Factors Affecting Innovative Work Behavior: Mediating Role of Knowledge Sharing and Job Crafting
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Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior and the effect of knowledge sharing on job crafting. Furthermore, the roles of knowledge sharing as a mediator for the impact of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior, and job crafting as a mediator for the relationship between variables, were also examined. This research employed quantitative analysis, including the PLS-SEM approach; SMART-PLS, a measurement and structural equation model was employed to explain the relationship between variables, and the effect of mediation. The population study consisted of all lecturers at the Faculty of Economics and Faculty of Economics and Business at the PTKIN in East Java, Indonesia, comprising 220 randomly-selected samples. The result showed spiritual leadership does not directly influence innovative work behavior, while knowledge sharing directly affects job crafting. The findings indicated knowledge sharing mediates the impact of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior, and the role of job crafting as a mediator for the relationship between variables was accepted. Therefore, this research confirms a positive influence of knowledge sharing on job crafting, and indicates both factors play an important role in mediating between variables, and are important for lecturers' innovative work behavior.
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1. Introduction

The intense competition between tertiary institutions, regulatory changes, and quality assurance standardization by the Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia (DIKTI), demands an improvement in quality of universities through innovative upgrades to educational management.

According to Wibowo (2016), ingenious steps required to raise the quality of advanced education covers several aspects, including legality, value management, accountability, and stakeholder perceptions. These efforts ensure continuity and standardization, and the improvements in quality and image is attained by input advancement, selection of qualified incoming students, enhancement in learning processes, and inventive field research and community service. In addition, a measurement for assessment is accreditation, and based on Government Regulation Number 32 of 2013 as an Amendment to Government Regulation Number 19 of 2005 on National Education Standards, this is employed to assess the practicability of programs and academic units using predetermined criteria. Therefore, the tool ensures quality of schools and measures the readiness of a university to carry out the educational process. Furthermore, evaluation, accreditation and certification are applied to adjust education quality assurance and control to national standard.

The implementation of innovative work behavior is necessary due to the changing environment of higher education, globalization and increasing competition between corporations (Woods et al., 2017). This positive, constructive and helpful social behavior portrays the added value of
employees (Supriyanto, 2019), and is important for the survival of organizations (Hon & Lui, 2016; Kim & Koong, 2018; Li & Hsu, 2016). Furthermore, the attitude is prevalent in customer service-focused organizations, including universities, where there is a need to stay informed about technological changes and for lecturers to be consistently innovative. Therefore, to improve overall quality and performance, higher education motivates lecturers towards generation and implementation of new ideas (Edghiem & Mouzugh, 2017; Li & Hsu, 2016).

Leadership is a part of management function and plays an important role to improve the quality (Adeel et al., 2019). Furthermore, this has the potential to promote innovative work behavior by employee motivation, creation of conducive atmosphere, creativity and innovation development, leading to competitive advantages for organizations (Patiar & Wang, 2016; Schuckert et al., 2018; Supriyanto et al., 2020). In addition, leaders have the ability to adapt to environmental changes, stimulate intrinsic motivation and influence subordinates creativity by providing resources and a favorable work environment (Padayachee, 2009; William et al., 2017; Paais & Pattiruhu, 2020).

Various theories debate the right leadership style to foster innovative work behavior among employees, and previous research emphasizes spiritual leadership as important (Supriyanto, 2019; Wang et al., 2019). Moreover, this style is suitable for organizations adapting constantly to environmental changes, and involves not only intelligence and leadership skills, but also shaping of personal and others characters and morals by continually upholding spiritual values including truth, honesty, integrity, credibility, wisdom, and compassion. (Fry et al., 2011; Sani et al., 2016). Several conducted research on leadership were focused on organizational climate (Stachowicz-Stanusch & Simha, 2013); organizational justice (Yang et al., 2013); employee effectiveness (Wang et al., 2017); and innovative work behavior (Afsar et al., 2019). Contreras et al. (2017) postulates an indirect influence of leadership on innovative work behavior through organizational climate. However, while spiritual leadership is very important to increase organizational effectiveness, there are differences between theory and practice in reality (Ather & Sobhani, 2007).

Generally, tertiary institutions are customer-oriented, and therefore, integration of knowledge and creativity by the academic community is necessary to improve the image of the university. To achieve this, effort is made to implement proactive work behavior through changing and reshaping tasks to keep jobs challenging and motivate employees to execute, known as job crafting (Patiar & Wang, 2016); (Kim & Koong, 2018). This views employees as passive recipients of organizational design, and proactively modifies jobs to suit individual preferences, therefore evoking a feeling of suitability for the job. Consequently, the underlying factor is a fundamental desire in workers to find positive meaning and to build a confident self-identity in the organization (Sengkey & Meiyang, 2016).

Research on job crafting has increased rapidly over the last decade and received large attention in recent job design literature. However, there is confusion on ways to develop the practice despite the positive influence on the lives and welfare of employees, and workplace prosperity. Insufficient literature exploring exhaustively the association between leader behavior and job crafting exists (Rudolph et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017). However, recent studies show resulting increase in work engagement, creativity, performance (Demerouti et al., 2015; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014; Van Wingerden et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2019), and innovative work behavior (Devloo et al., 2015; Tangaraja et al., 2015). Therefore, job crafting mediates the way spiritual leadership affects innovative work behavior.

Lee and Song (2018) posited an improvement in job crafting through intrinsic motivation and knowledge sharing. Furthermore, Lin (2007) highlighted the accommodation of spiritual leadership influence on innovative work behavior by employee knowledge sharing, where a proportion of individuals share information with colleagues. The sharing of information and knowledge results in innovation (Ritala et al., 2015; Almuhl, 2020), and therefore among employees, bridges the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior.

The various contradictory research provide a gap for this study to examine the influence of spiritual leadership on employee behavior directly, and through mediating variables, comprising knowledge sharing and job crafting. The addition of these variables is believed to enable a bridging of the gap between leadership and employee behavior in line with the findings by Van Wingerden et al. (2017); Wang et al. (2017); (Ritala et al., 2015) of a resulting innovative work behavior. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior, the effect of knowledge sharing on job crafting, and the role of knowledge sharing and job crafting as mediators for the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses

Reave (2005) defined spiritual leadership as an observable phenomenon arising when a person in a leadership position embodies spiritual values including integrity, honesty, humility, and creates an example capable of trust, reliance and admiration.

Furthermore, innovative work behavior refers to the ability of an individual to create new ideas while working (Birdi et al., 2016). According to Janssen (2000), this results from comprehensive set of behaviors related to idea creation and implementation. Axtell et al. (2000) defines the behavior as...
as an increased ability for developing new ideas related to a number of organizational jobs, and is aimed as a set of tools for progress (Jong & Hartog, 2007), being a result of individuals facing problems and generating solutions (Afšar et al., 2017; Akram et al., 2018). Also, spiritual leadership is attentive, and motivates increased creativity in employees through innovative work behavior (Afšar et al., 2019). Therefore, the research hypothesis based on the described theoretical and empirical studies is:

**H1:** A better spiritual leadership increases innovative work behavior

Knowledge sharing reflects a social interaction culture involving employee knowledge, experiences, and skills, exchanged across departments or organizations (Lin, 2007). In addition, this behavior comprises information exchange and contribution of ideas relevant to the task (Edwards et al., 2017), and impacts organizational innovation (Kim & Lee, 2013). This is because to complete innovative tasks, employees need to continually gain benefit from the knowledge, skills and work experience existing in the organization. Therefore, to generate new ideas and thoughts useful for organizational development, leaders are to encourage the practice of sharing knowledge among employees, groups, and within the organization (Tuan, 2017; Liao et al., 2018).

Job crafting is viewed as a change to meaningful, interesting, and satisfying work, initiated by employees (Demerouti, 2014). In addition, this is characterized by searching for job opportunities and reducing job demands endangering the organizational development (Petrout et al., 2015). The research hypothesis based on the described theoretical and empirical studies is:

**H2:** An increased knowledge sharing improves job crafting behavior

Padayachee (2009) indicated the need for leaders to nurture and respect spiritual needs by effectively applying practices, to prevent unhealthy consequences arising for individuals, organizations and society. Furthermore, good leaders are required to integrate spirituality with five leadership practices, comprising challenging the process, inspiring a common vision, enabling others to act, setting an example, and giving encouragement.

Lin (2007) affirmed the accommodation of spiritual leadership influence on innovative work behavior by employee knowledge sharing, where a proportion of individuals share information with colleagues, resulting in innovation (Ritala et al., 2015). Furthermore, these leaders have the ability to articulate organizational vision with individual goals, and increase inspirational motivation among followers (Bednall et al., 2018). Therefore, the assumption is spiritual leaders are capable of inspiring employees to engage in innovative work behavior by developing a sense of belonging to the organization, enabling ease to initiate and implement the change process. The research hypothesis based on the described theoretical and empirical studies is:

**H3:** Knowledge sharing mediates the influence of knowledge sharing on innovative work behaviors

Job crafting includes changing and reshaping of tasks to keep jobs challenging, and motivate execution by employees (Patiar & Wang, 2016; Kim & Koong, 2018). Furthermore, the basic underlying premise is an active ability of employees to coordinate tasks based on experience, by making changes to jobs. Leaders play an important role in inspiring employees through the development of job crafting (Petrout et al., 2012), causing a change in work method, better performance and task enjoyment. Therefore, an increased involvement stimulates creation of new ideas in carrying out work (Kim & Koong, 2018). The research hypothesis based on the described theoretical and empirical studies is:

**H4:** job crafting mediates the influence of knowledge sharing on innovative work behavior

### 3. Research Methods and Materials

The data collection technique used was questionnaire, provided to all lecturers of Islamic Higher Education in East Java. In addition, the study population includes all lecturers at the Faculty of Economics and Islamic Business from Islamic Universities in East Java, with a total of 220. Data collection involved the distribution of questionnaire to all respondents. spiritual leadership refers to Yusof (2011), measurement of innovative work behavior variables refers to Kim and Lee (2013), Knowledge sharing refers to Afšar et al. (2019), job crafting refers to (Tims et al., 2012); Afšar et al., 2019). The measure used to evaluate the variables was the Likert scale, weighed according to the items, with a range of 1 to 5 (Sekaran, 2003).

This research also employed quantitative analysis, including PLS-SEM approach, because the concept was to test the modified results of several research models to provide an overview of the variables studied (Garson, 2016). The variables and constructs measurement criteria were based on conditions, including the AVE value > 0.50 (Hair et al., 2014; Supriyanto et al., 2020) and the composite reliability value (CR> 0.6) (Chin, 1998; Supriyanto & Ekowati, 2020). Also, the main constituents of variables are measurement of Cronbach’s alpha value > 0.5 (Chin, 1998).
4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Statistical calculation results

This research stage is to examine the relationship between variables using SMART-PLS, as well as measurement and structural equation models. Furthermore, the reliability test result for each variable, comprising spiritual leadership, innovative work behavior, knowledge sharing and job crafting, had a higher Cronbach’s alpha value compared to the cut off point 0.60. Therefore, the variables are accepted internally, because Cronbach’s alpha needs to be higher than α> 0.60 (Hair et al., 2014). However, the results of composite reliability are declared accurate, where the value is above 0.70. The square root of average variance extracted (√AVE) outcome for all the variables designed in this study to be greater than the correlation between latent types, therefore the instrument is declared to be valid. This also compares the square root of average variance extracted (√AVE) with 0.5. Table 1 shows the results.

4.2. Structural Equation Modeling

SEM using PLS was performed to test hypotheses including direct and indirect or moderating effects.

4.2.1. Direct Effects

The results of the direct effects described in this study are shown in Table 2. The findings indicated that spiritual leadership did not influence innovative work behavior (path coefficient = 0.188, P> 0.000), hence H1 was statistically rejected. Also, the relationship between knowledge sharing and job crafting was found to be positive and significant with (path coefficient = 0.415, p <0.000), therefore H2 was accepted.

4.2.2. Mediating Effects

This study investigates the mediating effect of knowledge sharing and job crafting. For the investigation, each relationship was tested using PLS path analysis. Interestingly, with knowledge sharing found to mediate the correlation between spiritual leadership and innovative work behavior, With the results (β = 0.192, p = 0.027 <0.000); therefore H3 is statistically accepted. Also, the relationship between spiritual leadership and innovative work behavior is reflected by job crafting, with an outcome of β = 0.176, (p = 0.004 <0.000); hence H4 is statistically accepted. Table 3 shows a summary of the results.

Table 1: Results of Instrument Reliability Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>√AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Leadership</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job crafting</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWB</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Hypothesis Testing Results for Direct Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t statistics</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>IWB</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>19.286</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>5.711</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>IWB</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>2.364</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>IWB</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>3.560</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Hypothesis Testing Results for Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Relationships</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t statistics</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL-KS-IWB</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>2.229</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-JC-IWB</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. Discussion

The path analysis on the inner model shows spiritual leadership has no direct influence on innovative work behavior, and this confirms Contreras et al. (2017) findings of an indirect effect through organizational climate. Furthermore, this affirms Jong and Hartog’s (2007) discovery of leaders having an impact on employee innovation through deliberate actions aimed at stimulating the application of novel ideas to support performance. Supriyanto’s (2019) supports the result indicating spiritual leadership does not directly increase innovative behavior. Therefore, leadership has the potential to promote innovative work behavior by employee motivation, creation of conducive atmosphere, and creativity and innovation development leading to competitive advantage for organizations (Patiar & Wang, 2016; Schuckert et al., 2018).

However, the result is inconsistent with Wang et al. (2019) findings of innovative behavior being increased by leadership. Leadership plays no role because innovation emphasizes creativity, and improves performance by idea implementation. Furthermore, innovative work behavior is described as individual attitude aimed at achieving deliberate initiation and recognition (within work roles, groups or organizations) for ideas, processes, and products, and the IWB developed measure encourages creative thoughts. Purba (2009) declares this emphasizes existence of creative attitudes, and therefore, involves the process of changing from traditional to modern attitudes, or from unadvanced to advanced.

IWB is influenced by several factors, including task autonomy, learning opportunities, job involvement, employee motivation and emotional distress. Furthermore, a feeling of comfort with a job results in constant work involvement and freedom from emotional stress, and therefore a greater tendency for innovation (Spiegelaere et al., 2014). In addition, a response of high innovative behavior arises from valuing employees greatly, and is limited when the work done is less valued. The conclusion based on the social exchange theory is leader behavior influences employee attitude. According to Jong and Hartog (2007), employees vary in work performance or showing IWB, and tend to innovate to perform tasks correctly, but stop when judged to be good.

The path analysis on the inner model shows knowledge sharing significantly influences job crafting. This is consistent with Lin (2007) findings of increased innovative work behavior through employee knowledge sharing, where a proportion of individuals share information with colleagues, and results in innovation (Ritala et al., 2015). Therefore, the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior is bridged by sharing and exchanging information among employees, because others access sufficient information to generate and implement new ideas.

The research results are supported by Lee and Song (2018) discovery of an improvement in job crafting through intrinsic motivation and knowledge sharing. Furthermore, knowledge sharing reflects social interaction culture involving employee exchange of knowledge, experiences, and skills across departments or organizations (Lin, 2007), and impacts organizational innovation (Kim & Lee (2013). This behavior involves communicating information and contributing ideas relevant to completing innovative tasks (Edwards et al., 2017). Therefore, to generate new useful ideas and thought, leaders are to encourage the practice of sharing knowledge among employees, groups, and within the organization (Tuan, 2017; Liao et al., 2018).

Job crafting considers employees as passive recipients of an organizational design, and proactively modifies jobs to suit individual preferences. Furthermore, performing this results in a feeling of job suitability in workers and ultimately being bound to the work. The underlying factor is the existence of a fundamental desire to find positive meaning in tasks and to build a positive self-identity in the organization (Sengkey & Meiuyanto, 2016).

The path analysis results for spiritual leadership, knowledge sharing and innovative work behavior show a path coefficient value of 0.192, with a t-count value of 2.229 > 1.96 and a significance of 0.027 < 0.05. Therefore, the conclusion is knowledge sharing mediates the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior, and Afsar et al. (2019) corroborates this improvement in IWB by leadership. Similarly, Wang et al. (2019) highlighted an effect on knowledge sharing and innovative work behavior by spiritual leadership and this is supported by findings of William et al. (2017) stating the ability of leaders to adapt to environmental changes, stimulate intrinsic motivation and use personal knowledge to influence subordinates’ creativity by providing resources and creating favorable work environment. Knowledge sharing is a form of reflection measured by contribution, and the practices and norms increase innovative work behavior under transformational leaders (Mittal & Dhar, 2015). Furthermore, this is viewed as a facilitator of the leadership role, and remains an important key utilized by leaders to direct innovation in employees.

Knowledge sharing is a set of behaviors involving information exchange, sharing, suggestion and contributions to relevant tasks between team members (Edwards et al., 2017). In addition, to complete innovative tasks, there is need for employees to continually gain benefit from the knowledge, skills and work experience existing within the organization. Therefore, to generate new ideas and thoughts useful for developing new opportunities leaders are to encourage the practice of sharing knowledge among employees, groups, and within workplaces (Tuan, 2017; Liao et al., 2018).
The study findings support Lin (2007) to indicate influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior is accommodated by employee knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing refers to a proportion of individuals sharing information with colleagues, and results in innovation (Ritala et al., 2015). Therefore, this bridges the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior because others access sufficient information to generate and implement new ideas under spiritual leadership where individuals share knowledge.

The path analysis results for spiritual leadership, job crafting and innovative work behavior show a path coefficient value of 0.176, with a t-count value of 2.866 > 1.96 and a significance of 0.004 <0.05. Therefore, the conclusion is job crafting mediates the influence of spiritual leadership on innovative work behavior. Furthermore, the research results corroborate Supriyanto and Ekowati (2020) to find spiritual leadership as a process influencing subordinates by creativity and innovation development. Patiar and Wang (2016); Schuckert et al. (2018) found leadership has the potential for promoting innovative work behavior by employee motivation, creation of conducive atmosphere, and promotion of creativity and innovation, resulting in a competitive advantage for the organization. In addition, leadership influences organizational members activities by combining creativity and innovation, and beyond getting a position or power, involves a process of interaction and communication between leaders and subordinates. Therefore, a leader has the ability to work effectively and influence others using personal knowledge (William et al., 2017).

The research results affirms Afsar et al. (2019) discovery of IWB improving by leadership, and Contreras et al. (2017) supports an indirect effect of leadership on innovative work behavior through organizational climate. Furthermore, job crafting is viewed as a change to meaningful, interesting, and satisfying work initiated by employees (Demerouti, 2014) and is characterized by searching for job opportunities and reducing job demands endangering organizational development (Petrou et al., 2015). Leaders play an important role in inspiring employees through the development of job crafting (Petrou et al., 2012), causing a change in work method, better performance and task enjoyment. Therefore, an increased involvement stimulates creation of new ideas in work execution (Kim & Koong, 2018). Also, leaders create active learning environments (Wang et al., 2017), and the work is made more attractive by giving lecturers autonomy and development time. The underlying premise of job crafting is the existence of a fundamental desire in employees to find positive meaning in work and to build a positive self-identity in the organization (Dutton et al., 2010).

5. Conclusion

Spiritual leadership does not directly influence innovative work behavior. Furthermore, leaders influence employee innovative behavior through deliberate actions aimed at stimulating the application of novel ideas to support performance. Therefore, leadership has the potential to promote innovative work behavior by employee motivation, creation of a conducive atmosphere, and creativity and innovation development, leading to competitive advantage for the organization. Also, knowledge sharing refers to a proportion of individuals sharing information with colleagues and results in access by others to sufficient information to generate and implement new ideas. The completion of innovative tasks in an organization requires continuously gaining benefit from the knowledge, skills and work experience present, and leaders are to encourage this practice to generate new ideas and thoughts necessary for organizational development. The leaders play an important role in inspiring employees through job crafting development, and this stimulates the creation of novel ideas in work execution.
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