

Self-Sacrifice Leadership and Job Performance in Hotels

Subjects: Management

Contributor: HyoungChul Shin

Self-sacrifice leadership had significant positive effects on social capital and job performance. Moreover, social capital significantly improved job performance and mediated the interaction between self-sacrifice and job performance. Therefore, building social capital for employees is critical, which implies that hotels require education and training to promote self-sacrificing leadership. In particular, self-sacrificing leadership has a decisive influence on employees' job performance; thus, a system that improves the working environment must be established.

Keywords: self-sacrifice leadership ; social capital ; job performance ; hotel industry

1. Introduction

Companies in modern society cannot refuse to change and innovate to maintain a competitive advantage in the era of super-competition, despite rapid environmental changes and the incompleteness of organizational composition. Hence, attention has focused on the dedication and participation of the organization members, who are the sources of a company's sustainable survival and competitive advantage. Moreover, factors that generate innovative ideas have received considerable attention. In this process, the leader's behavior can have a significant impact on the behavior of the organizational members ^[1]; therefore, there has been much research on effective leadership ^[2]. Many researchers have conducted research on leadership that positively affects the performance and creativity of organization members ^{[3][4][5]}.

As the business environment becomes more uncertain, leadership has evolved beyond the initial leadership theories of characteristics, behavior, and situation; one of these styles of leadership is self-sacrifice leadership ^{[6][7]}.

The efficient performance of the organization requires its members' voluntary participation, risk-taking, and sacrifice, as self-sacrifice leadership acts as a catalyst for their dedication, effort, and risk-taking ^{[8][9]}. Furthermore, the more rapid the changes in the corporate environment, the more members expect the leader's sacrificial behavior ^[10]. Moreover, they hope that the leader demonstrates excellent self-sacrifice leadership for the organization's survival and development ^{[11][12]}. As a result, a leader's voluntary self-sacrifice instills self-belief in members that they can form a positive and active attitude to improve job performance and overcome difficulties even in complex environments ^[13]. This implies that the leader's self-sacrifice behavior can have a significant impact on the behavior and attitude of employees.

To achieve a company's long-term goal, various departments must perform their duties well and collaborate closely with one another. This concept is known as social capital, which promotes the specific behavior of members of the organizational structure. An organization's intangible assets are productive and allow for creating organizational performance ^[14]. Hence, when social capital is formed within an organization, its members can create new values by sharing resources within the organization through cooperation and support for corporate goals and corresponding gains ^{[15][16]}.

As a result, the self-sacrificing leadership of perceived leaders, or members of the organization, will influence the formation of attitudes toward their duties or organizations. It also exerts significant influence on social capital formed through active mutual exchanges with other members. Furthermore, the employee's job performance depends on whether the organization has core capital ^[17] and how effectively it uses its capital ^[18]. In other words, the ability to utilize and convert intangible capital held by a company or created by its members is a critical factor in improving and maintaining a company's competitiveness ^[19]. Therefore, the leader's self-sacrifice leadership and social capital are critical requirements for the performance creation of hotel companies.

2. Self-Sacrifice Leadership

Leadership research is a topic that has long piqued the interest of many researchers ^[20]. Various theories and approaches to effective leadership have been proposed, particularly in organizational behavior and personnel management. For instance, Hughes et al. ^[21] divided leadership into leaders, members, and situations. Most leadership studies recognized three components of the leadership process: leaders, members, and situations. Moreover, many scholars have focused on effective leadership that encourages members to pursue organizational goals voluntarily ^[6], with self-sacrifice of the leader being recognized as a desirable and essential leadership behavior ^{[22][23]}.

Self-sacrificing leadership is defined as sacrificial work behavior beyond the scope of work officially granted by the organization; it is the act of refraining from or giving up the use of authority or privileges granted to an employee position and the suspension or waiver of benefits granted to him/her ^{[12][24]}. Van Knippenberg et al. ^[25] defined actions taken to achieve the goals and interests of an organization or group to which an individual belongs as self-sacrifice leadership, in which individuals were at risk of losing, and those affected by this were designated as organizations' employees.

According to previous research on self-sacrifice leadership, leaders' self-sacrifice made members of the organization perceive their bosses as desirable leaders ^[26]. It demonstrated administrative outcomes that prompted additional efforts from members ^[27]. Furthermore, charismatic perception and trust in leaders ^[28], trust ^[29], and leadership effectiveness ^[30] improved self-sacrifice obligations and organizational commitment.

3. Social Capital

Social capital, which refers to networks, norms, trust, and relationship structures that promote collective action, is one of the essential core concepts in raising awareness of the interrelationship between economic outcomes and social achievement. According to Adler and Kwon ^[31], social capital can influence organizational members' career success and managerial remuneration, encourage resource exchange and product innovation, reduce turnover, foster entrepreneurship, and strengthen supplier relationships, networks, and learning.

Meanwhile, Coleman ^[32] defined social capital as a component that rapidly shapes individual and organizational behavior within the social structure. He regarded mutual trust, norms, expectations, obligations, and information power as forms of social capital. Putnam ^[33] called social organization characteristics such as trust, norms, and networks that can increase social efficiency by facilitating cooperative work behavior social capital. Furthermore, Ostrom ^[34] defined social capital as shared understanding, clarification, rule, and knowledge of interactions that cause individuals and organizations to repeat actions. In addition, Inkpen and Tsang ^[35] stated that it refers to the sum of resources that arise from and are inherent in the relationship held by individuals or organizations in the network. In this way, social capital can be divided into structural and cultural aspects. In contrast, structural characteristics emphasize social network connections, whereas cultural elements emphasize trust, norms, and values ^[36].

Because there are various definitions of social capital, each previous study presents different perspectives on the components. For example, Putnam ^[33] presented network, trust, and norm as sources of social capital, and Nahapiet and Ghoshal ^[15] classified social capital into structural, relational, and cognitive dimensions and proposed factors for each dimension.

Among the components of social capital, trust, norms, and networks take a central position. Trust is a belief that exists between people, and in the case of organizations, it plays a critical role in sharing and communicating knowledge and information ^[37]. Meanwhile, the norm is a primary mechanism that promotes the organization's culture by causing group members to act in accordance with the shared language, behavior, and goal ^[38]. The network functions as an infrastructure for social capital, allowing it to exist as a relationship within a group.

4. Job Performance

Job performance refers to the physical behavior of the investigator to achieve the organization's goal ^[39]. From this perspective, job performance refers to actions evaluated by the organization as part of the employee's responsibilities and duties ^[40].

As the organization's need for adaptability grows, job performance is classified as task performance and contextual performance. Research on the model system of job performance progresses; thus, the concept of adaptive performance, which necessitates individual adaptability on the part of employees, emerges ^{[41][42]}. The performance of tasks is an official job that is specified in job descriptions. It can be defined as an action that either directly executes the

organization's core skills or indirectly performs the tasks necessary for such skills ^[43]. Meanwhile, contextual performance is an action that supports the organization's social and psychological environment so that its core functions can be carried out smoothly. Adaptation performance is a concept that encompasses behaviors, abilities, and attributes that helps members comprehend the organizational environment for changing and uncertain situations and adapt accordingly ^[41]. As a result, job performance has evolved into a concept that encompasses various job behaviors, such as anti-productivity and organizational citizenship, including contextual and task performance that contributes to organizational effectiveness ^[44].

References

1. Avolio, B.J.; Gardner, W.L. Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadersh. Q.* 2005, 16, 315–338.
2. Yukl, G. Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Acad. Manag. Perspect.* 2012, 26, 66–85.
3. Shin, S.J.; Zhou, J. Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Acad. Manag. J.* 2003, 46, 703–714.
4. Wang, A.C.; Cheng, B.S. When does benevolent leadership lead to creativity? The moderating role of creative role identity and job autonomy. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2010, 31, 106–121.
5. Lin, W.; Ma, J.; Zhang, Q.; Li, J.C.; Jiang, F. How is benevolent leadership linked to employee creativity? The mediating role of leader–member exchange and the moderating role of power distance orientation. *J. Bus. Ethics* 2018, 152, 1099–1115.
6. Lowe, K.B.; Gardner, W.L. Ten years of the leadership quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future. *Leadersh. Q.* 2000, 11, 459–514.
7. Dinh, J.E.; Lord, R.G.; Gardner, W.L.; Meuser, J.D.; Liden, R.C.; Hu, J. Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *Leadersh. Q.* 2014, 25, 36–62.
8. Bass, B.M. Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organ. Dyn.* 1985, 13, 26–40.
9. Conger, J.A. *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership*; Jossey-Bass: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1989.
10. De Cremer, D.; Mayer, D.M.; Van Dijke, M.; Schouten, B.C.; Bards, M. When does self-sacrificial leadership motivate prosocial behavior? It depends on followers' prevention focus. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2009, 94, 887–899.
11. Kim, M.H.; Chae, S.W.; Kim, Y.S.; Kim, M.S. Relationship of nursing informatics competency and self-leadership among hospital nurses. *J. Korean Acad. Nurs. Admin.* 2007, 13, 176–183.
12. Zhang, W.H. A Study on the Structural Relationship between Self-Sacrificing Leadership, Likeability about Superiors and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Master's Thesis, Dongkook University, Seoul, South Korea, 2017.
13. Halverson, S.K.; Murphy, S.E.; Riggio, R.E. Charismatic leadership in crisis situations: A laboratory investigation of stress and crisis. *Small Group Res.* 2004, 35, 495–514.
14. Coleman, J.S. Commentary: Social institutions and social theory. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 1990, 55, 333–339.
15. Nahapiet, J.; Ghoshal, S. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 1998, 23, 242–266.
16. Tsai, W.; Ghoshal, S. Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Acad. Manag. J.* 1998, 41, 464–476.
17. Carmeli, A.; Tishler, A. The relationships between intangible organizational elements and organizational performance. *Strateg. Manag. J.* 2004, 25, 1257–1278.
18. Brooking, A. *Intellectual Capital, Core Asset for the Third Millennium Enterprise*; Thompson Publishing International Business Press: London, UK, 1996.
19. Watson, S.; Hewett, K. A multi-theoretical model of knowledge transfer in organizations: Determinants of knowledge contribution and knowledge reuse. *J. Manag. Stud.* 2006, 43, 141–173.
20. Yukl, G.; Michel, J.W. Proactive influence tactics and leader member exchange. *Power Influ. Organ.* 1177, 87–103.
21. Hughes, D.; Rodriguez, J.; Smith, E.P.; Johnson, D.J.; Stevenson, H.C.; Spicer, P. Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Dev. Psychol.* 2006, 42, 747–770.

22. Avolio, B.J.; Bass, B.M. Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *Leadersh. Q.* 1995, 6, 199–218.
23. Conger, J.A.; Kanungo, R.N. Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 1987, 12, 637–647.
24. Choi, Y. Self-Sacrificial Leadership: Mediating and Moderating Effects of People's Spirituality. *Leadersh. Rev.* 2011, 2, 3–24.
25. Van Knippenberg, D.; Van Knippenberg, B.; De Cremer, D.; Hogg, M.A. Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *Leadersh. Q.* 2004, 15, 825–856.
26. Van Knippenberg, B.; Van Knippenberg, D. Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2005, 90, 25–37.
27. Sosik, J.J. The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: A model and preliminary field study. *Leadersh. Q.* 2005, 16, 221–244.
28. De Cremer, D.; Van Knippenberg, D. Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader self-confidence. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Processes* 2004, 95, 140–155.
29. De Cremer, D.; Van Knippenberg, D. Cooperation as a function of leader self-sacrifice, trust, and identification. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 2005, 26, 355–369.
30. Janson, A. Extracting leadership knowledge from formative experiences. *Leadership* 2008, 4, 73–94.
31. Adler, P.S.; Kwon, S.W. Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 2002, 27, 17–40.
32. Coleman, J.S. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *Am. J. Sociol.* 1988, 94, 95–120.
33. Putnam, R.D. Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *PS Political Sci. Politics* 1995, 28, 664–683.
34. Ostrom, E. Collective action and the evolution of social norms. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 2000, 14, 137–158.
35. Inkpen, A.C.; Tsang, E.W. Social capital, networks, and knowledge transfer. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 2005, 30, 146–165.
36. Van Deth, J.W. Measuring social capital: Orthodoxies and continuing controversies. *Int. J. Soc. Res. Methodol.* 2003, 6, 79–92.
37. Cohen, D.; Prusak, L. *In Good Company*; Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA, USA, 2001.
38. McFadyen, M.A.; Cannella, A., Jr. A. Social capital and knowledge creation: Diminishing returns of the number and strength of exchange relationships. *Acad. Manag. J.* 2004, 47, 735–746.
39. Campbell, J.P. *Modeling the Performance Prediction Problem in Industrial and Organizational Psychology*; Consulting Psychologists Press: Palo Alto, CA, USA, 1990.
40. Jex, S.M.; Britt, T.W. *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*; John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2014.
41. Allworth, E.; Hesketh, B. Construct-oriented biodata: Capturing change-related and contextually relevant future performance. *Int. J. Sel. Assess.* 1999, 7, 97–111.
42. Griffin, B.; Hesketh, B. Adaptable behaviours for successful work and career adjustment. *Aust. J. Psychol.* 2003, 55, 65–73.
43. Borman, W.C.; Motowidlo, S.J. Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Hum. Perform.* 1997, 10, 99–109.
44. Shoss, M.K.; Witt, L.A.; Vera, D. When does adaptive performance lead to higher task performance? *J. Organ. Behav.* 2012, 33, 910–924.