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ABSTRACT

The COVID outbreak has frazzled many employers to research how to upkeep and boost the performance outcomes continuously. It is even trickier in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) when they have hibernated from conventional to cyber universities due to the COVID pandemic. It is relatable to motivate and retain the knowledge workers persistently. Therefore, this study is designed to investigate the impact of academicians’ spiritual motivation on their tacit knowledge sharing behavior, with the moderation of COVID-induced occupational stress. The population embraced the academicians of Pakistani Higher Education Institutions. ~289 academicians were considered as the sample size. Descriptive and inferential statistics (linear regression) were performed in SPSS, whereas; Hayes’ process macro was used to test moderation. The findings designate that academician’s spiritual motivation is significantly and positively associated with tacit knowledge sharing behavior—moreover, COVID-induced occupational stress moderates their relationship. Consequently, the results bequeath the policymakers and the relevant authorities of HEIs, with valuable propositions on how to upkeep academician’s tacit knowledge sharing behavior by considering COVID-induced occupational stress as eu-stress if they are spiritually motivated. Profuse suggestions were also presented to future researchers to further look into the anticipated study model.

1. Introduction

Since the advent of the COVID pandemic outbreak, the external environment has become uncertain; hence, it stresses the workplace environment and a severe deterioration of employees’ psychological health. Latest studies designate that Post-Traumatic Stress Symptoms (PTSS) is globally growing after the COVID pandemic (Gargot et al., 2021). It is, therefore, making the employers investigate how employers will tackle the COVID-induced occupational stress to sustain and augment organizational in-role and extra-role performance. Gargot et al. (2021) even designed a mobile application to educate people about the psychological impact that can occur during and after trauma, normalize acute distress and refer to professional help if a disorder is constituted. This stress can be either negative (distress) or positive (eu-stress). According to the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2002), people build, maintain, and protect their resources since eu-stress depends on gaining their resources. On the other hand, losing them will result in distress. These recourses are objects (valued for physical nature), conditions (being employed, being married), personal characteristics (upbeat personality, psychological capital, i.e., optimism,
resilience, and self-esteem, etc.), energies (time, money, and knowledge), and social support (affective, emotional, instrumental, material). It is pertinent to note that spiritual motivation is the psychological capital (part of personal characteristics in COR theory) as an individual knows his worth.

Moreover, this study also encompasses the condition resources, i.e., work situations, e.g., working under changed circumstances due to COVID. Additionally, the social class of the HEIs academicians is “professionals with advanced university degrees). Furthermore, the authors also noted the time resource since academicians have time to devote to spiritual activities among energy resources. Therefore, this study focuses on the personal, condition, and energy resources and their impact on Tacit Knowledge Sharing Behaviour (TKSB), with COVID-Induced Occupational Stress (CIOS) moderation. M. D. Merino, Valellano, Oliver, and Mateo (2021) claimed that researchers earlier studied COR theory in the Turkey earthquake, hurricane Katrina, Taiwan towers attack, but no one applied it in the COVID-19 context. They further found that when there is fear of loss of resources or lack of gain, there will be a lack of adaptation to the changing environment, which results in distress. Conversely, these resource acquisition and conservation are associated with eu-stress.

Researchers extensively use Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to examine human behavioural motivations (Deci & Ryan, 2008). If the 'spiritual motivation' is high, it will bring more favourable in both directions (Hodge & Bodie, 2007). Whether employees have a spiritual dimension in their lives or not, it unquestionably affects their work performance (Argandoña, 2011). Spiritual motivation is among the psychological resources. It is enjoyment in helping others, a sense of self-worth, and affective commitment which encourages behavioural outcomes (Iram Shahzadi, 2017). The 'enjoyment in helping others is one person’s intention to endow some support to their colleagues (Dovidio, Piliavin, Schroeder, & Penner, 2006). Therefore, it is imperative for intrinsic motivation (Iram Shahzadi, 2017). Besides, a sense of self-worth is the conviction that one's mind and abilities are bounteous for a happy life (Eren & Sagar, 2020). It is the extent to which employees perceive themselves as presenting value to their organizations through their knowledge sharing. In addition, affective commitment is an employee's psychological/emotional attachment to an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). It encourages them to accomplish more of what is required from them from their jobs.

Knowledge-Intensive Organizations (KIOs) (e.g., HEIs) will not continue to exist if knowledge workers do not create and transfer/share their knowledge. Hence, it takes a position at the heart of KIOs. For this reason, Knowledge Sharing (KS) is renowned as KIOs’ survival constituent in this contemporary era. We know more than we can distribute (Iram Shahzadi, 2017). Hence, transfer (especially tacit knowledge, which resides in the minds of knowledge workers) motivation is of utmost prominence for knowledge management (Irram Shahzadi, Hameed, & Kashif, 2015), sustainable growth, and societal transformation (Irram Shahzadi & Ali, 2020). Following research objectives are designed for this study:

**RO1:** Does spiritual motivation positively impacts the academician’s tacit knowledge-sharing behaviour among HEIs?

**RO2:** Does COVID-19 induced occupational stress to moderate the relationship between spiritual motivation and academician’s tacit knowledge sharing behaviour among HEIs?

2. Literature Review

Since the COVID-19 outbreak, the agile organizations, especially Knowledge Intensive Organizations (KIOs), have started to imagine how this deadly virus will affect job outcomes. This uncertain external environment has added up the employees’ exposure to extra-organizational stressors, possibly enabling effective work behaviours (Montani & Staglianò, 2021). Many countries have instituted remote working and quarantine to reduce the pandemic effect. It will hasten the trends to reform the businesses. Earlier research has mixed findings on the association of occupational stress (by non-catastrophic events, e.g., COVID Induced Occupational Stress) and organizational outcomes. The majority of them have found a negative relationship between them (Syed, Naseer, & Bouckenooghe, 2021; Wang, Eva, Newman, & Zhou, 2020).
Additionally, Brooks et al. (2020) found that this pandemic brings severe deterioration to psychological health and affects the people as they are now less socially connected, have less freedom to move, boredom, uncertainty, etc. The depressing impact of infectious illness outbreaks on psychological health embraces anxiety and tension (Ren, Gao, & Chen, 2020). However, exposure to traumatic incidents can encourage change in work outcomes (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). Moreover, the tension caused by crisis experience can lead to creative adaptation and the discovery of new-fangled opportunities (Damian, 2017). Hence, it creates a need to investigate and reduce the negative consequences of COVID-induced occupational stress. Since the newly fangled pandemic crises are inevitable (Scudellari, 2020) hence, the working population will be exposed to the risks associated with acute stress. Such actions characterize an essential driver of post-COVID recovery (Roper & Turner, 2020). Besides, Bartik et al. (2020) endorsed having a firm policy response to COVID to sustain short and long-term consequences.

The prospective researchers did not focus on the CIOS on work outcomes. Since preceding studies (Connelly & Zweig, 2015) have distinguished the prominence of KSB (Knowledge Sharing Behaviour) in complicated business circumstances. Montani and Staglianò (2021) suggests identifying the inner individual resources (e.g., KSB) to overcome such challenges and boost innovative performance. Montani and Staglianò (2021) found KSB as a coping behaviour to shape CIOS. They discovered that CIOS brings innovation when employees have knowledge-sharing behaviour. However, CIOS does not bring innovation when employees do not have KSB at work. According to the transactional theory of stress, when there is a stressful situation (caused by a catastrophic event, e.g., COVID-19), the work outcomes are dependent upon the employees' coping strategies (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987). An empirical study by Kim and Park (2017) also found that the employees, who have KSB, are more likely to be engaged in creating and applying contemporary ideas. The stressful employees can discover unconventional, creative solutions to the nuisance caused by stressful experiences (Zhang & Bartol, 2010), e.g., COVID-19. Hao, Shah, Nawazb, Barkat, and Souhall (2020); Montani and Staglianò (2021) found that work-stress induced by pandemics can be destructive to the workforce and help innovate to flourish through a pandemic.

Moreover, they also found that CIOS harms work outcomes only when employees do not have KSBs. However, if they are engaged in KSBs, CIOS does not break the work outcomes. They also confirm that KSB acts as a coping behaviour to manage CIOS and bring innovation. KSB is a coping behaviour that employees adapt to shape their reaction to catastrophic events, e.g., CIOS optimistically. CIOS is usually related to adverse outcomes, but when employees are engaged in KSB, it becomes positive. It is the foremost determinant of employees' innovation against reactions of CIOS. When KSBs are low, CIOS is negatively associated with innovation. Nevertheless, when KSBs are elevated, CIOS and innovation's association becomes considerably encouraging (Montani & Staglianò, 2021).

One of the theories which assist in understanding the association and situation is the Conservation of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 2002). It states that people value (maintain, protect, and build) their resources since eustress is associated with gaining the resources, while distress occurs when lost. Distress is the negative stress and harms the mental health and organizational outcomes whereas, eustress is the positive/constructive stress associated with wellbeing (Shafiq & Gillani, 2018). Hobfoll (1989) categorized resources into four types, i.e., objects (valued for physical nature), conditions (being employed, being married), personal characteristics (upbeat personality, psychological capital, i.e., optimism, resilience, and self-esteem, etc.), energies (time, money, and knowledge), and social support (affective, emotional, instrumental, material). When there is a threat to the employee resources, the consequence is the lack of environmental adaption, which leads to distress. However, acquisition and conservation of resources and linked with eustress. It is, therefore, pertinent to identify and retain employees’ resources so that they cope up with catastrophic or any other kind of occupational stress in a healthier way (M. D. Merino et al., 2021).

Knowledge Sharing Behaviour (KSB) is “a set of individual behaviours concerning sharing one's job-related knowledge and expertise with colleagues” (Yi, 2009). Tacit knowledge refers to the competence of the knowledge donator to generate knowledge by their experiences, expertise, observation, and individual beliefs to execute an action in particular circumstances (Bennet & Bennet, 2008). It is instinctive and is a crucial component of
cognitive discernment. However, it is not readily transferred (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Nevertheless, its value (Reychav & Weisberg, 2010) makes its' sharing indispensable for organizations. It augments innovative work behaviour (Scudellari, 2020). Moreover, (Panahi, Watson, & Partridge, 2013) also originated that the intention to share knowledge is due to; intrinsic value (because they feel happy), extrinsic value (rewards), a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic values, incentivizing (bonus, salary, increment, promotion), and encouragement. Moreover, knowledge hiding is not the nonexistence of KS, but it intentionally withholds the knowledge (Irram Shahzadi & Waqas Raja, 2021).

Academics have to perform diverse roles, e.g., teaching, supervising, consulting, publishing research output, and performing administrative jobs, which requires them to practice TKSB with their colleagues and students. Hence, sharing their tacit knowledge (resides in their minds) will bring quality education and performance of HEIs (Adhikari, 2010). Nonetheless, the competition among HEIs puts escalating pressure on academicians to share their helpful knowledge to unravel their problems related to teaching and research (Rahman, Mannan, Hossain, Zaman, & Hassan, 2018). Conversely, the lack of TKSB among HEI’s academicians will result in resource underutilization. Nevertheless, research on TKSB of HEIs' academicians is scarce (Jolae, Nor, Khani, & Yusoff, 2014). Moreover, tacit knowledge’s unstructured nature makes it not-readily manageable via conventional systems (mentoring, face-to-face communication, chatting, direct observation, etc.) of knowledge management. Hence, they are no longer flexible for TKSB (Hashmi, Ahmad, & Nawaz, 2021; Panahi et al., 2013). Therefore, there is a need to investigate academicians’ motivation, personality, and self-efficacy for their TKSB (Belay, 2014; Hussain, Bhatti, Nawaz, & Ahmad, 2019).

It is essential for academicians of HEIs’ to have the knowledge-sharing intention and motivation to get a high ranking (locally and globally) among HEIs (Chong, Salleh, Ahmad, & Sharifuddin, 2011). Rahman et al. (2018) found that individual motivation considerably augments the explicit and TKSB in an organization. The studies are growing on promoting the prominence of spiritual motivation as a directive of human behaviours. The distinction of spirituality at the workplace has comprehensively attained the curiosity of researchers. Thus, Guillén, Ferrero, and Hoffman (2015) synthesized the earlier classical taxonomies on motivation and originate that they are incomplete as they lack moral and spiritual motivation. Hence, it necessitates integrating SM in the motivation taxonomy. These spiritual motives may be present in one individual and may not necessarily present in others (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000). Spiritual Motivation (SM) is a type of intrinsic motivation that takes into account academicians’ Enjoyment in Helping Others (EHO), Sense of Self-Worth (SSW), and Affective Commitment (AC) (Iram Shahzadi, 2017). The concept of EHO belongs to the theory of altruism (when people have the intention to assist others while expecting nothing in return). Individuals who enjoy helping others have more intention towards knowledge sharing (Ullah, Akhtar, Shahzadi, Farooq, & Yasmin, 2016).

Moreover, the SSW is the extent to which workers perceive themselves as endowing value to their organizations by sharing their knowledge. Researchers consider it the most indispensable psychological need in SDT and as an antecedent in knowledge sharing (Yan & Davison, 2013). Additionally, affective commitment is the degree to which a person is emotionally attached to his organization (Newman & Sheikh, 2012). Affectively committed individuals do more than the formal requirements from them (Choi, 2006). It is the most significant organizational commitment to enhancing knowledge sharing, among other types of commitment.

Previous researchers also found a constructive affiliation of a sense of psychological happiness (Irram Shahzadi & Ali, 2020) and internal value (Zia-ur-Rehman & Shahzadi, 2014) with knowledge transfer at the workplace. Besides, psychological wellbeing is partially associated with employee performance (R. Shahzadi, Ali, Khan, & Naeem, 2021). However, there is still a lack of studies on the impact of motivation on TKSB among academicians of HEIs (Rahman et al., 2018). Previous authors recommended examining knowledge sharing in the education sector (Kanwal, Nunes, & Arif, 2019) of developing countries (Asrar-ul-Haq & Anwar, 2016), principally in the South Asian region (Kanwal et al., 2019). Nonetheless, the earlier studies ignored the effects of job stress on work-related behaviours (Montani & Staglianò, 2021). Moreover, Irram Shahzadi and Ali (2020) also recommended working on the impact of spiritual motivation on skill (knowledge) transfer/sharing. Aryadi and Rahmawati (2019) also
recommended working on factors other than spiritual motivation and performance outcomes. Therefore, the moderating role of COVID-induced occupational stress will also be studied.

Due to the COVID pandemic, individuals have experienced Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PSTD), e.g., COVID-induced occupational stress. Therefore, they recommended investigating the impact of COVID-induced occupational stress on tacit knowledge sharing behaviour. This societal transformation is as essential as the COVID response. This gap is in urgent need of attention since; there is no/limited research on the impact of COVID-induced occupational stress on KSB. Therefore, this study investigates the effect of SM on TKSB among HEI academicians while moderating the impact of CIOS will also be examined. Figure-I illustrates the theoretical framework that presents two hypothesized relationships. Besides, the subsequent section encompasses the study hypotheses as well:

Figure I: Theoretical Framework

H1: Spiritual motivation positively impacts the academician’s tacit knowledge-sharing behaviour among HEIs.

H2: COVID-19 induced occupational stress moderates the relationship between spiritual motivation and academician’s tacit knowledge-sharing behaviour among HEIs.

3. Materials and Methods

It was a hypothetical deductive study since there was hypotheses testing. In addition, the authors collected the primary data from the respondents by using an adapted questionnaire. While, the secondary data sources were; journal articles, books, and online sources. The population embraced the academicians of Pakistani HEIs (Public and Private). The sample frame covers the full-time academicians of all levels, i.e., lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, and Professors. A total of 289 academicians were the study sample. The authors circulated the adapted questionnaire among the academicians of selected HEIs. It was a census (Saunders, 2011) study as the population frame is not mammoth hereafter; there was no need for sampling technique. Additionally, the authors ensured confidentiality and anonymity.

The questionnaire embraced 26 items of all the selected variables. Fifteen items of spiritual motivation were adopted from the previous studies (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, 2005) and used by Iram Shahzadi (2017). Moreover, the authors adopted five items of TKSB from the study of (Cummings, 2004). Additionally, we adopted six measuring items of CIOS from the survey of (Hochwarter, Laird, & Brouer, 2008). Instead of Hurricane (in hurricane-induced job stress), COVID was replaced since there was a lack of measurement scale when authors conducted this study. A 5-point Likert scale measures all items, where '1' signifies "Strongly Disagree" and '5' represents "Strongly Agree". There were few demographic questions (gender, education, designation level, and teaching experience) at the end of the questionnaire. The collected data was analyzed by using SPSS. At first, the authors performed descriptive statistics (which include mean, standard deviation, and correlation). Moreover, reliability analysis was also performed to check if the instruments are reliable or not by investigating the Cronbach alpha values. Furthermore, H1 was analyzed for inferential statistics by performing linear regression analysis. Linear regression was analyzed to investigate how much independent variable regress the dependent variable. Additionally, H2 was analyzed to test moderation by using model-1 of Hayes' process macro in SPSS.
4. Results

The authors performed the reliability analysis to analyze the internal consistency. The Cronbach’s alpha values of SM, TKSB, and CIOS are 0.87, 0.81, and 0.86, respectively. Hence, it ensures reliability since Cronbach’s alpha values are significant than 0.6 (Sekaran & Bougie, 2003). Moreover, descriptive statistics and correlation tests were also performed (mentioned in the below table). It has been found from correlation results that all the relationships are strongly and positively correlated.

### Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

|        | Mean | SD  | SM  | TKSB | CIOS |
|--------|------|-----|-----|------|------|
| SM     | 3.64 | .80 |     |      |      |
| TKSB   | 3.77 | .81 | .699**|      |      |
| CIOS   | 3.75 | .84 | .725**| .898**|      |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

We performed linear regression to analyze H1. The R-value shows a correlation which is 0.699 (high correlation). Whereas, R square value shows the per cent change in TKSB due to SM, i.e., 48.9%.

### Table 2
Model Summary (H1)

|          | R    | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |
|----------|------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
|          | .699**| .489     | .487              | .57904                    | .489             |
|          |      |          |                   |                           | 274.461          |
|          |      |          |                   |                           | 1                |
|          |      |          |                   |                           | 287              |
|          |      |          |                   |                           | .000             |

Additionally, the ANOVA table shows how well the regression equation fits the data. Hence, it shows that the regression model predicts TKSB significantly. It shows that the regression model is statistically significant (P-value is <0.05). Therefore, it is a good fit for data.

### Table 3
ANOVA

|            | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Regression | 92.023         | 1  | 92.023      | 274.461 | .000b |
| Residual   | 96.227         | 287| .335        |       |      |
| Total      | 188.250        | 288|             |       |      |

Moreover, in the coefficient table, the unstandardized beta value is positive, showing the direct relationship between SM and TKSB. Furthermore, the P-value is <0.05, which depicts that SM positively and statistically impact TKSB. Hence, H1 is accepted. The regression equation is TKSB=1.192+0.709(SM).

### Table 4
Coefficients

|                | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| (Constant)     | 1.192                       | .160                      | 7.471 | .000 |
| SM             | .709                        | .043                      | .699  | 16.567 | .000 |

In SPSS, we performed the process macro to analyze H2 by using Hayes’ model-1. The R-value shows the correlation that is 0.9 which depicts a high correlation. R square value depicts that 82.88% change in TSKB is due to CIOS. Moreover, P-value is significant (<0.05), which shows a good model fit.
Table 5
Model Summary (H2)

| R   | R-Sq | MSE    | F    | Df1  | Df2  | P   |
|-----|------|--------|------|------|------|-----|
| .9104 | .8288 | .1131  | 460.0287 | 3.0000 | 285.0000 | .0000 |

It is pertinent to note that the p-values in the below table are significant (<0.05) whereas, t-values are also substantial. Moreover, LLCI and ULCI have values in one direction only (either positive or negative) (Hayes, 2012). For SM, CIOS, Int_1. The results also confirm the moderating impact of CIOS on the relationship between SM and TKSB. Hence, H2 is accepted.

Table 6
Results of Moderation

| Model       | Coeff  | SE   | t     | P     | LLCI  | ULCI  |
|-------------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Constant    | -.6812 | .2237| -3.0454| .0025 | -.1214| -.2409|
| SM          | .5165  | .0833| 6.2040| .0000 | .3527 | 1.2869|
| CIOS        | 1.1442 | .0725| 15.7789| .0000 | 1.0015 | .6804|
| Int_1       | -.1213 | .0221| -5.4964| .0000 | -.1648| -.0779|

5. Discussion

This study investigated the role of academicians’ spiritual motivation in their tacit knowledge sharing behaviour, with the moderation of COVID-induced occupational stress among South Asian HEIs. We developed two hypotheses to meet the research objectives. We analyzed them via linear regression analysis and Process macro by using SPSS. H1 (Spiritual motivation positively impacts academicians’ tacit knowledge sharing behaviour among HEIs) is accepted as the P-value is <0.05 and β value is positive, which shows it is a direct relationship. These findings indicate that SM has a constructive impact on TKSB. These findings are consistent with Iram Shahzadi (2017) results, who found the optimistic effect of SM on knowledge sharing. It is also compatible with the study of Omar, Akhir, Ab Hamid, Misron, and Misron (2021); Iram Shahzadi et al. (2015) who found a positive relationship between motivation and KSB. Moreover, there is a consistency of our study findings with the results of Muhara, Wibisono, and Mujtahid (2020), who found that SM positively impacts performance behaviour. As KSB is a part of the extra-role performance, therefore, the findings are said to be consistent with previous research. However, these findings are inconsistent with the study of Aryadi and Rahmawati (2019) who found no relationship between spiritual motivation and performance.

Moreover, H2 (COVID-induced occupational stress moderates the relationship between spiritual motivation and academicians’ tacit knowledge sharing behaviour among HEIs) is also accepted. As COVID is a new phenomenon, fewer/no studies have investigated the moderation of COVID-induces occupational stress on the relationship of spiritual motivation and tacit knowledge sharing behaviour. However, the findings of H2 seem to be consistent with previous results (Hobfoll, 1989), who found that positive personality/psychological attributes are associated with favourable outcomes since they adapt to their environment and achieve their goals (Hobfoll, 2002; M.-D. Merino & Privado, 2015). These psychological resources are associated with eu-stress, which is regarded as productive stress and endows with optimistic outcomes. The study findings also depict that in the presence of COVID-induced stress, employees are more inclined towards sharing their tacit knowledge with others. It ensures that the recruitment practices are good enough that employees enjoy helping others; they are spiritually motivated, better at stress management, and better at converting stress into eu-stress.

6. Conclusion

This study has investigated the role of academicians’ spiritual motivation in their tacit knowledge sharing behaviour, with the moderation of COVID-induced occupational stress. Hence, to meet two research objectives, we developed two hypotheses. Based on findings, we conclude that spiritual motivation positively and significantly impacts the academicians’ tacit knowledge sharing behaviour among HEIs. Moreover, COVID-induced occupational stress moderates their relationship. It means academicians can now manage COVID-Induced
occupational stress that is no longer impacting the extra-role performance behaviours since it’s more than a year now. Employees are better able to manage their routine work if they are spiritually motivated. If HEIs have the intention to ensure implicit knowledge-sharing behaviour, they must first ensure that academicians have high spiritual motivation.

7. Implications

The current research is exceptional because there are no studies that consider the impact of SM on KSB during the COVID-19 pandemic, especially in the HEIs context. This study adds to the literature by taking COVID-induced occupational stress as eustress by using the conservation of resource theory. The study model also supports the self-determination theory to examine human behavioural motivations in the knowledge-sharing context. This study also advances the literature regarding job stress (CIOS), caused by catastrophic extra-organizational events, i.e., COVID-19. It ensures that spiritual motivation acts as the vital resource that shapes employees’ knowledge-sharing behaviour, even during occupational stress caused by COVID-19.

Despite varied theoretical contributions, this study also provides guidelines to the HR managers, HODs, practitioners, and the policymakers of HEIs. They must recruit such academicians who are highly spiritually motivated individuals since they will be better at resource management (as per conservation of resources theory). Hence, they will provide person-organization fit during extra-organizational catastrophic events. Addressing the actual behaviours will develop a more accountable society. These findings are equally applicable in other KIOs. KIOs should create conducive conditions (during catastrophic or non-catastrophic events) for knowledge exchange of those employees whose spiritual motivation or another resource-set is low. To accomplish this, KIOs must have a KM (Knowledge Management) Expert in their R&D department, who will indefatigably work on ensuring and retaining employees’ resource set so that the knowledge sharing activities are not disturbed in the presence/absence of any catastrophic events.

Moreover, we also recommend deeming knowledge sharing as an in-role performance indicator in KIOs, by making it an integral part of their job description. Therefore, it is indispensable for HR managers to rethink their recruitment practices in KIOs to have a P-O fit. We recommend using referrals for candidate selection to ensure a harmonious match amid candidates’ skills and organizational objectives. We also recommend ensuring knowledge management-based HR practices, e.g., provide transparent feedback, knowledge management-based financial (spot bonus, management incentive plans, person-focused pay), skill-based pay, behaviour encouragement plans, and competency-based pay plans) and non-financial (paid vacations) compensation, promotions, and appreciations. It will encourage employees to have knowledge collection and donation behaviour and act as de-lurking strategies. There must be some motivational seminars/mentoring sessions to ensure the sense of self-worth by making them realize that the only competitor they have is themselves. It will change their perception from taking others as competitors/threats; to a win-win mindset as sharing knowledge creates a piece of new knowledge. The study upshots are generalized to the business schools and other KIOs (e.g., knowledge workers in the IT industry, architects, doctors, engineers, etc.). They can take up the same model to persuade tacit knowledge sharing behaviours.

8. Limitations and Recommendations:

Besides the study contributions to society, there are some limitations as well. Firstly, we collected data only from a few HEIs of Pakistan. Therefore, we recommend that future authors should collect data from other countries to generalize the findings. Moreover, we collected data from a developing country with having collectivist culture. Therefore, it will be interesting to compare the results from other South Asian countries and individualist cultures to generalize the conclusions or investigate their differences when there are contrasting cultures. Furthermore, the future authors should compare public and private sector HEIs to see the difference. Additionally, future authors should also collect data from other Knowledge Intensive Organizations (KIOs) to investigate the moderating role of COVID-induced occupational stress. This study examined only personal (spiritual motivation), conditions (working under changed
circumstances due to COVID, social class of professionals having advanced university degrees), and energy resources spiritual motivational resource of eu-stress during COVID pandemic. Therefore, we recommend the future authors comprehensively investigate all five recourses of the theory of conservation of resources in knowledge sharing context to investigate during remote working due to COVID-19. These recourses are objects (having sufficient space at home, number of members living in that home), conditions (being employed, being married, or having a stable partner), personal characteristics (upbeat personality, physical wellbeing, psychological wellbeing/capital, i.e., optimism, resilience, and self-esteem, etc.), energies (time, money, and knowledge), and social support (affective, emotional, instrumental, material). Future studies may also investigate the impact of musculoskeletal disorders (due to prolonged sitting) on employees’ in-role and extra-role behavioural outcomes. Adding mediating (self-efficacy and clan culture) and moderating (country culture, gender, age, and different personality type) variables into the model will be an exciting addition to the literature.
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