



Kent Academic Repository

Usman, M., Ali, M., Ogbonnaya, C. and Babalola, M.T. (2021) *Fueling the intrapreneurial spirit: A closer look at how spiritual leadership motivates employee intrapreneurial behaviors*. *Tourism Management*, 83 . ISSN 0261-5177.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/92857/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104227>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives)

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal* , Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Fueling the Intrapreneurial Spirit: A Closer Look at How Spiritual leadership Motivates Employee Intrapreneurial Behaviors

Abstract

This study enriches the hospitality literature by testing a theoretical model on the direct and indirect (via psychological empowerment) relationships between spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behaviors among hotels' frontline employees. The study also tests the moderating role of work centrality, both in terms of the direct and indirect (via psychological empowerment) relationships between spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behavior. Using time-lagged (two waves, two months apart) survey data from 204 employees and 48 supervisors in 48 hotels, our results show that spiritual leadership is positively associated with frontline employees' psychological empowerment, which in turn increases intrapreneurial behaviors. We also find evidence that work centrality increases the strength of these positive relationships. Our results thus provide new leadership-related insights on how spiritual leadership motivates hotels' frontline employees to depart from customary ways of performing their jobs, towards seeking new opportunities to create value for the organization. We suggest that managers, through their vision, altruistic love, and faith, can indeed inspire feelings of empowerment among frontline employees and encourage them to engage in intrapreneurial behaviors.

Keywords. Spiritual leadership; psychological empowerment; intrapreneurial behavior; work centrality; hospitality industry

1. Introduction

The hospitality industry is uniquely complex as its services are usually high-contact. The delivery process is inherently heterogeneous, uncertain (Ndou, Mele, & Del Vecchio, 2019), and often jointly provided by multiple actors through processes that evolve consistently (Calisto, 2015). The hospitality industry is also characterized by service-specific features, including a simultaneous production and consumption of services, intangibility, and inconsistent delivery performance that add to its complexity and indicate the volatile nature of its services (Ndou et al., 2019; Kirillova, Fu, & Kucukusta, 2020). Importantly, the hospitality industry is exposed to several threats, including local food inedibility, political unrest, natural disasters, weather conditions, security issues, and crime (Fuchs, 2013; Karl, 2018). These conditions affect tourists' perceived risk levels, decision making, and tour plans, which, in many cases, impede hospitality firms' growth and performance (Fuchs, 2013; Karl, 2018). To survive in such a volatile and challenging business environment, employees in hospitality firms need to demonstrate autonomous motivation to go beyond job norms to engage in creativity, innovation, discovery, and exploitation of opportunities (Calisto, 2015; Thomas & Wood, 2015). Calisto (2015) argues that employees' autonomous motivation to challenge existing norms, engage in creativity and innovation, and endeavor to explore and exploit opportunities are the key aspects of intrapreneurship, which can help hospitality firms adapt to their complex and volatile business environment, meet challenging customers' demands, and respond to the competitive pressure to gain a foothold in the market.

Despite the strategic importance of employees' intrapreneurial behaviors in driving the growth and competitiveness of hospitality firms (Calisto, 2015), we know little about the antecedents of such behaviors. Although prior hospitality research has examined leadership as an

important driver of hospitality employees' extra-role behaviors, such as citizenship behavior (Qiu, Alizadeh, Dooley, & Zhang, 2019), creativity (Wang, Tsai, & Tsai, 2014), and innovative work behavior (Schuckert, Kim, Paek, & Lee, 2018), there is, surprisingly, a paucity of research on the association of leadership with hospitality employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. This represents a notable research gap, as the role of leadership in promoting hospitality employees' extra-role behaviors remains insufficiently understood. To our knowledge, only two studies (Moriano, Molero, Topa, & Mangin, 2014; Valsania, Moriano, & Molero, 2016) have explored the links between leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behavior. Both studies highlight the positive effects that transformational and authentic leadership have on intrapreneurial behavior and subsequently urged scholars to explore the link between other positive leadership styles and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. Such research considerations are needed, as they would provide the hospitality and tourism discipline with recommendations as to when and why leaders may encourage this important employee behavior.

Accordingly, to address these critical research gaps, we draw on spiritual leadership theory (Fry, Vitucci, & Cedillo, 2005) to empirically examine a model that links spiritual leadership with hospitality firms' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. In so doing, we advance the nomological network of antecedents associated with employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. Spiritual leadership is considered in this study because some of its key attributes are not only distinct from other related leadership styles (e.g., charismatic, servant, and transformational leadership styles) but also imperative for hospitality firms, their employees, and customers. For instance, transformational and charismatic leadership styles focus on developing a vision that inspires followers' optimism about future goal attainment; however, they tend to overlook the importance of followers' spiritual values and needs (Boorom, 2009; Nicolae, Ion, &

Nicolae, 2013). Extant hospitality literature suggests that the satisfaction of employees' spiritual needs shapes the essence of hospitality – i.e., employees' hospitable behavior, which refers to their altruistic behaviors and genuine care and concerns for customers (Golubovskaya, Robinson, & Solnet, 2017; Nicolaidis, 2018). A tendency to ignore employees' spiritual needs in the hospitality context can therefore lead to a decline in the essence of hospitality (Nicolaidis, 2018), as well as a reduction in employees' capacity to demonstrate genuine care, empathy, interconnectedness, and compassion (Killinger, 2006). In this vein, spiritual leadership encourages social, ethical, and spiritual values along with rational determinants in decision-making, and in so doing, develops employees' vision and satisfies their spiritual needs (Fry, 2003; Yang, Liu, Wang, & Zhang, 2019). Such positive attributes make spiritual leadership a unique leadership style (Ali, Aziz, Pham, Babalola, & Usman, 2020; Fry, 2003; Beazley & Gemmill, 2006; Boorom, 2009; Nicolae et al., 2013) that can be useful in fulfilling both the business and spiritual essence of hospitality, and as such enhance employees' intrapreneurial behaviors.

To facilitate a better understanding of the link of spiritual leadership with employees' intrapreneurial behaviors, we consider psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995) as a key mediator. The role of psychological empowerment is critical, as, first, the hospitality industry is often characterized by long working hours, poor treatment of employees, hierarchical controls, and centralized decision-making (Øgaard, Marnburg, & Larsen, 2008), which can undermine employees' customer service performance (Jha & Nair, 2008). Second, psychological empowerment enables employees to identify and satisfy customers' differing preferences or expectations, thereby encouraging better service delivery and customer satisfaction (Huertas-Valdivia, Gallego-Burín, & Lloréns-Montes, 2019; Namasivayam, Guchait, & Lei, 2014). Third,

feelings of empowerment encourage proactiveness and risk-taking abilities (Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), with positive implications for employees' intrapreneurial behaviors and ultimately the performance and competitiveness of hospitality firms (Stull & Singh, 2005; Valsania et al., 2016). Fourth, our focus on psychological empowerment concurs with recent calls to explore the role of psychological empowerment as an underlying mechanism between positive leadership styles (e.g., spiritual leadership) and hospitality employees' engagement in positive work behaviors (Huertas-Valdivia et al., 2019).

Furthermore, we integrate spiritual leadership theory with identity theory (Stryker, 1980; 1987) to identify and test the moderating effects of work centrality (Hirschfeld & Feild, 2000; Kanungo, 1982) on the direct and indirect (via psychological empowerment) relationships between spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behavior. Although previous studies have linked work centrality to several favorable outcomes, including commitment, work engagement, job performance, and citizenship behavior (Bal & Kooij, 2011; Diefendorff et al., 2002; Hirschfeld & Feild, 2000; Kanungo, 1982), research has barely explored its relevance in the hospitality context (see Jung & Yoon, 2016; Park & Gursoy, 2012 for exemptions). These are critical omissions, as extant literature (e.g., Highhouse, Zickar, & Yankelevich, 2010; Twenge & Kasser, 2013), including the hospitality literature (Gursoy, Chi, & Karadag, 2013; Park & Gursoy, 2012) argue that people are now placing less importance on work than in the past, suggesting a decline in work centrality. According to Gursoy et al. (2013, p. 47) "boomers live to work. Millennials work to live". It is therefore important to explore how work centrality may affect leadership's influence on employees' psychological empowerment and intrapreneurial behaviors to facilitate appropriate managerial interventions (Gursoy et al., 2013; Park & Gursoy, 2012) that has largely been ignored so far. Our proposed model is presented in Figure 1.

Our research makes several theoretical contributions. First, we provide novel insights by highlighting the importance of spiritual leadership in facilitating employees' intrapreneurial behaviors for hospitality firms' competitiveness. Compared to existing hospitality research (Schuckert et al., 2018; Qiu et al., 2019), which has mainly focused on employees' creativity, innovative behaviors, and citizenship behavior, we apply spiritual leadership theory in addressing a critical, yet overlooked, aspect of employees' extra-role behavior. In doing so, we contribute to the existing literature (e.g., Moriano et al., 2014; Valsania et al., 2016) on leadership-employees' intrapreneurial behavior link. Second, we foreground psychological empowerment as a mechanism explaining why spiritual leadership positively influences employees' intrapreneurial behavior link, thus reflecting the need to improve hospitality employees' active engagement in their work roles by enhancing their sense of self-control. Third, by exploring the role of work centrality as a moderator of the spiritual leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors link, our study enhances knowledge as to why some employees, relative to their counterparts, are expected to benefit more from spiritual leaders' benevolent attributes. In other words, our study brings to the fore the consequences of a relatively important, yet overlooked, individual-level factor that could potentially improve intrapreneurial behaviors.

Insert Figure 1 about here

2. Hypotheses development

2.1. Hotels' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors

Intrapreneurial behavior is a unique type of extra-role behavior that instigates individuals to depart from customary ways of performing their work roles and instead seek new

opportunities(e.g., novel practices for improving products and services) to create value for the organization (Gawke, Gorgievski, & Bakker, 2019; Stull & Singh, 2005; Valsania et al., 2016). As a higher-order construct, employees' intrapreneurial behavior is characterized by risk-taking behavior, innovativeness, and proactiveness (Stull & Singh, 2005; Valsania et al., 2016). Proactiveness refers to an individual's autonomous future-oriented actions that aim to challenge and improve oneself by anticipating and countering future challenges instead of waiting for such challenges to emerge (Calisto, 2015; Valsania et al., 2016). Innovativeness refers to an individual's ability to develop or embrace creative ideas, new technologies, and practices towards improving current processes, products, and services, or changing the nature of existing processes, products, and services (Moriano et al., 2014). Risk-taking refers to an individual's willingness to venture into the activities where the outcome may be unknown or uncertain (Stull & Singh, 2005; Valsania et al., 2016).

The concept of intrapreneurial behavior is characteristically different and broader in scope from other types of extra-role behaviors (e.g., creativity, innovative work behavior, and citizenship behavior), both in terms of its antecedents and outcomes (Gawke, Gorgievski, & Bakker, 2018; Valsania et al., 2016). For example, creativity focuses on the production of a new and useful idea (Wang et al., 2014), while innovative behavior entails the creation of new services, processes, and products (Gawke et al., 2018). Also, citizenship behaviors are aimed at promoting the organization's effective functioning (Valsania et al., 2016). Compared to these constructs, intrapreneurial behaviors entail not only employees' tendency to innovate and generate new ideas but also a broad range of replicative behaviors, such as searching for and seizing potential opportunities to tackle difficult problems (Stull & Singh, 2005; Valsania et al., 2016; Gawke et al., 2018). For instance, the expansion of existing services in new markets and

the adoption of a European model of service quality by a Pakistani hotel may not be categorized as a novel idea or innovation; however, these practices constitute an important aspect of intrapreneurial behaviors. In sum, hospitality employees' intrapreneurial behaviors encompass proactive engagement towards identifying customers' implicit needs and taking the risk to offer both innovative and replicative services to satisfy such needs that can be instrumental for improving service performance and ultimately contributing to hospitality firms' growth and competitiveness.

In the present study, we focus our investigation on frontline employees. They are key agents of the service delivery process due to their direct interactions with customers, managers, and other employees involved in service delivery (Kim, Yoo, Lee, & Kim, 2012). Indeed, the quality of interactions between frontline employees and customers has important implications for customer retention and loyalty (Chen, Chang, & Wang, 2019). As a result, scholars have suggested that the experiences of frontline employees should be placed at the heart of the corporate strategy of hospitality organizations (e.g., Kim et al., 2012). Through their proactive engagement with customers, frontline employees as intrapreneurs play an imperative role in identifying customers' implicit service expectations (Calisto, 2015) and offering customized, improved, or innovative solutions towards addressing customers' needs and expectations.

2.2.Spiritual leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behavior

Spiritual leadership is defined as “*comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate one's self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership*” (Fry, 2003, p. 711). Vision, hope/faith, and altruistic love are fundamental building blocks of spiritual leadership. Spiritual leaders are also visionary

and future-oriented (Fry, 2003; Fry & Egel, 2017) and tend to put in place clear guidelines and working procedures to ensure employees are on board with their vision (Yang & Fry, 2018). A clearly articulated vision gives meaning to employees' work, energizes them, and makes them committed to the organization (Presbitero & Teng-Calleja, 2019; Schuckert et al., 2018). Leaders' vision shapes employees' strategic orientation and, importantly, aligns employees' work role and organizational strategic priorities that make employees proactive (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019; Presbitero & Teng-Calleja, 2019; Schuckert et al., 2018). Proactiveness enables employees to understand customers' tacit needs and establish stronger relationships with their leaders, peers, and customers. It also helps employees better understand customers' demands, ensure high-quality service, and cope with future service challenges (Raub & Laio, 2012).

Additionally, the hospitality literature suggests that customers perceive hospitality more than mere eating and sleeping (Golubovskaya et al., 2017; Nicolaides, 2018), and their service expectations are often tacit and difficult to identify (Karlson, 2018). The inability to identify customers' tacit service expectations may thus constitute a service failure likely to increase customer dissatisfaction and deterioration in the firms' customer base (Golubovskaya et al., 2017; Nicolaides, 2018). Prior hospitality literature suggests that spiritual leadership develops a transcendent vision, inculcates a sense of faith/hope among employees, creates an overall culture of love that improves followers' intrinsic motivation, and satisfies their spiritual needs (Presbitero & Teng-Calleja, 2019; Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019). In doing so, spiritual leaders actively shape hotel employees' sense of calling and membership, thereby inspiring them to demonstrate genuine care, empathy, and compassion towards the customer (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019). Intrinsically-motivated and spiritually-driven employees demonstrate an enhanced tendency to share knowledge and customers' feedback with peers and managers that facilitate

idea generation and experimentation, such as the customization of services and innovative solutions to the customers (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019; Chang & Teng, 2017; Lee & Kim, 2017).

Finally, spiritual leadership enhances employees' capabilities to understand and solve complex issues through dialogue and intellectual discourse (Fry et al., 2017). Spiritual leadership's characteristic of faith/hope enhances hotels' frontline employees' trust in their skills and shapes a conviction among them to engage in extra-role behaviors (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019; Calisto, 2015; Schuckert et al., 2018). Characteristics, such as employees' trust in their skills and willingness to go beyond job norms to serve customers instigate them to develop new skills, respond to the sophisticated customers' demands in novel ways, and search for and seize new opportunities, thereby increasing their intrapreneurial behaviors (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019; Calisto, 2015; Schuckert et al., 2018).

H1. Spiritual leadership is positively related to hotels' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors

2.3. Psychological empowerment as a mediator

Psychological empowerment refers to the *"increased intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions reflecting an individual's orientation to his or her work role: competence, impact, meaning, and self-determination"* (Spreitzer, 1995, p. 1443). Self-determination refers to employees' sense of autonomy in making work-related decisions. Meaning refers to the perceived value of a task, as well as the sensed synchronization between an individual's and the organization's goals, values, and beliefs. Competence refers to an individual's feelings of personal mastery or self-efficacy that he/she has the skills and capability

to perform a task successfully. Impact refers to the extent to which an employee perceives that his/her work contributes to and affect organizational outcomes.

Spiritual leadership theory attempts to foreground the value of employees' contribution to the achievement of the vision and create congruence between leader's and employees' values (Fry et al., 2005). That is, spiritual leadership can positively shape employees' sense of meaning and impact. The type of vision and hope/faith associated with spiritual leadership should transform employee's capabilities and also inculcate a sense of competence in them (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019). Spiritual leadership also instills high ideals among employees by enhancing their sense of calling and membership (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019; Salehzadeh, Pool, Lashaki, Dolati, & Jamkhaneh, 2015). This sense of calling and membership, in turn, helps employees satisfy individuals' psychological needs' such as autonomy, competences, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Additionally, two key dimensions of spiritual leadership, including transcendent vision and altruistic love, create a work environment characterized by care for employees, joy, peace, and serenity that improve employees' competence, self-determination, self-efficacy, and ability to demonstrate autonomous behaviors (Chen & Li, 2013). As such, one could argue that spiritual leadership enhances employees' sense of psychological empowerment.

In turn, this enhanced sense of psychological empowerment should enhance employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. Psychologically empowered employees are more likely to take risks and embrace novel practices and processes while performing their work roles (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). They are also able to challenge existing norms and respond more proactively to new opportunities (Fry, 2003; Wang, Guo, Ni, Shang, & Tang, 2019). In this regard, past research has also shown that employees' sense of empowerment can increase their willingness to engage in

innovative behaviors (Hassi, 2019). Likewise, employees' feelings that their work is valuable and contributes significantly to the achievement of organizational goals inspire them to take risks, engage in experimentation, challenge organizations' existing norms and practices and strive for improvement and innovation (Pradhan & Jena, 2019; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Therefore, to the extent that spiritual leadership makes employees feel psychologically empowered, psychological empowerment should enhance hotels' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. Thus, we develop the following hypothesis.

H2. Psychological empowerment mediates the positive relationship between spiritual leadership and hotels' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors.

2.4. Spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behaviors: work centrality as a moderator

Work centrality refers to the extent to which work is thought to be important in the configuration of one's life, irrespective of one's current job (Hirschfeld & Feild, 2000; Kanungo, 1982). The concept of work centrality is different from other related concepts, such as job involvement, work involvement, workaholism, and meaningful work (see Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002). Individuals for whom work is the central identity intend to achieve high in their work roles to preserve their central identity (Yidong & Xinxin, 2013). Therefore, such employees may allocate more resources, including time and energy to work than those for whom work is not a central identity (Diefendorff et al., 2002). Such employees are expected to demonstrate more active engagement in extra-role behaviors (Diefendorff et al., 2002; Yidong & Xinxin, 2013) and embrace novel technologies and processes. Thus, we infer that if work is central to an individual's life, he/she may invest proactively in it and assume risk-taking and innovative behaviors. Thus, we post that employees high on work centrality can be more inclined to engage in intrapreneurial behaviors.

The moderating role of work centrality is in line with identity theory (Stryker, 1980; 1987), which posits that an individual can have as multiple identities as different roles he/she plays and distinct positions he/she occupies in different networks of relationships. Identity theory also suggests that people are more receptive and responsive to the behaviors, actions, and information that are in congruence with their central identities (Markus, 1977). Based on this premise, we argue work centrality enhances employees' responsiveness to spiritual leadership in that such a leadership approach speaks to the value of work, and as such in congruence with employees high on work centrality. Thus, work centrality should strengthen the association between spiritual leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors.

More specifically, we argue that employees with high work centrality are expected to benefit more from spiritual leadership' core features, such as faith, vision, and the ability to make more effective use of their knowledge, capabilities, and autonomy at work. In other words, employees high on work centrality are more likely to harness these core characteristics of spiritual leadership in achieving their career aspirations and preserving their central identity. Therefore, compared to their counterparts, employees high on work centrality are likely to be more responsive and attuned to spiritual leadership's attributes and ultimately expected to demonstrate more active engagement in intrapreneurial behaviors. Thus, we develop the following hypothesis.

H3. Work centrality moderates the positive relationship between spiritual leadership and hotels' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors, such that the relationship is stronger when work centrality is high.

2.5.Spiritual leadership and psychological empowerment: work centrality as a moderator

Past research suggests that work centrality shapes employees' sense of meaning (Jiang & Johnson, 2018). Work centrality inspires individuals to preserve their central identity and achieve high in their work roles (Carr, Boyar, & Gregory, 2008). Work centrality is a source of autonomous motivation and self-determination that nurtures individuals' competence by inspiring them to devote more time, energy, and extra efforts in accomplishing their central values (deCharms, 1968; Fisher, 1978). Moreover, work centrality enables individuals to synchronize their self-concept with the organization's values and objectives and acquire resources, knowledge, and skills that they deem fundamental for achieving high in their work roles (Carr et al., 2008). These arguments are consistent with identity theory (Styker, 1980, 1987), which suggests that identity carries central importance in shaping individuals' self-definition and motivating them to take actions that protect their central identities. Thus, we infer that work centrality positively shapes employees' competence, meaning (work carrying personal significance), autonomous motivation, and self-determination when led by spiritual leaders. Since competence, meaning, autonomous motivation, and self-determination are the core components of psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), spiritual leadership is more likely to psychologically empower employees who are high on work centrality.

Additionally, prior hospitality literature suggests that spiritual leadership instills high ideals in employees and ultimately improves their sense of meaningfulness through a broader social and spiritual appeal (Fry et al., 2017; Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019). This suggests that spiritual leadership provides an impetus for employees to accomplish and preserve their central identities through high ideals and an enhanced sense of self-efficacy, competence, meaning, and autonomous motivation. These arguments are in line with the identity theory, according to which

individuals high on work centrality are inspired to achieve high in roles that they perceive are close to their self-definition (Diefendorff et al., 2002). Going by these assumptions, therefore, we argue that employees high on work centrality are likely to benefit from the spiritual leadership's features in terms of enhancing their sense of meaning, competence, and self-efficacy. In other words, spiritual leadership's influence should be more profound on psychological empowerment for employees with high work centrality than those with low work centrality.

H4. Work centrality moderates the positive relationship between spiritual leadership and hotels' frontline employees' psychological empowerment, such that the relationship is stronger when work centrality is high.

2.6. The indirect relationship between spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behavior: work centrality as a moderator

As noted earlier (H2), spiritual leadership shapes employees' autonomous motivation, self-determination, and competence, which in turn inspires them to go beyond job norms, engage in risk-taking behaviors and demonstrate proactive engagement in their work roles. In other words, spiritual leadership's effects on employees' intrapreneurial behaviors are translated through psychological empowerment. Moreover, as posited above (H4), a high degree of work centrality may accentuate spiritual leadership's main features, including the potential to instill a sense of meaningfulness in followers, encourage their feelings of autonomy, and enable them to accomplish and preserve their central identity. Based on the identity theory, we argue that spiritual leadership can be more effective in shaping psychological empowerment for employees high on work centrality than those low on work centrality. In other words, work centrality can

serve as a boundary condition of the indirect association between spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behavior. From a statistical viewpoint, this represents a moderated mediation case (Hayes, 2015) whereby work centrality interacts with spiritual leadership to indirectly influence intrapreneurial behaviors via and psychological empowerment. Thus, the following hypothesis is developed.

H5. Work centrality moderates the indirect relationship (via psychological empowerment) between spiritual leadership and hotels' employees' intrapreneurial behavior, such that the indirect relationship is stronger when work centrality is high.

3. Method

3.1. Sample and data collection procedure

Data were collected from 204 frontline employees and 48 managers in 48 (11 five-star, 24 four-star, and 13 three-star) hotels operating in Pakistan. Access to hotels was managed through personal and professional references. The survey was pilot-tested 15 respondents (ten employees and five managers) and five management scholars. To establish content validity, we also conducted 11 interviews and held several discussions with the respondents, including the managers and employees in these hotels. These interviews and discussions helped us adapt different items of the scales we used in this study.

There are a total of 11 five-star and 24 four-star hotels in Pakistan, all of which were identified for data collection. From a total of 51 three-star hotels in the country, we randomly identified 13 hotels for data collection, making a total of 48 hotels in the present study. There were a total of 328, 486, and 276 frontline employees working in 11 five-star, 24 four-star, and 13 three-star hotels, respectively. Mails consisting of the information sheet, the questionnaires,

the promise of confidentiality, and pre-paid return envelopes were sent to a random selection of 350 respondents. Data from employees were collected in two waves. In line with prior studies (e.g., Anser, Ali, Usman, Rana, & Yousaf, 2020; Usman, Jeved, Shaukat, & Bashir, 2019), two data collection waves were separated by two months. Data about spiritual leadership (the independent variable), work centrality (the moderator), age, gender, work experience, and tenure with the current supervisor were collected in the first wave. We received a total of 240 responses. Data about psychological empowerment (the mediating variable) were collected in the second wave. We received 224 responses in the second round. However, two responses that had missing data were excluded from further analyses. We also screened the data for negligence, and 11 responses that were completed inappropriately were also excluded from further analyses. Thus, we received 213 usable employees' responses. Data about employees' intrapreneurial behaviors were collected from their immediate managers (supervisors). A total of 48 supervisors' responses were received. Unique codes were used to match the responses.

After matching the employees' and supervisors' responses, we used a sample of 48 managers (88.88% response rate) and 204 employees (58.28% response rate). One supervisor rated three to five employees on their intrapreneurial behaviors. Employees' demographic data showed that 110 respondents were males, and 94 were females. We tested the data for non-response bias. Independent sample t-test results showed no difference in terms of demographics – education ($t = .86$, ns), age ($t = 1.12$, ns), and experience ($t = .69$, ns) – between the initial sample (350) and the final sample (204), suggesting that that non-response bias was not a problem.

Employees' average age was 31.61 years and their average experience 5.02 years. Moreover, 55.4% of respondents had an undergraduate degree and 44.6% had a master's degree.

Managers' demographic data showed that 34 managers were males, and 14 were females. Managers' average age was 37.83 years and their average work experience was 8.20 years. AMOS 24.0, SPSS 24.0, and Hayes' PROCESS macro (model 4 and model 8) for SPSS were used to analyze the data.

Data were collected using a time-lagged strategy from two sources to reduce common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Two months lag is considered appropriate for reducing common method variance and has been used in several studies (e.g., Anser et al., 2020; Usman et al., 2020). We also used Herman's single factor to examine the data for method bias. Therefore, we constrained all the items of our variables onto a single factor, which explained 34.39% variance, which was well below the threshold value (50%) (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thus, method bias was not a problem in our data. Moreover, multicollinearity was not a concern, as the highest tolerance value was .98, the lowest tolerance value was .75, and the highest value of the variance inflation factor was 1.33.

3.2.Measures

All the responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) and to 5 (strongly agree).

3.2.1. Spiritual leadership

A 17-item scale was adapted from Fry et al. (2005) to measure spiritual leadership. Example items are: "I have faith in my leadership's vision for its employees" (vision), "I set challenging goals for my work because I believe that leaders in my organization want us to succeed" (hope/faith), and "Leaders in my organization are honest and without false pride" (altruistic love). We examined the psychometric properties of the first-order factors – vision,

hope, and altruistic love. One item (AL4 of the altruistic love scale) with the lowest loading (.46) was dropped due to poor factor loading. The model showed a good fit [$\chi^2(101) = 192.86$, $\chi^2/df = 1.91$, RMSEA = .063, CFI = .94, IFI = .94, and TLI = .93]. The model also achieved satisfactory levels of discriminant and convergent validities (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Second, following the recommendations of Rindskopf and Rose (1988) and Nunkoo, Teeroovengadam, Thomas, and Leonard (2017), we compared different models. The first model M1 was a first-order model with all items loading on spiritual leadership. In the second model M2, the items loaded on their respective dimensions but the three dimensions of spiritual leadership were hypothesized as uncorrelated. In the third model M3, the items loaded on their respective dimensions, and the three dimensions of spiritual leadership were considered as correlated. The final model M4 was a second-order model. CFA was performed for each of the proposed models. The fit indices are presented in Table 2. The model M1 and M2 demonstrated an unacceptable fit, while the model M3 and M4 demonstrated a good fit with the data. The dimensions of spiritual leadership were highly correlated and the second-order model M4 showed a good fit with the data. Moreover, our purpose was to examine the influence of the overall level of spiritual leadership on overall level intrapreneurial behavior. Therefore, following the recommendations of Koufteros, Babbar, and Kaighobadi (2009) and Nunkoo et al. (2017), we used an overall measure of spiritual leadership. To develop the overall measure of spiritual leadership, we used a two-step approach. In the first step, the scores of the first-order constructs were estimated using data imputation function in AMOS (version 24.0). Then in the

second stage, the scores of the first-order constructs were used as indicators of spiritual leadership as the second-order construct.

Insert Table 2 about here

3.2.2. Psychological empowerment

A 12-item scale was adapted from Spreitzer (1995) to measure psychological empowerment. Example items: “I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job” (self-determination), “The work I do is very important to me” (meaning), “I have significant influence over what happens in my organization” (impact), and “I have mastered the skills necessary for my job” (competence). To adapt this scale, the term “department” was replaced with “organization.” We examined the psychometric properties of the first-order factors – and self-determination, impact, competence, and meaning. One item (ME3) that showed suboptimal loading (.48) was dropped. The model showed a good fit [$\chi^2(38) = 62.84$, $\chi^2/df = 1.65$, RMSEA = .057, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, and TLI = .97] and also achieved satisfactory levels of discriminant and convergent validities (see Table 1).

Second, following the recommendations of Rindskopf and Rose (1988) and Nunkoo et al. (2017), we compared four different models (M1, M2, M3, and M4) as we did for spiritual leadership’ measure. The fit indices are presented in Table 2. The models M1 and M2 demonstrated an unacceptable fit, while the model M3 and M4 showed a good fit with the data. Since the dimensions of psychological empowerment were highly correlated, the second-order model M4 showed a good fit with the data, and our purpose was to examine the role of an overall level of employees’ psychological empowerment as an underlying mechanism of the relationship

between spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behavior, following the recommendations of Koufteros et al. (2009) and Nunkoo et al. (2017), we used an overall measure of psychological empowerment. We followed a two-step approach to develop the overall measure of psychological empowerment. In the first step, the scores of the first-order constructs were estimated using data imputation function in AMOS (version 24.0). Then in the second stage, the scores of the first-order constructs were used as indicators of psychological empowerment.

3.2.3. Employees' intrapreneurial behaviors

We adapted a 15-item scale from Stull and Singh (2005) to measure employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. "In the course of his/her work, he/she takes calculated risks despite the possibility of failure" (risk-taking), "In the course of his/her work, he/she keeps ahead of changes instead of responding to them" (proactiveness), and "In the course of his/her work, he/she finds new ways to do things" (innovativeness) were the sample items. As data about employees' intrapreneurial behavior were collected from immediate supervisors, the intrapreneurial scale was adapted to make it appropriate for supervisors' ratings. For example, the scale item "In the course of my work, I find new ways to do things" was changed to "In the course of his/her work, he/she finds new ways to do things." We examined the psychometric properties of the first-order factors – risk-taking behavior, proactiveness, and innovativeness. CFA results showed that this model had a good fit with the data [$\chi^2 (8) = 127.96$, $\chi^2/df = 1.47$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .97, IFI = .97, and TLI = .97]. The scales also achieved satisfactory levels of discriminant and convergent validities (see Table 1).

Second, following the recommendations of Rindskopf and Rose (1988) and Nunkoo et al. (2017), we compared four different models (M1, M2, M3, and M4) as we did for the spiritual

leadership and psychological empowerment measures. The fit indices are presented in Table 2. The models M1 and M2 demonstrated an unacceptable fit, while models M3 and M4 demonstrated a good fit with the data. Since the dimensions of intrapreneurial behaviors were highly correlated, the second-order model M4 showed a good fit with the data, and our purpose was to examine the influences of spiritual leadership and psychological empowerment on an overall level of intrapreneurial behavior, following the recommendations of Koufteros et al. (2009) and Nunkoo et al. (2017), we used an overall measure of employees' intrapreneurial behavior. We used a two-step approach to develop the overall measure of intrapreneurial behavior. In the first step, the scores of the first-order constructs were estimated using data imputation function in AMOS (version 24.0). Then in the second stage, the scores of the first-order constructs were used as indicators of intrapreneurial behavior.

3.2.4. Work centrality

Work centrality was measured by adapting three items from Bal and Kooij (2011). "The most important things that happen to me involve my work" was a sample item of the work centrality scale.

3.3. Control variables

Because gender, education, work experience (the number of years an employee has worked in his/her life), and tenure with the organization (the number of years an employee has worked with the current organization) can affect psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995) and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors (De Jong, Parker, Wennekers, & Wu, 2015), we controlled for these demographic variables. However, results from one-way ANOVA revealed no significant effects of these demographic variables on psychological empowerment and

intrapreneurial behavior. Furthermore, according to Eyoun, Chen, Ayoun, and Khlifaf (2020), the majority of the current hospitality workforce belongs to three generations – Baby Boomers (born between 1946 and 1964), Generation X (born between 1965 and 1980), and Generation Y or Millennials (born between 1981 and 2000). These generations are argued to have different attitudes toward work and work practices, including autonomy, hierarchies, learning, and technology adoption (Eyoun et al., 2020), and thus can confound the results. However, our respondents belonged to two generations – Generation X (44.6%) and Millennials (55.4%). Therefore, to control for age, we grouped our respondents into Generation X and Generation Y. However, results from independent samples t-test revealed no significant difference between these age groups in terms of psychological empowerment and intrapreneurial behavior.

Additionally, to account for the unique effects of spiritual leadership, we controlled for servant leadership, a leadership style that has conceptual overlapping with spiritual leadership (Wang et al., 2019) and has typically been shown to account for more variance in predicting employee and work outcomes above and beyond other leadership styles (e.g., authentic and transformational leadership (see Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018). We measured servant leadership using the 7-item scale by Liden, Wayne, Meuser, Hu, Wu, and Liao (2015). Example items: “My leader emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community” and “My leader puts my best interests ahead of his/her own”. Our results were significant with or without these control variables, thereby providing evidence for the robustness of our results and enhancing the significance of our contributions to the literature.

4. Results

4.1. Non-independence of the data

As 204 respondents belonged to 48 hotels, the non-independence of the data was examined. ICC (1) values for our outcome variable (employees' intrapreneurial behavior) and the mediator (psychological empowerment) were calculated (Bliese, 2000). The ICC (1) values for employees' intrapreneurial behaviors and psychological empowerment were .02 (ns) and .01 (ns), respectively. Thus, non-independence was not a concern.

4.2.Means and correlations

Means and correlations for the variables of the study are presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

4.3.Measurement model

CFA was used to evaluate the measurement model consisting of spiritual leadership (along with its three indicators – vision, altruistic love, and hope/faith), psychological empowerment (along with its four indicators – impact, meaning, competence, and self-determination), employees' intrapreneurial behavior (along with its three indicators – innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness), and work centrality. The results showed that the measurement model had an acceptable fit with the data [$\chi^2 (59) = 84.87$, $\chi^2/df = 1.44$, IFI = .98, TLI = .97, CFI = .98, and RMSEA = .046]. Moreover, the scales demonstrated satisfactory levels of discriminant validity, convergent validity, and internal consistency (see Table 4)

Insert Table 4 about here

4.4.Mediation results

Model 4 of Hayes' PROCESS macro for SPSS (5000 bootstrapping) was used to test the first two hypotheses. The results showed a positive association between spiritual leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors ($B = .26$, *lower limit = .12 and upper limit = .41*). The results also showed a significant positive indirect (via psychological empowerment) association of spiritual leadership with employees' intrapreneurial behaviors ($B = .05$, *lower limit = .01 and upper limit = .12*). Thus, hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported.

4.5. Moderation results

The moderating effect of work centrality on the direct and indirect relationships between spiritual leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors was tested using Model 8 of Hayes' PROCESS macro for SPSS (5000 bootstrapping). The interaction (Table 5) between spiritual leadership and work centrality had a significant positive effect on employees' intrapreneurial behaviors ($B = .20$, $p < .01$). The interactions plotted at $+1/-1$ SD from the mean of work centrality are shown in Figure 2. Simple slope test showed that the positive effect of spiritual leadership on employees' intrapreneurial behaviors was significant ($B = .56$, $p < .001$) when work centrality was high, while the effect was insignificant ($B = .18$, *ns*) when work centrality was low. Thus, hypothesis 3 was accepted. The interaction (Table 5) between spiritual leadership and work centrality had a significant effect on psychological empowerment ($B = .23$, $p < .001$). The interactions plotted at $+1/-1$ SD from the mean of work centrality are shown in Figure 3. Simple slope test showed that the positive effect of spiritual leadership on psychological empowerment was significant ($B = .43$, $p < .001$) when work centrality was high; while the effect was insignificant ($B = .01$, *ns*) when work centrality was low (Table 5). Thus, hypothesis 4 was accepted. Moreover, the indirect effect of spiritual leadership on intrapreneurial behavior was significant (*bootstrap estimate = .10, bootstrap 95% confidence interval did not*

overlap with zero) when work centrality was high, while the effect was insignificant (*bootstrap estimate = .002, ns*) when work centrality was low (Table 5). Finally, the index of moderated mediation was significant (*bootstrap estimate = .06, bootstrap 95% confidence interval did not overlap with zero*). Thus, the results supported hypothesis 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Insert Figure 2 and Figure 3 about here

5. Discussion

Prior studies have highlighted the imperativeness of employees' intrapreneurial behaviors for the growth and competitive success of hospitality firms (Calisto, 2015). Some studies have also recognized the important role of leadership in shaping employees' intrapreneurial behavior (Valsania et al., 2016). However, surprisingly, there is a paucity of research on employees' intrapreneurial behaviors and the links between leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors in the hospitality industry. To fill in these knowledge gaps, the present study built on spiritual leadership theory to propose that spiritual leadership is positively related to hotels' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors, both directly and indirectly via psychological empowerment. Moreover, building on the identity theory (Stryker, 1980, 1987), the present study proposed that work centrality moderates the aforementioned relationships, such that these relationships are strong when work centrality is high. Results from time-lagged survey data from

204 frontline employees in 48 hotels in Pakistan provide support for our hypothesized relationships.

5.1.Theoretical contributions

The work at hand makes several contributions to both the hospitality and general management literature. First, we contribute to the hospitality literature on the leadership-employees' extra-role behavior connection (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019; Qiu et al., 2019). This existing literature offers valuable contributions by revealing the influence of leadership on employees' engagement in different extra-role behaviors, such as innovative work behavior (Schuckert et al., 2018), citizenship behavior (Qiu et al., 2019), and creativity (Wang et al., 2014). However, our study departs markedly from the extant hospitality literature on the links between leadership and employees' extra-role behaviors (Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019; Qiu et al., 2019) because of its focus on employees' intrapreneurial behaviors that are more challenging and broader in scope than the other types of extra-role behavior (e.g., innovative behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors). In doing so, we extend the scarce literature on hospitality employees' intrapreneurial behaviors (Calisto, 2015). Given the potential of employees' intrapreneurial behaviors for organizations' long-term success, Calisto (2015) has urged scholars to explore its antecedents in the hospitality context. Our work, therefore, is a response to such calls that enhances the nomological network of the antecedents of hospitality employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. Based on spiritual leadership theory, our finding indicates that spiritual leadership's vision together with altruistic love and hope/faith make hotels' frontline employees proactive in anticipating and dealing with the customers' ever-increasing demands and inspire them to engage in intrapreneurial behaviors.

Second, there is an on-going debate on how to rejuvenate the essence of hospitality (Golubovskaya et al., 2017; Nicolaides, 2018). Golubovskaya et al. (2017) and Nicolaides (2018) argue that the essence of hospitality lies in employees' hospitable behaviors during the service delivery process that has diminished due to the commercialization of hospitality and the inability of employees to understand the transcendental meanings of the work activities. They further highlight that spiritual values and drives can help revive the true essence of hospitality. By portraying spiritual leadership as a means of rejuvenating the essence of hospitality, our work contributes to the on-going debate on how to revive the essence of hospitality (Golubovskaya et al., 2017; Nicolaides, 2018).

Third, we extend the scant general literature on the links between leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behavior. To date, only two studies – Moriano et al. (2014) and Valsania et al. (2016), respectively – have shown transformational leadership and authentic leadership to be positively associated with employees' intrapreneurial behavior. These studies urged scholars to extend this line of research by examining the role of other positive leadership styles with employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. The present study is therefore both timely and relevant given its focus on the importance of employees' intrapreneurial behaviors for organizations' competitive advantage. It makes a significant contribution to the literature where there is also a lack of consensus regarding the predictors and conditions of employees' intrapreneurial behavior (Kollmann, Stöckmann, Meves, & Kensbock, 2017; Neessen, Caniëls, Vos, & De Jong, 2019), and also the scarcity of research on the links between leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behavior in the general as well as the hospitality literature.

Fourth, by revealing that psychological empowerment mediates the positive relationship between spiritual leadership and hotels' employees' intrapreneurial behaviors, we extend three

important knowledge streams – spiritual leadership (Salehzadeh et al., 2015; Bayighomog & Arasli, 2019), psychological empowerment (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012; Raub & Liao, 2012), and intrapreneurship (Castilo, 2015). The finding advances our understanding of why spiritual leadership is positively related to employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. In so doing, our findings highlight the role of spiritual leadership in empowering and intrinsically inspiring their followers to engage in intrapreneurial behaviors.

Although our findings are somewhat comparable with prior hospitality research that has revealed that psychological empowerment positively influences frontline employees' extra-role behaviors (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012; Raub & Liao, 2012), our study broadens the scope of psychological empowerment for affecting a larger system of inputs and outputs are constructive influences on employees' self-directed drive to challenge the existing norms and learn and embrace new technologies and processes (Fry, 2003; Wang et al., 2019). Our findings that employees' feelings of psychological empowerment can lead them to engage in intrapreneurial behaviors and contribute to hotels' competitiveness thus offer a nuanced view of looking at frontline employees as intrapreneurs in the hospitality industry and highlight the significance of their sense of empowerment in their role as intrapreneurs. Given the commercialization of the hospitality industry that is symptomatic of managers' emphasis on hierarchical controls rather than employees' autonomy and hospitable services, these findings are imperative. Importantly, by establishing psychological empowerment as a mediator of the relationship between spiritual leadership and hotels' frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors, our study responds to the call for exploring the role of psychological empowerment as an underlying mechanism between positive leadership styles and employees' engagement in positive work behaviors in the hospitality context (Huertas-Valdivia et al., 2019).

Finally, the present study established work centrality as a boundary condition of the direct and indirect relationships between spiritual leadership and hotel's frontline employees' intrapreneurial behavior. In line with the identity theory, our findings indicate that the positive relationships of spiritual leadership with hotels' frontline employees' psychological empowerment and intrapreneurial behaviors are not homogenous across different levels of work centrality. Rather, employees with high work centrality benefit more from spiritual leaderships' features, such as vision and hope/faith in terms of enhancing their competence, the value of their contributions to the organization's goals, and self-determination. The findings also suggest that, as compared to their peers, employees who view work as central to their identity perceive spiritual leadership's vision and hope/faith characteristics in congruence with their central identity, and consequently, demonstrate a higher level of engagement in intrapreneurial behaviors to preserve their central identity. In this regard, our research adds to the limited but growing research on work centrality in hospitality research (Gursoy et al., 2013; Park & Gursoy, 2012) and contributes to the general literature on work centrality by underscoring its role in employees' intrapreneurial behaviors.

5.2. Practical implications

The present study carries several practical implications that can help managers positively shape employees' intrapreneurial behavior and enhance customer experience and loyalty and thus, contribute to the hospitality firms' long-term success. Our findings suggest the need for appreciating frontline employees' ideas and initiatives related to the improvement in service delivery, understanding of the customers' demands, and new market opportunities and encourage them to sharpen their capabilities of thinking out of the box. To do so, managers could organize training sessions, discussions, and brainstorming sessions focused on new ideas and market

opportunities that would build frontline employees' orientation as intrapreneurs. Furthermore, managers can provide some financial rewards along with acknowledgment and appreciation certificates for the workable ideas and initiatives, which should also inspire other employees to leave their comfort zone and perform challenging extra-role behaviors. Empowering employees and triggering their self-leadership qualities can also encourage frontline employees' intrapreneurial behaviors.

Furthermore, the hospitality industry is characterized by tense and demanding occupational settings, where frontline employees often face stress, emotional exhaustion, and uncertainty (Calisto, 2015; Huertas-Valdivia et al., 2019). In such tense and demanding occupational settings, employees require intrinsic motivation of accomplishing something meaningful beyond the transactional exchange of service for remuneration. To inspire employees intrinsically, managers should merge spiritual values with the aforementioned traditional management techniques to explain and clarify the transcendental importance of their work and contributions. For this purpose, managers should focus on developing a culture based on altruistic love to provide employees with an opportunity to share and discuss ideas in a friendly environment. In this way, managers can enroll their subordinates into the transcendent vision and create a sense of calling and membership among them, thereby fostering employees' feelings of pleasure and joy while experimenting at the workplace to meet the challenging demands of the hospitality industry.

Furthermore, our findings suggest that employees' sense of empowerment stimulates employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. Therefore, managers as spiritual leaders should instill a sense of empowerment among employees by practicing participatory decision making. Managers should also encourage followers' to take responsibility to handle challenging issues. This will

enable employees to feel empowered and engaged psychologically. Organizations should understand that delegating autonomy can encourage individuals to go beyond the script and behave like intrapreneurs. Managers can do so by shaping their subordinates' self-leadership skills that, in turn, can instigate them to perform challenging extra-role behaviors and demonstrate hospitable behaviors when dealing with customers.

Finally, managers in the hospitality and tourism organizations are suggested to focus on understanding individual differences while attempting to encourage their frontline employees' engagement in intrapreneurial behaviors. Specifically, we suggest that the managers need to identify and differentiate those employees for whom work is the top identity from those for whom work is not the top identity. Identifying these differences would help managers develop customized strategies to encourage employees to take intrapreneurial initiatives. For instance, psychometric tests involving work centrality items can be incorporated as part of the hiring process and performance appraisal. Frequent communication and interactions can also be helpful to understand such differences in work centrality. For instance, Gursoy et al. (2013) suggest that Millennial generation employees tend to place less importance on work (low work centrality) than those from Baby Boomers and Generation X. These Millennials are keen to work in a transparent and flexible work environment, transparency (Gursoy et al., 2013). By providing flexible conditions, highlighting the importance of work, empowering them, and rewarding their initiatives, managers can make their work more enjoyable and inspire them to internalize work activities into their identity, which should instigate them to seek and seize new opportunities and discover novel ways to serve customers.

5.3.Limitations and future research directions

This study is not without limitations. For instance, we tested our hypothesized relationships in five-star, four-star, and three-star hotels that often have a better career-development opportunity for employees, job structure, and other incentives as compared to small hotels (Chang, 2011; Szivas, 2001). Therefore, studying these relationships in smaller hotels may offer other unique insights. Likewise, our sample included hotels' frontline employees, examining the interrelations between spiritual leadership, psychological empowerment, employees' intrapreneurial behaviors, and work centrality on samples from employees in various departments and organizations other than hotels may also be an important area of research.

Another potential limitation of this study is that we focused on the links between spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behaviors at the individual level. Future studies can extend this work by examining the influence of spiritual leadership on a team level to enhance our understanding of the consequential potential of spiritual leadership for team level intrapreneurial behaviors. As noted by Neessen et al. (2019), employees' intrapreneurial behavior has not been contextualized in the green context, a context important for hospitality organizations. Given the rising concerns about organizations' environmental footprint (Khan, Ali, Usman, Saleem, & Jianguo, 2019; Pham, Tučková, & Jabbour, 2019), contextualizing intrapreneurial behavior in the green and sustainability context provides a useful pathway for future research.

Furthermore, future research would benefit from exploring additional mediating and moderating mechanisms accounting for spiritual leadership's influence on employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. For instance, spiritual leadership's feature of altruistic love may create a sense of a psychologically safe environment that encourages employees to question existing norms and practices, and in doing so foster their intrapreneurial behaviors. Therefore, psychological safety can be studied as a mediator of the relationship between spiritual leadership

and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors. Individual-level difference variables such as self-esteem and instrumental thinking may also be worth exploring as potential moderators of the relationship between spiritual leadership and employees' intrapreneurial behaviors.

Finally, the identity theory suggests that employees are more receptive to behaviors that are in congruence with employees' central identities. Other positive leadership styles may also demonstrate behaviors and create conditions that are in congruence with work as employees' central identity. Therefore, work centrality can act as a boundary condition for the relationship between other positive leadership styles and employees' extra-role behaviors. Future studies should examine such a role of work centrality to foreground its imperativeness for the relationship between leadership and employees' extra-role behaviors.

References

- Ali, M., Aziz, S., Pham, T. N., Babalola, M. T., & Usman, M. (2020). A positive human health perspective on how spiritual leadership weaves its influence on employee safety performance: The role of harmonious safety passion. *Safety Science, 131*, 104923.
- Anser, M. K., Ali, M., Usman, M., Rana, M. L. T., & Yousaf, Z. (2020). Ethical leadership and knowledge hiding: an intervening and interactional analysis. *The Service Industries Journal, 1-23*.
- Bal, P. M., & Kooij, D. (2011). The relations between work centrality, psychological contracts, and job attitudes: The influence of age. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20(4)*, 497-523.

- Bayighomog, S. W., & Araslı, H. (2019). Workplace spirituality–customer engagement Nexus: the mediated role of spiritual leadership on customer-oriented boundary-spanning behaviors. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(7-8), 637-661.
- BeazleY, D., & Gemmill, G. (2006). Spirituality and servant leader behavior. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 3(3), 258-270.
- Bliese, P.D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis, in K. J. Klein and S. W. J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 349-381). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Boorom, R. (2009). *Spiritual leadership: A study of the relationship between spiritual leadership theory and transformational leadership (Doctoral Dissertation)*, ProQuest Information & Learning, US.
- Calisto, M. L. (2015). How Some HR Management Practices may Hinder Innovation: The Case of the Hotel Industry. In *European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (p. 113). Academic Conferences International Limited.
- Carr, J. C., Boyar, S. L., & Gregory, B. T. (2008). The moderating effect of work-family centrality on work-family conflict, organizational attitudes, and turnover behavior. *Journal of Management*, 34(2), 244-262.
- Chang, J. (2011). Introduction: Entrepreneurship in tourism and hospitality: The role of SMEs. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(5), 467-469.

- Chang, J. H., & Teng, C. C. (2017). Intrinsic or extrinsic motivations for hospitality employees' creativity: The moderating role of organization-level regulatory focus. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 60, 133-141.
- Chen, K. Y., Chang, C. W., & Wang, C. H. (2019). Frontline employees' passion and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of emotional labor strategies. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76, 163-172.
- Chen, C. Y., & Li, C. I. (2013). Assessing the spiritual leadership effectiveness: The contribution of follower's self-concept and preliminary tests for moderation of culture and managerial position. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 240-255.
- Chiang, C. F., & Hsieh, T. S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 180-190.
- Chen, K. Y., Chang, C. W., & Wang, C. H. (2019). Frontline employees' passion and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of emotional labor strategies. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76, 163-172.
- De Jong, J. P. D., Parker, S. K., Wennekers, S., & Wu, C. H. (2015). Entrepreneurial behavior in organizations: does job design matter?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(4), 981-995.
- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academic.

- 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.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 93-108.
- Eyoun, K., Chen, H., Ayoun, B., & Khlifaf, A. (2020). The relationship between purpose of performance appraisal and psychological contract: Generational differences as a moderator. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 86, 102449. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102449
- Fisher, A. A. (1978). *Atlas of aquatic dermatology* (pp. 35-44). New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693-727.
- Fry, L. W., Vitucci, S., & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5), 835-862.
- Fry, L., & Egel, E. (2017). Spiritual Leadership: Embedding Sustainability in the Triple Bottom Line. *Graziadio Business Review*, 20(3), 1-12.
- Fry, L. W., Latham, J. R., Clinebell, S. K., & Krahnke, K. (2017). Spiritual leadership as a model for performance excellence: a study of Baldrige award recipients. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 14(1), 22-47.

- Fuchs, G. (2013). Low Versus High Sensation-seeking Tourists: a Study of Backpackers' Experience Risk Perception. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 81-92.
- Gawke, J. C., Gorgievski, M. J., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Personal costs and benefits of employee intrapreneurship: Disentangling the employee intrapreneurship, well-being, and job performance relationship. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(4), 508-519.
- Gawke, J. C., Gorgievski, M. J., & Bakker, A. B. (2019). Measuring intrapreneurship at the individual level: Development and validation of the Employee Intrapreneurship Scale (EIS). *European Management Journal*, 37(6), 806-817.
- Golubovskaya, M., Robinson, R. N., & Solnet, D. (2017). The meaning of hospitality: do employees understand?. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(5), 1282-1304.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G. Q., & Karadag, E. (2013). Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 40-48.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis (Seventh Edition)*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Hassi, A. (2019). Empowering leadership and management innovation in the hospitality industry context. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(4), 1785-1800.

- Hayes, A. F. (2015). An index and test of linear moderated mediation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 50*(1), 1-22.
- Highhouse, S., Zickar, M. J., & Yankelevich, M. (2010). Would you work if you won the lottery? Tracking changes in the American work ethic. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 349-355.
- Hirschfeld, R. R., & Feild, H. S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 21*(7), 789-800.
- Huertas-Valdivia, I., Gallego-Burín, A. R., & Lloréns-Montes, F. J. (2019). Effects of different leadership styles on hospitality workers. *Tourism Management, 71*, 402-420.
- Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 44*(2), 501-529.
- Jiang, L., & Johnson, M. J. (2018). Meaningful work and affective commitment: A moderated mediation model of positive work reflection and work centrality. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 33*(4), 545-558.
- Jung, D. I., Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(4-5), 525-544.

- Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2016). What does work meaning to hospitality employees? The effects of meaningful work on employees' organizational commitment: The mediating role of job engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53, 59-68.
- Jha, S. S., & Nair, S. K. (2008). Influence of locus of control, job characteristics and superior-subordinate relationship on psychological empowerment: A study in five star hotels. *Journal of Management Research*, 8(3), 147-161.
- Karlsson, J. (2018). Frontline employees' role in service innovation and value creation (Doctoral dissertation, Karlstads Universitet), available at <http://kau.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1171113&dswid=-6311> (accessed July 2019).
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 341-350.
- Karl, M. (2018). Risk and uncertainty in travel decision-making: Tourist and destination perspective. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(1), 129-146.
- Killinger, B. (2006). *The workaholic breakdown syndrome*. In Burke, R. J (ed.), *Research companion to working time and work addiction*, Cornwall, Edward Elgar.
- Kim, T. T., Yoo, J. J. E., Lee, G., & Kim, J. (2012). Emotional intelligence and emotional labor acting strategies among frontline hotel employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(7), 1029-1046.
- Kirillova, K., Fu, X., & Kucukusta, D. (2020). Workplace design and well-being: aesthetic perceptions of hotel employees. *The Service Industries Journal*, 40(1-2), 27-49.

- Khan, M. A. S., Ali, M., Usman, M., Saleem, S., & Jianguo, D. (2019). Interrelationships between ethical leadership, green psychological climate, and organizational environmental citizenship behavior: the moderating role of gender. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 1-12.
- Kollmann, T., Stöckmann, C., Meves, Y., & Kensbock, J. M. (2017). When members of entrepreneurial teams differ: linking diversity in individual-level entrepreneurial orientation to team performance. *Small Business Economics, 48*(4), 843-859.
- Koufteros, X., Babbar, S., & Kaighobadi, M. (2009). A paradigm for examining second-order factor models employing structural equation modeling. *International Journal of Production Economics, 120*(2), 633-652.
- Lee, S. A., & Kim, S. H. (2017). Role of restaurant employees' intrinsic motivations on knowledge management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29*(11), 2751-2766.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(2), 254-269.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(2), 63-78.
- Moriano, J. A., Molero, F., Topa, G., & Mangin, J. P. L. (2014). The influence of transformational leadership and organizational identification on intrapreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 10*(1), 103-119.

- Namasivayam, K., Guchait, P., & Lei, P. (2014). The influence of leader empowering behaviors and employee psychological empowerment on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 69-84.
- Ndou, V., Mele, G., & Del Vecchio, P. (2019). Entrepreneurship education in tourism: An investigation among European Universities. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 25, 100175. doi: 10.1016/j.jhlste.2018.10.003
- Neessen, P. C., Caniëls, M. C., Vos, B., & De Jong, J. P. (2019). The intrapreneurial employee: toward an integrated model of intrapreneurship and research agenda. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 15(2), 545-571.
- Nicolae, M., Ion, I., & Nicolae, E. (2013). The research agenda of spiritual leadership. Where do we stand?. *Revista De Management Comparat International*, 14(4), 551-566.
- Nicolaidis, A. (2018). The role of spirituality in moderating hospitality industry conflict management and promoting sustainability. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7(2), 1-18.
- Nunkoo, R., Teeroovengadum, V., Thomas, P., & Leonard, L. (2017). Integrating service quality as a second-order factor in a customer satisfaction and loyalty model. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(12), 2978-3005.
- Øgaard, T., Marnburg, E., & Larsen, S. (2008). Perceptions of organizational structure in the hospitality industry: Consequences for commitment, job satisfaction and perceived performance. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 661-671.

- Park, J., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Generation effects on work engagement among US hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1195-1202.
- Pham, N. T., Tučková, Z., & Jabbour, C. J. C. (2019). Greening the hospitality industry: How do green human resource management practices influence organizational citizenship behavior in hotels? A mixed-methods study. *Tourism Management*, 72, 386-399.
- Podsakoff, P. M.; MacKenzie, Scott, B.; Lee, Jeong-Yeon & Podsakoff, Nathan, 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.
- Pradhan, S., & Jena, L. K. (2019). Does meaningful work explains the relationship between transformational leadership and innovative work behaviour?. *Vikalpa*, 44(1), 30-40.
- Presbitero, A., & Teng-Calleja, M. (2017). Employee proactivity in hotels undergoing organizational change and development. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 16(4), 401-421.
- Qiu, S., Alizadeh, A., Dooley, L. M., & Zhang, R. (2019). The effects of authentic leadership on trust in leaders, organizational citizenship behavior, and service quality in the Chinese hospitality industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 40, 77-87.
- Raub, S., & Liao, H. (2012). Doing the right thing without being told: Joint effects of initiative climate and general self-efficacy on employee proactive customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(3), 651-667.
- Rindskopf, D., & Rose, T. (1988). Some theory and applications of confirmatory second-order factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 23(1), 51-67.

- Salehzadeh, R., Pool, J. K., Lashaki, J. K., Dolati, H., & Jamkhaneh, H. B. (2015). Studying the effect of spiritual leadership on organizational performance: an empirical study in hotel industry. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9(3), 346-359.
- Schuckert, M., Kim, T. T., Paek, S., & Lee, G. (2018). Motivate to innovate. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 776-796.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
- Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*, Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company, Menlo Park, CA.
- Stryker, S. (1987). Identity theory: Developments and extensions, in K. Yardley and T. Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives* (pp. 89-103).
- Stull, M., & Singh, J. (2005). Intrapreneurship in nonprofit organizations examining the factors that facilitate entrepreneurial behaviour among employees, available at <http://weatherhead.case.edu/edm/archive/details.cfm?id=7635>, (accessed August 22, 2018).
- Szivas, E. (2001). Entrance into tourism entrepreneurship: a UK case study. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3(2), 163-172.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666-681.

- Twenge, J. M., & Kasser, T. (2013). Generational changes in materialism and work centrality, 1976-2007: Associations with temporal changes in societal insecurity and materialistic role modeling. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*(7), 883-897.
- Usman, M., Javed, U., Shoukat, A., & Bashir, N. A. (2019). Does meaningful work reduce cyberloafing? Important roles of affective commitment and leader-member exchange. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 1-15.
- Valsania, S. E., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2016). Authentic leadership and intrapreneurial behavior: cross-level analysis of the mediator effect of organizational identification and empowerment. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *12*(1), 131-152.
- Wang, C. J., Tsai, H. T., & Tsai, M. T. (2014). Linking transformational leadership and employee creativity in the hospitality industry: The influences of creative role identity, creative self-efficacy, and job complexity. *Tourism Management*, *40*, 79-89.
- Wang, M., Guo, T., Ni, Y., Shang, S., & Tang, Z. (2019). The effect of spiritual leadership on employee effectiveness: An intrinsic motivation perspective. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*, 2627. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02627
- Yang, F., Liu, J., Wang, Z., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Feeling energized: a multilevel model of spiritual leadership, leader integrity, relational energy, and job performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *158*(4), 983-997.

Yidong, T., & Xinxin, L. (2013). How ethical leadership influence employees' innovative work behavior: A perspective of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116*(2), 441-455.

Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(1), 107-128.

Table 1.Discriminant validity of first-order factors

| Construct | 1 | 2 | 3 | | AVE | CR | MSV | ASV |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Vision | .76 | | | | .58 | .87 | .45 | .42 |
| 2. Altruistic love | .67 | .72 | | | .52 | .87 | .45 | .44 |
| 3. Hope/faith | .63 | .65 | .74 | | .55 | .86 | .42 | .41 |
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | |
| 4. Meaning | .74 | | | | .55 | .70 | .31 | .26 |
| 5. Competence | .56 | .74 | | | .55 | .78 | .50 | .37 |
| 6. Impact | .43 | .54 | .79 | | .63 | .84 | .42 | .30 |
| 7. Self-determination | .54 | .71 | .65 | .72 | .52 | .76 | .50 | .41 |
| | 8 | 9 | 10 | | | | | |
| 8. Risk-taking | .75 | | | | .56 | .86 | .53 | .48 |
| 9. Proactiveness | .65 | .77 | | | .60 | .88 | .42 | .37 |
| 10. Innovativeness | .73 | .57 | .79 | | .63 | .89 | .53 | .43 |

Note. n = 204. MSV = Maximum variance shared. ASV = Average variance shared. AVE = Average value extracted. Bolded values on the diagonals of columns 2 to 5 are the square root values of AVE.

Table 2. Comparison of models

| Construct | Model | χ^2 | Df | χ^2/df | IFI | CFI | TLI | RMSEA |
|---------------------------|-------|----------|-----|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Spiritual leadership | M1 | 534.30 | 104 | 5.14 | .74 | .74 | .70 | .14 |
| | M2 | 381.13 | 104 | 3.66 | .83 | .83 | .81 | .11 |
| | M3 | 192.86 | 101 | 1.91 | .94 | .94 | .93 | .06 |
| | M4 | 192.86 | 101 | 1.91 | .94 | .94 | .93 | .06 |
| Psychological empowerment | M1 | 261.26 | 44 | 5.93 | .76 | .76 | .70 | .15 |
| | M2 | 276.56 | 44 | 6.15 | .74 | .74 | .69 | .16 |
| | M3 | 62.84 | 38 | 1.65 | .97 | .97 | .97 | .06 |
| | M4 | 64.60 | 40 | 1.62 | .97 | .97 | .97 | .05 |
| Intrapreneurial behavior | M1 | 582.12 | 90 | 6.47 | .73 | .73 | .68 | .16 |
| | M2 | 337.97 | 90 | 3.75 | .86 | .86 | .84 | .12 |
| | M3 | 127.96 | 87 | 1.47 | .97 | .97 | .97 | .05 |
| | M4 | 127.96 | 87 | 1.47 | .97 | .97 | .97 | .05 |

Notes. M1 = a first-order model with all items loading on the main construct. M2 = all the items loaded on their respective dimensions but different dimensions of the constructs were hypothesized as uncorrelated. M3 = all the items loaded on their respective dimensions but different dimensions of the constructs were hypothesized as correlated. M4 = a second-order model.

Table 3.Means and correlations

| Construct | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---------------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| 1. SL | 3.69 | .75 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. PE | 3.17 | .74 | .21** | | | | | | | | |
| 3. IB | 3.25 | .82 | .29** | .30** | | | | | | | |
| 4. WC | 3.44 | .86 | .12 | .06 | -.01 | | | | | | |
| 5. SRL | 3.61 | 1.27 | .61** | .11 | .09 | .14* | | | | | |
| 6. Age | 31.61 | 8.76 | -.07 | -.05 | -.05 | .03 | -.11 | | | | |
| 7. Gender | 1.46 | .50 | .09 | -.07 | -.04 | .04 | .15* | -.02 | | | |
| 8. Education | 1.45 | .50 | -.01 | -.08 | .00 | -.15* | .06 | .05 | -.02 | | |
| 9. Experience | 5.02 | 3.36 | -.02 | -.07 | -.01 | .04 | -.06 | .34** | -.03 | -.11 | |
| 10. Tenure | 1.90 | .76 | -.03 | .00 | .04 | -.07 | -.07 | .05 | -.15* | .04 | .19** |

Note. n = 204. * P <.05, ** P <.01 level (2-tailed). SD = Standard deviation. Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female. Education: 1 = undergrad; 2 = master's degree. SL = spiritual leadership. PE = psychological empowerment. IB = intrapreneurial behavior. WC = work centrality. SRL = servant leadership.

Table 4.Reliability and convergentand discriminant validities

| Construct | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | CR | AVE | MSV | ASV |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Spiritual leadership | .85 | | | | .89 | .72 | .12 | .06 |
| 2. Psychological empowerment | .21 | .82 | | | .89 | .66 | .12 | .07 |
| 3. Intrapreneurial behavior | .34 | .30 | .85 | | .88 | .72 | .17 | .09 |
| 4. Work centrality | .14 | .08 | .01 | .72 | .76 | .52 | .02 | .01 |

Notes. n = 204. α = Cronbach' s Alpha. AVE = average value extracted. MSV = maximum sharedvariance. ASV = average sharedvariance. CR= composite reliability.Bolded values on the diagonals of columns 2 to 5 are the square root values of AVE.

Table 5. Results for moderation: Work centrality as a moderator of the direct and indirect relationships of spiritual leadership and intrapreneurial behavior

| | Psychological empowerment | | | | | Intrapreneurial behavior | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----|-------|-------|------|--------------------------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| | B | SE | T | LL | UL | B | SE | T | LL | UL |
| Age | -.01 | .09 | -.09 | -.20 | .18 | -.05 | .10 | -.47 | -.26 | .16 |
| Gender | -.08 | .09 | -.84 | -.26 | .10 | -.01 | .10 | -.08 | -.21 | .19 |
| Education | -.09 | .09 | -1.01 | -.28 | .09 | .04 | .10 | .42 | -.16 | .25 |
| Experience | -.01 | .01 | -.73 | -.04 | .02 | .006 | .02 | .41 | -.02 | .04 |
| Tenure | -.003 | .05 | -.06 | -.10 | .10 | .02 | .05 | .42 | -.09 | .14 |
| SRL | -.01 | .05 | -.25 | -.11 | .08 | -.09 | .06 | -1.59 | -.20 | .02 |
| SL | -.56 | .26 | -2.12 | -1.08 | -.04 | -.32 | .29 | -1.08 | -.89 | .26 |
| PE | | | | | | .24 | .08 | 3.09 | .09 | .39 |
| WC | -.85 | .29 | -2.93 | -1.44 | -.28 | -.80 | .32 | -2.43 | -1.44 | -.15 |
| SL × WC | .23 | .07 | 3.04 | .08 | .38 | .20 | .08 | 2.39 | .03 | .37 |
| R ² | .11 | | | | | .19 | | | | |

| Conditional direct effect of SL on PE | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------|------------------|------------------|
| | Coefficient | Boot SE | Boot LL (95% CI) | Boot UL (95% CI) |
| Work centrality (-1 SD) | .01 | .10 | -.20 | .21 |
| Work centrality (+1 SD) | .43 | .10 | .21 | .60 |

| Conditional direct effect of SL on IB | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------|------------------|------------------|
| | Coefficient | Boot SE | Boot LL (95% CI) | Boot UL (95% CI) |
| Work centrality (-1 SD) | .18 | .11 | -.04 | .41 |
| Work centrality (+1 SD) | .56 | .13 | .31 | .81 |

| Conditional indirect effect of SL on IB via PE | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------|------------------|------------------|
| | Coefficient | Boot SE | Boot LL (95% CI) | Boot UL (95% CI) |
| Work centrality (-1 SD) | .002 | .03 | -.06 | .07 |
| Work centrality (+1 SD) | .10 | .05 | .02 | .21 |

| Index of moderated mediation | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|---------|------------------|------------------|
| | Index | Boot SE | Boot LL (95% CI) | Boot UP (95% CI) |
| | .06 | .02 | .01 | .13 |

Notes. n = 204, B = Unstandardized regression coefficient. Bootstrap sample size = 5000. Confidence interval = 95 %. LL = Lower limit. UL = Upper limit. SL = Spiritual leadership. PE = Psychological empowerment. WC = Work centrality. SRL = servant leadership. SE = Standard error.