Citation

Aslam, N. and Sahibzada, U.F. (2023), "Catalyzing transformational leadership in Chinese hospitality industry – complexity theory perspective: mix method approach", Leadership & Organization Development Journal, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2023-0205

Table 1: Sources of measurement instruments.

Variables	Dimensions	No of Items	Sources
Transformational Leadership	-	04	McColl-Kennedy & Anderson (2002)
Marketing Orientation	Customer Orientation	05	Dabrowski *et al.* (2019)
	Competitor Orientation	04	
	Cross-Functional Integration	04	
Competitive Advantage	-	04	Khandekar and Sharma (2005))
Organizational Performance	-	05	(Tseng, 2010)

Source(s): Authors

Table 2: Item loadings, reliability, and convergent validity.

	Item Loadings	Alpha	CR	AVE
Transformational Leadership		0.903	0.928	0.722
TL1	0.871			
TL2	0.885			
TL3	0.843			
TL4	0.804			
Market Orientation				
Cross-Functional Integration		0.838	0.892	0.673
CFI1	0.786			

CFI2	0.804			
CFI3	0.832			
CFI4	0.858			
Competitor Orientation		**0.874**	**0.913**	**0.725**
CTO1	0.797			
CTO2	0.869			
CTO3	0.877			
CTO4	0.861			
Customer Orientation		**0.810**	**0.869**	**0.572**
CUO1	0.696			
CUO2	0.646			
CUO3	0.838			
CUO4	0.847			
CUO5	0.734			
Competitive Advantage		**0.846**	**0.897**	**0.685**
CA1	0.828			
CA2	0.845			
CA3	0.841			
CA4	0.794			
Organizational Performance		**0.896**	**0.923**	**0.707**
OP1	0.794			
OP2	0.860			
OP3	0.879			
OP4	0.846			
OP5	0.821			

Source(s): Authors

Table 3: Discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker Criterion)

	CA	CTO	CFI	CUO	OP	TL
CA	0.827					
CTO	0.537	0.852				
CFI	0.632	0.750	0.821			
CUO	0.687	0.625	0.673	0.756		
OP	0.555	0.628	0.699	0.601	0.841	
TL	0.673	0.331	0.382	0.551	0.369	0.850

Source(s): Authors

Note: TL, transformational leadership, OP, organizational performance; CA, competitive advantage; CTO, competitor orientation; CFI, cross-functional integration; CUO, customer orientation

Table 4: Hypotheses testing

Hypotheses	Relationships	Beta	SD	T Statistics	P Values
H1a	Transformational Leadership -> Customer Orientation	0.55	0.05	11.08	0.000
H1b	Transformational Leadership -> Competitor Orientation	0.33	0.05	6.00	0.000
H1c	Transformational Leadership -> Cross-Functional Integration	0.38	0.05	7.37	0.000
H2a	Customer Orientation -> Competitive Advantage	0.47	0.05	8.10	0.000
H2b	Competitor Orientation -> Competitive Advantage	0.01	0.06	0.19	0.846
H2c	Cross-Functional Integration -> Competitive Advantage	0.30	0.06	4.44	0.000
H3	Competitive Advantage -> Organizational Performance	0.56	0.04	13.38	0.000

Source(s): Authors

Table 5. Necessity conditions

	Consistency	Coverage
TLC	0.667986 [*]	0.679314
~TLC	0.496988	0.520314

CUOC	0.659879 *	0.679130
~CUOC	0.673699 *	0.689332
CTOC	0.749325 *	0.798803
~CTOC	0.576574	0.691034
CFIC	0.746598 *	0.749903
~CFIC	0.439694	0.539304
CAC	0.679677 *	0.793690
~CAC	0.639689	0.671047

Source(s): Authors

Note: ~ shows that a condition does not exist. For the most part, it meets the 0.65 consistency benchmark.

Table 6. The outcomes of the intermediate solution

Conditions	Outcome: Organizational (Hotel) Performance		
	1	2	3
Transformational Leadership	●		●
Market Orientation			
CUO		●	●
CTO	●		
CFI		●	●
Competitive Advantage	Ø		●
Raw Coverage	0.499014	0.430199	0.510379
Unique Coverage	0.047391	0.041394	0.043419
Consistency	0.893179	0.851671	0.810057
Solution Coverage		0.649	
Solution Consistency		0.641	

Source(s): Authors

Note: ● states the existence of a condition, Ø omits a condition, and a blank area indicates 'do not care'.