

THE INFLUENCE OF SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUCH AS HUMBLE LEADERSHIP AND JOB CHARACTERISTICS ON EMPLOYEES' INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOR

Jun Yao, Lili Fan,

Economics and Management College of Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu city, China

ABSTRACT

Among the many variables influencing employee performance and behavior, leadership style is one of the main variables. As an important way of leadership, the humble leadership has been paid much attention to how it plays an important role in subordinates' behavior and what role it plays. Based on the actual investigation, the author analyzes the influence of humble leadership on subordinates' innovation, and points out that humble Leadership helps subordinates to innovate. At the same time, the complexity of work plays a moderating role.

Keywords:

Humble leadership, innovation, performance.

INTRODUCTION

The completion of any work is in a specific environment, and these specific environmental factors are collectively referred to as the working context factors. The working situation is one of the main factors that affect employee performance and behavior, has always been scholars and Entrepreneur's attention to the situation, how the factors affect employee behavior and performance, there are a lot of relevant research results. In general, situational factors can be divided into from the work itself and from the external environment, For example Hertzberg think that influencing factors of employee performance and behavior is divided into health factors and incentive factors, health factors which mainly come from outside of work environment and incentive factors mainly comes from the work itself. Situational factors can also be classified according to the hierarchy, such as the work itself, the team, the organization, etc..This paper focuses on the interactive effects of humble leadership and job characteristics on employee performance and behavior.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND ASSUMPTION

Humble leadership and subordinate behavior

Humility is an ancient concept in both eastern and Western cultures. In China culture it has always been emphasized that the self introspection of the leader, while in western culture humble is regarded as a useful and positive personality ^[1,2]. In recent years, with the complexity of the organizational environment, the completion of enterprise work needs more dependent on individual conscious active behavior, great style and command style leadership reflects more and more limitations.

In this context, many scholars and Entrepreneur have done in-depth research on humble leadership, and made a lot of useful discussions on its connotation, antecedent variables, outcome variables and application effects. Owens and Hekman put forward in 2012: The humble leadership is a kind of "bottom-up" leadership in essence. It is the leadership style that leaders can shape through their own behavior, and further puts forward the three dimensions of humble leadership: Acknowledge their limitations, appreciate the strengths and efforts of others, and be willing to engage in dialogue and learning ^[3].

First of all, people are usually more willing to work with whom the humility and the courage to admit those humble, tolerant leadership, humble type leader can more effectively unite members, stimulate their positive behavior, resulting in higher performance. At the same time, humble leadership also means to admit that he is not omniscient and omnipotent, can take the initiative to decentralization and tolerance under the fault; Second, the humble leadership can better perceive the advantages and strengths of subordinates and appreciate the efforts of subordinates ^[4,5]. Generally speaking, leaders at high altitude tend to ignore other people's efforts and hard to communicate. Humble leaders respect subordinates more and make positive evaluations to them, which can not only bring subordinates higher work input, but also effectively promote employee development; Finally, humble leaders are tolerant of different opinions and opinions. They have clear goals and are more willing to communicate with employees. They learn not only from dialogues, but also from subordinates.

In actual work, the behavior of employees is very complex. Scholars have done a lot of research on so many of employees behavior. On the basis of role behavior, scholars put forward the concept of extra-role behavior. For example, in the late 20th century proposed organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) ^[6,7], Prosocial Organizational Behavior (POB) ^[8] and Organizational spontaneity ^[9] and other etc. all belong to this. Chinese scholar Han yi concludes employee performance activities into four behaviors: task, relationship, learning, and innovation, and constructs employee performance structures.

Among many performance behaviors, innovative behavior has special significance for enterprises, and innovation is the cornerstone of sustainable development of enterprises. Innovation can be divided into three levels: organization, team and individual, but individual level innovation is the basis of the former two. From the connotation of humble leadership, the awareness of their deficiencies will reduce ineffective leadership, thereby improving the performance of subordinates, and can provide greater support and tolerance for subordinates' innovation; Appreciation and recognition of subordinates' contribution can stimulate subordinates' higher work motivation and maintain their enthusiasm for innovation; Modest learning style improves the ability of subordinates to innovate.

The following Assumption1 can be obtained: Humble leadership can effectively stimulate innovative behavior of employees.

Complexity of work

Job characteristics are one of the main environmental factors that affect employees' job outcomes. One of the most famous theories is the classic JCM Model. JCM Model believes that there are five main features of the work: Skill diversity, task integrity, autonomy, task importance and feedback. According to the theory, jobs with these characteristics can better stimulate employees' positive mental state, resulting in more intrinsic motivation and higher performance (Hackman & Oldman, 1980). Frese, by measuring the degree of difficulty in individual job decision-making, points out that work complexity can produce high level and high knowledge practical activities, and contributes to employee's enthusiasm and self-efficacy^[10]. As a result, the work with higher complexity has more uncertainty, higher skills and more specialization skills, which requires more input and continuous focus.

In summary, this paper proposes Assumption2: Work complexity plays a moderating role in the process which humble leadership effect subordinates' positive behavior and performance. That is: With the increase of work complexity, the influence of humble leadership on subordinates' positive behavior will be weakened.

DATA ANALYSIS

Variable measurement

The author randomly selected enterprise staff to issue questionnaires in this paper. In order to obtain authentic answers as much as possible, the academic use and the anonymity of the questionnaire were emphasized in the beginning of the questionnaire. The survey consists of two stages: pre-test and formal investigation.

The pre-test was conducted in a small scale. The purpose of the pre-test was to refine the semantic and specific content of the questionnaire, so as to make it more consistent with the understanding of Chinese employees. The formal measurement was conducted by network questionnaire, and the questionnaire was started to guide and explain the sample's filling, which ensured the validity of the filling. In dealing with the questionnaire, all unanswered questions and abnormal values out of range and continuous values were regarded as abnormal questionnaires and deleted.

250 valid questionnaires were returned online. A total of 287 questionnaires were collected, and after the invalid questionnaires were eliminated, recycling effective rate was 87.1%. Sample of 132 men, 52.8%, 118 women, 47.2%; Working time, 1 years of service below, accounting for 0%; 1-3 years of service, 153, accounting for 61.2%; 3-5 years of service, 77, accounting for 30.8%; 20 people with more than 5 years working age, accounting for 8%. In terms of job categories, 84 managers, accounting for 33.6%, 117 professionals, accounting for 46.8%, 49 business personnel, accounting for 19.6%.

This study adopts the form of scale survey and data from self-report. In order to determine whether there is a common method bias in the study, the Harman single factor test was used. Through exploratory factor analysis, the results of non rotation factor showed that the first factor load was 24.43%, indicating that there was no significant common method bias problem.

Measurement tools

The measuring tools used in this paper are derived from the representative scales in international and domestic authoritative journals, and their semantics are adjusted to the national conditions. The reliability and validity of the scale were in accordance with the requirements.

Humble leadership. Using Owens and other people's humble leadership behavior questionnaire, a total of 9 items, including 3 dimensions. They are leaders' self awareness, appreciation of others and learning demonstration. Using 5 point scoring system, 1 is very inconsistent, 5 is in full compliance. The scale used empirically in China has been to prove its reliability and validity ^[11]. In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.81, and the item load distribution ranged from 0.69 to 0.81, and the Convergence validity AVE was 0.61.

Employee innovation. Using the scale used by Scott^[12], the scale has 6 items, the scale adopts 5 point scoring system, 1 points are totally inconsistent, and 5 points are completely consistent. In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.88, and the item load distribution ranged from 0.80 to 0.85, and the Convergence validity AVE was 0.71.

Work complexity. In this paper, we use scales developed by Dean et al^[13], a total of 3 items. Using a 7 point scoring system, 1 is very little and no complexity, and 7 is very large and very complex. In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale was 0.92, and the item load distribution ranged from 0.77 to 0.83, and the Convergence validity AVE was 0.69.

Control variable. Considering the influence of individual differences on innovation, referring to previous studies, this paper takes gender, length of service and position as control variables. A job is mainly divided into professional personnel, management personnel and business personnel. Length of service representative occupation career time of sample.

Data analysis

The main data of each variable, shown in Table 1, is visible. Employee innovation and humble leadership, work complexity were significant Correlation, Correlation degrees were 0.58, 0.70, which provides a preliminary basis for the study assumption in this paper. In addition, the data also showed that gender, post, seniority and other variables were not significantly correlated.

Table 1 Mean, standard deviation and Correlation coefficient of variables

	mean value	standard deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. gender	0.528	0.49	-					
2. positions	1.53	0.69	-0.22*	-				
3. seniority	3.13	0.71	0.23	-0.12	-			
4. humble leadership	3.17	0.75	-0.13	-0.11	-0.06	-		
5. complexity of work	3.26	0.77	0.02	-0.05	-0.13	0.47*	-	
6. innovative behavior	3.27	0.80	0.15	-0.06	-0.07	0.58**	0.70*	-

Note: N=250; * is $P < 0.05$, ** is $P < 0.01$; in gender, male =1, female =0; in seniority, 1 is 1-3 years, 2 is 3-5 years, 3 is more than 5 years; post nature, 1 is technology, 2 is administrative, 3 is business positions.

This paper uses PROCESS plug-in developed by Hayes et al for SPSS to do statistical analysis directly. Select Hayes's Analysis Model 1 for bootstrap test^[14], sample size selection 5000, confidence interval of 95%. Statistical analysis results show: At the 95% confidence level, the test results did not contain 0 (LLCI=-0.2404, ULCI=-0.0212), indicating that work complexity played a moderating role in the process of humble leadership influencing subordinates' innovation. Further analysis of the moderating role, in accordance with the mean, the mean plus or minus a standard deviation, the distinction between the low, medium and high complexity, the data shows that for the subordinates with low moderate work complexity, the moderating effect of task complexity significantly, confidence intervals of bootstrap test were (0.1779, 0.4805) and (0.0927, 0.3634), none of 0; For the subordinates with high work complexity, the moderating effect of work complexity was not significant (-0.0407, 0.2946), which included 0. Figure 1 shows that the humble leadership

has a significant impact on subordinates' innovative activities for those who work in the middle and low complexity, for the staff working in the high complexity, the humble leaders' influence on subordinates' innovative activities is not significant.

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):						
Task Complexity	Effect	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
2.4945	.3292	.0766	4.2996	.0000	.1779	.4805
3.2676	.2281	.0685	3.3288	.0011	.0927	.3634
4.0407	.1269	.0849	1.4958	.1368	-.0407	.2946
int_1	-.1308	.0555	-2.3587	.0196	-.2404	-.0212

Figure 1 Bootstrap test results

CONCLUSION

Innovation is the driving force for the sustainable development of enterprises and the source of enterprise vitality. The basis of all innovation is individual innovation. In this regard, motivating employees to innovate is an important job responsibility of leaders. On the other hand, the humble leadership behavior contains the connotation of fault tolerance, learning and self reflection, so it can better motivate employee innovation. In specific working situations, there are many factors that influence the results of humble leadership and employees innovation activity, and work complexity is one of them. Through the research, it is found that the role of humble leadership in motivating subordinates innovation is not obvious in the complex working situation; In the middle and low complex work, humble leadership can better motivate staff innovation behavior.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tangney J P. Humility [A]. Snyder C R and Lopez S J (Eds.). Handbook of positive psychology[C]. New York: Oxford University Press. 2002:411-419.
- [2] Peterson C and Seligman M. Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification[M]. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [3] Owens B P and Hekman D R. Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes [J]. Academy of Management Journal, 2012, 55 (4):787-818
- [4] Nielsen R, Marrone J A, Slay H S. A New Look at Humility: Exploring the Humility Concept and Its Role in Socialized Charismatic Leadership [J]. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 2010, 17(1):33-43.
- [5] Tangney J P. Humility: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Findings and Directions for Future Research [J]. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 2000, 19(1):70-82.
- [6] Smith CA, Organ DW, Near JP. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedent [J]. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1983, 68 (4): 475- 480.
- [7] Organ DW. Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington [M]. MA: Lexington Books, 1988
- [8] Brief AP, Motowidlo S J. Prosocial Organizational Behavior [J]. Academy of Management Review, 1986, 11(4): 710- 725.
- [9] George JM, Brief AP. Feeling good-doing well: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship [J]. Psychology Bulletin, 1992, 112 (2): 310- 329
- [10] Frese M; Kring W; Soose A; & Zempel J. Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany [J]. Academy of Management Journal, 1996, 39(1):37-64
- [11] QUQing, HEZhi-chan, MEIZhe-qun. An Empirical Study on the Impact of Leader Humility on Leadership Effectiveness and Employees' Organizational Identification[J]. China Soft Science, 2013 (7):101-109
- [12] Scott, S.G., Bruce, R.A.. Determinants of Innovative Behavior: A Path Model of Individual in the Workplace. Academy of Management Journal, 1994, 37(3):580-607.
- [13] Dean, J.W. & Snell, S.A. Integrated manufacturing and job design: moderating effects of organizational inertia. Academy of Management Journal, 1991. 34(4): 776-804

- [14] Hayes A F. An introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression based approach[M].2013.New York; Guilford Press.