Moreover, AVE of all variables should be greater than 0.5 (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Data on all the variables were both reliable and valid.

**Table 3:** Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Constructs	AVE	SL	PP	KS	JC
SL	0.572	<b>(0.756)</b>			
PP	0.604	0.335	<b>(0.777)</b>		
KS	0.554	0.501	0.411	<b>(0.744)</b>	
JC	0.578	0.492	0.399	0.441	<b>(0.762)</b>

### *Common method variance*

Common method variance is important to consider while gathering data through surveys, especially when the same respondents are the only source of getting data on criterion variables as well as on predictor (Podsakoff, et al., 2003). We used the Common Latent Factor (CLF) in AMOS version 21. A CLF was added to the hypothesised measurement model. According the CLF method, all the items are loaded on a single factor. The original structure of the model is also retained. Next, the Standardised Regression loadings without CLF were compared with loadings with CLF. The difference between loadings without CLF and loading with CLF should be below than 0.20. Results show that all the differences were below 0.20. Therefore, there is no indication of common method variance and the data is valid for further analysis.

### *Hypothesis Testing (Direct effects)*

Table 4 shows that the values of  $\chi^2/df$ , CFI, TLI and RMSEA are in accordance with the threshold values in both cases i.e. in hypothesised model (1.663, 0.971, 0.952, 0.037) and when control variables are added (1.978, 0.993, 0.943, 0.051). It notifies that the model including control variables was retained to test the hypotheses.

**Table 4:** Structural model fit

Model	CMIN/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Hypothesised	1.663	0.971	0.952	0.037
With control variables	1.978	0.993	0.943	0.051

Table 5 indicates the direct relationships among variables of this study. H1 proposed that SL positively affects the KS, and the results are in favour of that proposed hypothesis, as shown in the Table that SL has statistically positive effect on KS ( $\beta = 0.281$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) The second direct relationship is the relationship between JC and KS in which JC positively affects KS is also supported by the results ( $\beta = 0.185$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). And there is 25% variance explained by the model ( $R^2 = 0.255$ ). The third hypothesis which states a positive effect of SL on JC was also supported by results, as shown in the Table that SL has statistically significant effect on JC ( $\beta = 0.492$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and the model explained 24% variance ( $R^2 = 0.242$ )

**Table 5:** Results of Hypotheses

Paths	Standardised path coefficients	p-value	R <sup>2</sup>
SL→KS	0.281	***	0.255
JC→KS	0.185	***	
SL→JC	0.492	***	0.242

### *Mediating Effects*

H4 proposed that a positive effect of SL on KS is mediated by JC. In order to check the mediating effects the bootstrapping technique in AMOS 21 was used and was recommended for indirect effects. The Bootstrap sample of 2000, with 95% bias corrected confidence interval was used. Table 6 shows that mediation model was fit to the data.

Table 7 shows the results of mediation hypothesis. The results indicate that the mediating effect was also statistically significant ( $\beta = 0.091$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). It was also different from zero as the confidence interval limits did not include a zero (LCI = 0.035, UCI = 0.153).

**Table 6:** Structural Regression Model Fit

Model	CMIN/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Hypothesised	1.679	0.965	0.939	0.043

Moreover, the significance of the direct path (SL→KS) was checked in order to examine whether mediation was full or partial. In spite of the inclusion of indirect path (SL→JC→KS), the direct path was significant. So, it is concluded that the proposed hypothesis was partially supported because JC only partially mediated the effect of SL on KS.

**Table 7:** Results of Mediation

Effects	Point estimate	SE	KS		p-value	Mediation observed
			Lower	Upper		
Direct effect (SL→KS)	0.281	0.061	0.158	0.393	0.003	
Indirect effect (SL→JC→KS)	0.091	0.030	0.035	0.153	0.001	
Total effect	0.372	0.058	0.253	0.478	0.001	Partial

Mediator = JC, Bootstrap sample = 2000, BC = Bias Corrected, CI = Confidence Interval

### *Moderating effect*

H5 proposed that PP moderates the relationship between SL and KS in a way that when the people are high on PP, the relationship is higher and vice versa. Moderation analysis of this study was conducted using Process Macro. It is an add-on for SPSS (Hayes, 2012). Results concluded that PP interacts with SL and thus enhances KS ( $\beta = 0.158$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Moreover, the biased corrected confidence interval which was obtained through bootstrapping, shows that the results were statistically different from zero (LCI = 0.089, UCI = 0.197). So, we have strong evidence to accept H5. According to H6, PP moderates the effect of SL on JC. The results conclude that PP interacts with SL and thus enhances the JC ( $\beta = 0.201$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Just like H5, biased confidence interval obtained through bootstrapping showed that results were statistically different from zero (LCI = 0.157, UCI = 0.249). Hence, the results prove H6.

**Table 8:** Moderating Effects

Hypotheses	Effects	Point of estimate	SE	KS		p-value
				Lower	Upper	
H <sub>5</sub>	SL	0.265	0.016	0.126	0.301	0.001
	PP	0.179	0.023	0.109	0.213	0.001
	SL x PP	0.158	0.031	0.089	0.197	0.001
				JC		
H <sub>6</sub>	SL	0.449	0.067	0.311	0.501	0.001
	PP	0.201	0.095	0.141	0.253	0.001
	SL x PP	0.193	0.089	0.157	0.249	0.050

## **Discussion**

The objective of this study was to examine the effect of SL on KS with the mediating role of JC and the moderating role of PP. PP was not only used as a moderator in the relationship between SL and KS but it also played the role of moderator in the relationship between SL and JC, whereas all of the above mentioned relations were examined in cellular companies of Pakistan which are one of the most important parts of the telecom sector of the country. The results of this study revealed that JC partially mediates between SL and KS. Moreover, PP strengthens the effect of SL on KS.

### ***Theoretical Implications***

This study has enriched the literature of SL, KS, JC and PP. Moreover, it has added to some of the studies on individual level outcomes of JC. Though, there are many studies which have checked the impact of JC on work engagement (Brenninkmeijer & Hekkert, 2015), and the impact of JC on task performance (Guan & Frenkel, 2018) etc. not even a single study has figured out the impact of JC on KS as is investigated in this study. Secondly, a few studies have investigated the impact of SL on KS with different mediators such as public service motivation (Tuan, 2016) and OCB (Tuan, 2017), but no study has taken JC as mediator and PP as a moderator in relationship between SL and KS and PP as a moderator between the relationship of SL and JC. This study has also filled this gap by taking JC as a mediator and PP as a moderator. So, this study is exclusive in literature according to above mentioned points and it will not only strengthen the previous literature but will also give insight into the unique relationships which are configured in this study.

### ***Managerial Implications***

Organisations should promote SL style as a large number of leaders are still under the influence of cultural or typical behaviour with employees (Christodoulakis, 2015) because of which KS culture might get affected. In the present, competitive environment where organisations want to be distinct from others, organisations must promote KS behaviour to run competitively, and for this organisations are in need of a leadership style that promotes the culture of KS and SL (Podrug & Filipovic, 2017). Moreover, the study reveals that JC leads employees toward KS behaviour, so leaders must allow the employees to craft their jobs because when employees perform their jobs according to their own will, they will be able to perform their jobs more efficiently. So, it is suggested that organisations should follow SL and JC in order to increase employee's KS behaviour. Managers can improve the quantity of work along with the quality by promoting KS behaviour among employees. Moreover, both SL and JC can be helpful for managers in order to retain their employees. As when employees are led by servant leaders and are allowed to perform their tasks according to the ways which suit them the most, then employees not only get satisfaction, but also boost the motivation and commitment of the organisation (Qiu & Dooley, 2018), therefore organisations must use

SL and JC as a tactic to retain their employees. Finally, SL and JC hold a broad perspective for the organisations that want to bring innovation and change, because these two are untapped resources of many organisations which lead organisation towards change and improvement.

### ***Limitations and Future Research***

This study contains a few limitations. First, data was collected only from cellular companies from the telecom sector of Pakistan. So, the results of the study cannot be generalised to other sectors. Upcoming studies can be conducted with different sectors. Secondly, self-reported questionnaires were used, a potential reason for common method bias, though we took ex-post measures. The use of cross-sectional design limits the establishment of causality. Dyadic measures with separation of data collection time point might be opted in future studies.

Another limitation is that KS behaviour was measured on an individual level. Future researchers can conduct team level study for more valid results. The fourth limitation is that only one leadership style, that is SL, was used in this study. Future researchers can take other leadership styles along with SL. Moreover, it can also be investigated how organisational culture influence employees to share their knowledge. Future researchers should also investigate the other personality traits which may affect KS behaviour.

### **Conclusion**

Innovation is the current real need and it is most important for organisations to be innovative if they want to be successful. This study focused on the telecom sector of Pakistan, which is already so innovative but still in need of continuous innovation and that can be achieved if organisations pursue the climate of KS in their premises. The results of the study revealed that SL promotes KS behaviour among employees, whereas JC partially mediated the relation of SL and KS, and PP acted as a positive moderator.

## REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Anwar, S. (2016). A systematic review of knowledge management and knowledge sharing: Trends, issues, and challenges. *Cogent Business & Management*, 3(1).
- Bakker, A. B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations*, 65(10), 1359–1378.
- Bandura, A. (1971). Social Learning Theory. *Journal of Communication*, 28(3), 12–29.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191.
- Bartol, K. M., & Srivastava, A. (2002). Encouraging Knowledge Sharing: The Role of Organizational Reward Systems. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 64–76.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103–118.
- Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Tucker, J. S., Weathers, V., Bertolino, M., Erdogan, B., & Campion, M. A. (2006). Selection in the Information Age: The Impact of Privacy Concerns and Computer Experience on Applicant Reactions. *Journal of Management*, 32(5), 601–621.
- Bavik, A., Bavik, Y. L., & Tang, P. M. (2017). Servant Leadership, Employee Job Crafting, and Citizenship Behaviors: A Cross-Level Investigation. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 58(4), 364–373.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Routledge.
- Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012). Five necessary attitudes of a servant leader. *Review of Business*, 33(1), 83.
- Brenninkmeijer, V., & Hekkert-Koning, M. (2015). To craft or not to craft: The relationships between regulatory focus, job crafting and work outcomes. *Career Development International*, 20(2), 147–162.
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- Chen, C.-Y., Chen, C.-H. V., & Li, C.-I. (2013). The Influence of Leader's Spiritual Values of Servant Leadership on Employee Motivational Autonomy and Eudaemonic Well-Being. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 52(2), 418–438.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive Behavior in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435–462.



- de Vries, R. E., van den Hooff, B., & de Ridder, J. A. (2006). Explaining Knowledge Sharing. *Communication Research*, 33(2), 115–135.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Demerouti, E. (2014). Design Your Own Job Through Job Crafting. *European Psychologist*, 19(4), 237–247.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and Procedural Justice as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behavior Volume*, 23, 133–187.
- Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal Initiative At Work: Differences Between East and West Germany. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1), 37–63.
- Gregory Stone, A., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349–361.
- Guan, X., & Frenkel, S. (2018). How HR practice, work engagement and job crafting influence employee performance. *Chinese Management Studies*, 12(3), 591–607.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River New Jersey: Pearson.
- Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring Servant Leadership across Cultures: A Study of Followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, 3(4), 397–417.
- Hamna, A., & Mahreen, M. (2011). What determines innovation in the manufacturing sector? evidence from pakistan. *Pakistan Development Review*, 50(4), 365–376.
- Jawahar, I. M., & Liu, Y. (2016). Proactive personality and citizenship performance. *Career Development International*, 21(4), 378–401.
- Jiang, Z. (2017). Proactive personality and career adaptability: The role of thriving at work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 98, 85–97.
- Laurence, G. A., Fried, Y., Yan, W., & Li, J. (2019). Enjoyment of Work and Driven to Work as Motivations of Job Crafting: Evidence from Japan and China. *Japanese Psychological Research*.
- Liao, P.-Y. (2015). The Role of Self-Concept in the Mechanism Linking Proactive Personality to Employee Work Outcomes. *Applied Psychology*, 64(2), 421–443.
- Lichtenthaler, P. W., & Fischbach, A. (2018). Leadership, job crafting, and employee health and performance. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 39(5), 620–632.



- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177.
- Major, D. A., Turner, J. E., & Fletcher, T. D. (2006). Linking Proactive Personality and the Big Five to Motivation to Learn and Development Activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 927–935.
- Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who Displays Ethical Leadership, and Why Does It Matter? An Examination of Antecedents and Consequences of Ethical Leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 151–171.
- McInerney, C. (2002). Knowledge management and the dynamic nature of knowledge. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 53(12), 1009–1018.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14–37.
- Oye, N. D., Salleh, M., & Noorminshah, A. (2011). Knowledge Sharing in Workplace: Motivators and Demotivators. *International Journal of Managing Information Technology*, 3(4), 71–84.
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking Stock: Integrating and Differentiating Multiple Proactive Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36(3), 633–662.
- Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A Systematic Literature Review of Servant Leadership Theory in Organizational Contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377–393.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903.
- Robledo, E., Zappalà, S., & Topa, G. (2019). Job crafting as a mediator between work engagement and wellbeing outcomes: A time-lagged study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(8).
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315.
- Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 416–427.
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4), 845–874.



- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Shah, R., & Goldstein, S. M. (2006). Use of structural equation modeling in operations management research: Looking back and forward. *Journal of Operations Management*, 24(2), 148–169.
- Szpunar, K. K. (2010). Episodic Future Thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(2), 142–162.  
*teh2012.pdf*. (n.d.).
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(2), 1–9.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 173–186.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2015). Job crafting and job performance: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 914–928.
- Tuan, L. T. (2016). How servant leadership nurtures knowledge sharing The mediating role of public service motivation. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 29(1), 91–108.
- Tuan, L. T. (2017a). HR Flexibility and Job Crafting in Public Organizations : The Roles of Knowledge Sharing and Public Service Motivation. *Organization & Group Management*, 44(3), 1–29.
- Tuan, L. T. (2017b). Knowledge Sharing in Public Organizations : The Roles of Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40(4), 361–373.
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228–1261.
- Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 115–131.
- Williams, A. W., & Antic, G. H. (2017). Servant leadership and followership creativity: The influence of workplace spirituality and political skill. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(2), 1–11.
- Wingerden, J. Van, Stoep, J. Van der, & Poell, R. (2018). Meaningful Work and Work Engagement: The Mediating Role of Perceived Opportunities to Craft and Job Crafting Behavior. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 8(2), 1.



- Winston, B., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 413–434.
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a Job: Revisioning Employees as Active Crafters of Their Work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179–201.