The Influence of Transformational Leadership and Cross-Cultural Psychological Capital on Turnover Intentions in Hotel Industry
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Abstract: The study of transformational leadership encompassed many contexts and disciplines and is believed to be the most valuable hotel industry. The impact of perceived transformational leadership and cross-cultural psychological capital on the frontline employee's quit intentions in the Sabah hotel industry was examined in this study. Data were obtained from 162 frontline workers using a purposive sampling method. The relationships in question were tested using "Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modelling" (PLS-SEM). The findings demonstrated the positive effect of transformational leadership on cross-cultural psychological capital while having a negative impact on turnover intention. Conversely, however, it appears that cross-cultural psychological capital does not influence turnover intention level. Focused on the theory of Job Demands-Resources and Conservation of Resources, this study adds to the hospitality literature by offering a new theoretical model representing employees' perception of transformational leadership and cross-cultural psychological capital that affects frontline employees' turnover intention. These results have implications for leadership and turnover theory and retention practice, especially in the hotel industry.
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INTRODUCTION
Transformational leadership (TL) has been studied in many contexts and disciplines; however, TL traits are believed to be the most valued hospitality industry (Gui, Luo, Zhang & Deng, 2020; Tracey & Hinkin, 1994). TL’s impact on frontline employees or customer-contact employees has focused on many studies in the hospitality domain. Frontline employees, epitomized as the ‘face’ of the organization, are the first contact between the hotel and guests (Ma & Qu, 2011). They are directly representing the organization as frontline employees and helping to form the image of the organization. Recent empirical studies have demonstrated that a supervisor with transformational leadership characteristics can influence frontline employees’ attitudes and behaviors. These studies have associated TL in promoting psychological capital (PsyCap) and reducing the level of turnover intention (TI) and deviant behavior (Sesen et al., 2019; Chen & Wu, 2017; Zou, Tian, & Liu, 2015; Tang, Cai, Liu, Zhu, Yang & Li, 2015; Waldman et al., 2015). The research model is conceptualized using Job-Demands Resources (JD-R) and Conservation of Resources (COR) theories. In combination with the job and personal resources, the JD-R Theory defined TL and cross-cultural PsyCap as motivational mechanisms (Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, & Derks 2016). These resources will form a spiral effect to create ‘resource caravans,’ allowing frontline employees to meet job demands and challenges while lowering their turnover intention. This study contributes to the body of knowledge in four aspects. First, it determines how frontline employees perceived their supervisors’ transformational leadership in enhancing their cross-cultural PsyCap and reducing the level of quit intention. Second, by integrating the JD-R and COR theories, the study would contribute to the hospitality literature. Third, the correlation between PsyCap, behaviour, and productivity has been extensively researched (Avey, Luthans & Youssef, 2010). Despite the numerous studies conducted, however, research in PsyCap, particularly in cross-cultural PsyCap, is limited (Paek et al., 2015; Kotze & Massyn, 2019). Finally, this study investigates PsyCap in a cross-cultural setting. The hotel industry is an international industry which is regarded as a melting pot of employees and guest from different cultures, ethnic and religion (Whitelaw, 2013; Hears, Devine & Baum, 2007). As frontline employees’ job demands interactions with peers, superiors, and guests of diverse backgrounds (Dollwet & Rechard, 2014), these
employees need to be culturally competent. Based on these motivations, this study investigates cross-cultural PsyCap, and its antecedent (TL) and outcome (TI) in the hotel industry. The following section will include a summary of relevant literature, discussions on research methodology, data analysis, results, limitations, and future research recommendations.

LITERATURE REVIEW/STUDY SITE

Theoretical framework

The research's conceptual structure was built on the concepts of Job Demands-Resource (JD-R) and Conservation of Resources (COR). According to the JD-R theory, staff member health is associated with aspects of the workplace, which are specified as work demands and work resources (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The COR theory relates to human motivation, which is primarily dependent on resource maintenance and accumulation. These resources would generate more resources, resulting in "resource caravans" that produce positive results (Hobfoll, 1989; 2002). TL and PsyCap, can both serve as work and personal tools (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Bakker et al., 2017), forming 'resource caravans' to help frontline workers meet job demands and challenges, lowering their intention to leave.

Transformational leadership and Cross-Cultural Psychological Capital

A leader's ability to shift an organization's status quo by developing the beliefs, desires, and expectations of followers is known as transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1994). The four dimensions of TL: i) Idealized influence, which describes the ability of a leader to elicit emotional responses from his or her followers and become a role model that they want to emulate (Gardner and Avolio, 1998), ii) Inspirational motivation, which refers to the capacity of a leader to inspire others by demonstrating self-discipline and a dedication to achieving goals. (Bass & Avolio, 1994), iii) intellectual stimulation, which refers to the drive of a leader to convince his or her followers to challenge the status quo in order to generate new ideas that will aid the company's success (Bass & Avolio, 1994) and iv) Individualized consideration is described as a leader's ability to inspire and improve their followers' self-confidence by acting as a coach or mentor and concentrating on their own need for leadership development (Bass, 1998).

Cross-cultural psychological capital (PsyCap), which was based on Luthans et al., (2007) workplace PsyCap was proposed by Dollwet and Reichard (2014). The construct comprises four parts: self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience, which were firmly built-in in a cross-cultural context. Workers with high cross-cultural self-efficacy are secure in interacting effectively with people from different backgrounds or in different environments. It also leads to their ability to learn more and adapt to new situations related to various positive job outcomes (Dollwet& Reichard, 2014; Earley& Ang, 2003). Workers who have a high level of cross-cultural hope can better deal with cross-cultural difficulties and achieve their objectives (Dollwet & Reichard, 2014). Those with a high level of cross-cultural optimism can associate good communication and negotiation with having a strong cross-cultural relationship. Additionally, these employees will stay upbeat and 'expect the best when engaging with people from various cultures' (Dollwet & Reichard, 2014). Employees with far better cross-cultural optimism can stand firm despite adverse situations such as linguistic differences and difficulties in cross-cultural interaction. The confusion and uncertainties generated from the cross-cultural interactions will make employees' resilience a valuable psychological resource in overcoming such adverse events (Reichard & Dollwet, 2014).

According to previous studies, TL is critical in the growth of employees PsyCap(Sesen et al., 2018; Tuzun, Cetin, Basim, 2014; Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009; Kelloway et al., 2012). PsyCap's self-efficacy, confidence, hope, and resilience can be boosted by TL behaviours (idealised influences, inspirational encouragement, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration) across cultures (Schuckert et al., 2019). By establishing a vision (linked to optimism and hope), transformative leaders will inspire their followers to have better aspirations, evaluate, and predict positive outcomes. Besides, transformational leaders establish confidence in their ability to finish tasks successfully (self-efficacy), demonstrate inspired effort, and persevere in the face of obstacles (related to resilience). Furthermore, transformative leaders increase their self-confidence in their ability to complete tasks effectively (related to self-efficacy), show inspired effort, and also perseverance despite challenges (related to strength)(Gooty et al., 2009; Luthans et al., 2007). In the hospitality literature, TL was positively associated with PsyCap (e.g., Şesen et al., 2019; Schuckert et al., 2019; Wu & Chen, 2018). While the concept of workplace PsyCap has gained considerable interest over the last two decades, studies on this construct in the hotel industries lack. The current study will test the less researched construct in the four-and five-star hotel industry. To this end, based on the earlier discussion, the study hypothesizes:

H 1 Transformational leadership relates positively to cross-cultural PsyCap

Transformational leadership and turnover intention

Worker turnover is a significant issue in the global hospitality industry (Haldorai, Kim, Pillai, Park, Balasubramanian, 2019; Davidson, Timo & Wang, 2010). High turnover is associated with high personnel costs,
low staff morale, low job satisfaction, and poor service quality perceptions among customers (Yang et al., 2012). According to a survey conducted by Deloitte (2015), turnover in the hospitality industry is near twice the overall rate across all sectors. The average employee turnover in the UK and US hospitality industry is 30 percent and 31 percent, respectively. An individual’s behavioral intention to leave an organization is known as turnover intention (TI). Employees leave organizations for a variety of reasons. Job demands and stress resulting from extreme pressure to provide efficient and effective service, according to Whitelaw (2013), can affect hotel frontline workers’ behavior and efficiency. This condition may lead to a high level of turnover intention that will eventually lead to actual turnover.

Research studies in the hotel industry have significantly proposed that leadership design, primarily TL, can affect turnover (Chen & Wu, 2017; Zou, Tian, & Liu, 2015; Tang, Cai, Liu, Zhu, Yang & Li, 2015). Those in positions of authority whose actions do not align with their followers’ values and thoughts, on the other hand, can evoke negative behaviors and attitudes, such as the desire to leave (Mustaffa & Lines, 2013). Despite the well-known effects of TL on follower efficiency, there is a paucity of research on the correlation between TL and turnover intention (Waldman et al., 2015). According to previous research focused on the JD-R theory, positive leadership, which is a resource that can assist followers in dealing with job demands, can mitigate a lack of satisfaction and engagement (Waldman, Carter, and Hom, 2015). Hence, this study hypothesizes:

H 2: Transformational leadership relates negatively to turnover intention

Cross-Cultural Psychological Capital and Turnover Intentions

Employees with a high level of PsyCap have been shown in previous research to help minimise negative work attitudes and actions such as intention to leave (Kang, Busser & Choi, 2018; Nolzen, 2018; Karatepe & Karadas, 2014; Avey et al., 2009). Past research postulated that employees with a higher degree of PsyCap would stay cheerful and willing to accept a challenge and less likely to have turnover intentions (Avey et al., 2011). Although researchers have examined the link between work environment PsyCap and turnover intent, the gap still exists. Therefore, the present study replicates these researches in the Sabah hotel industry context as per the hypothesis below:

H 3: Cross-cultural PsyCap relates negatively to turnover intention

MATERIALS AND METHODS/METHODOLOGY

Instrument

The TL measurement, which consisted of 20 items, was determined by means of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-Form 5X) from Bass and Avolio (1995). The items’ feedback was evaluated based on a five-point Likert scale, with 1 = never and 5 = very frequently, if not always. A sample item includes “My immediate supervisor talks about his/her most important values and beliefs”. The 20 items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) were used to measure the cross-cultural PsyCap (Dollwet & Reichard, 2014). An example of the item factor is “At present, I am energetically pursuing my goals related to working with individuals from different cultures than me.” Olesegun’s (2013) 6-item turnover intention scale was adapted. Similarly, the items’ responses were graded on a five-point Likert scale. “I would quit my present job for a similar position with better pay in another organization at the least opportunity” is one of the items enquired. A pretest was conducted prior to distributing the questionnaire to address any possible issues that might arise during data collection (Memon et al., 2017). The results reveal no serious problems.

<p>| Table 1: Respondents’ demographics (n = 162) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 &amp; below</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Malaysian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadazandusun</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajau</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample and data collection
Seven hotels accepted our invitation to participate in the survey, out of a total of twenty-one hotels of four- and five-star rating. Purposive sampling was employed to select the frontline employees that fulfilled the study’s criteria. The study’s selection criteria include respondents working in the food & beverage departments, front office, or in a position with direct interaction with guests and have been employed for at least three months in any of the departments. The survey was conducted in two phases, in April and August 2019. The total number of valid questionnaires collected was 162. Using the ‘G*Power 3.1.9.2’ application, the minimum sample size required for the analysis was 85 to obtain an 80 percent statistical power and a 0.15 effect size (with a 5 percent probability of error)(Faul et al., 2007). The sample size (n=162) is greater than the required minimum and meets other general guidelines in this case (Hair et al., 2017a).

Two suggested tools were used to control common method variance (CMV) (Min & Kim, 2016; Podsakoff et al. 2003). First, assurances of privacy and confidentiality were constantly stressed at various points in the data collection process. Second, to see if there were any significant differences in the mean between the two groups, the first and second phase responses were compared using an ‘independent sample t-test’. There was no substantial difference between the first and second step responses, except for three factors: resilience, turnover intention, and consideration, where the p-value is less than 0.05. Accordingly, as Cohen (1988) recommended, the effect size of the three variables was examined. The result reveals a small effect size on Resilience and Turnover intention (between 0.2 and 0.49) and a borderline moderate effect size on consideration (0.55). As a result, this study’s response bias is not a big problem since the differences in responses between the two groups were considered appropriate.

After removing incomplete and suspicious response patterns, the survey yielded a sample of 162 employees. Table 1 shows that male and female participants are nearly evenly distributed, with 50.6 percent and 49.4 percent, respectively. Most respondents fall in the age range of less than 30 years (57.4%), Kadazandusun ethnic (43.8%), single (56.2%) and high school educated (57.4%).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
PLS-SEM was chosen as the most appropriate method of analysis in this study due to its ability for promoting dependent variable prediction (Ringle, Wende & Becker,2015; Hair et al., 2017b). The findings were evaluated using the recommended two-stage approach where the measurement and structural models are studied in the first and second stages, respectively(Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

Measurement model assessment
Reflective measurement and higher-order construct assessment
Internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity were checked for the study’s three constructs. The composite reliability (CR) values ranged from 0.84 to 0.91, exceeding the 0.7 CR threshold, implying sufficient internal consistency reliability (Hair et al., 2010). All the items tested had largely standardized factor loadings greater than 0.6, suggesting that the measurement model was convergent (Hair et al., 2017a). Furthermore, the average variance extracted (AVE) for the constructs ranged from 0.55 to 0.82, exceeding the 0.5 AVE cutoff for acceptable convergent validity. To assess discriminant validity, the researchers used cross-loading and the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion. After eliminating the indicators with low loadings, all the indicators’ cross-loading on their corresponding latent constructs was higher than all the other constructs. As shown in Table 2, AVE’s squared root for turnover intention is greater than the correlation for each construct. The findings indicate that the constructs have discriminant validity based on both the cross-loading and the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion. Sarstedt et al. (2019) recommended that all dimensions of TL and cross-cultural PsyCap were tested for collinearity issues and the significance and relevance of outer weights. The variance inflation factor (VIF) values for both constructs were less than 5.0 (Hair et al., 2011), implying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced / Widow / Widower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Diploma/Certificate</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school and below</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma/Certificate</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that the data did not have any collinearity. Additionally, bootstrapping is used to calculate the measurements' outer weights and importance, with a recommended re-sampling of 5,000. Except for the two indicators - cross-cultural PsyCap Efficacy and Optimism, all aspects of the two constructs were significant at p<0.05 and p<0.01. The two indicators were retained, considering their theoretical relevance (Hair et al., 2017a; Cenfetelli&Bassellier, 2009). Prior PsyCap literature research has shown that the respective indicators have ample theoretical meaning to be better interpreted as higher-order constructs (Luthans et al., 2007; Dollwet& Reichard, 2014).

Table 2: Discriminant validity - Fornell-Larker criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>CCPC</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>TI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCPC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>-0.371</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CCPC – Cross-cultural PsyCap, TL – Transformational Leadership, TI – Turnover Intention

Structural model assessment

Several assessments were used in the structural model evaluation to test the hypotheses (Hair et al., 2014; Ramayah et al., 2011, 2013). Following Hair et al. (2019) recommendations, the criteria include reporting for the path coefficient, t-values, p-values, the standard errors, confidence intervals, coefficient of determinations (R²), the effect size (f²) and predictive relevance (Q²). Before testing the hypothesis, lateral collinearity (predictor-criterion collinearity) was performed (Kock & Lynn, 2012). The VIF for both endogenous and exogenous constructs is below 5, signifying no problems with multicollinearity.

Table 3: Hypothesis testing results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path relationship</th>
<th>Std. beta</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>f²</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Q²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: TL- CCPC</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>4.986***</td>
<td>0.319 - 0.604</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: TL- TI</td>
<td>-0.365</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.033***</td>
<td>-0.513 - 0.128</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: CCPC-TI</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.074**</td>
<td>-0.301 - 0.299</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: H – Hypothesis, TL - Transformational leadership, CCPC – Cross-cultural PsyCap, TI – Turnover intention, *** p < 0.01, NS-Not significant.

The outcomes of the path relationship assessment showed that hypotheses 1 (H1) (β=0.491, t = 4.986, p < 0.01) and 2 (H2) (β = -0.365, t = 3.033, p < 0.01) were supported. However, hypothesis 3 (H3) (β = -0.013, t = 0.074, p < 0.01) was rejected as there is no statistical significance between cross-cultural PsyCap and TI. Both R² values for cross-cultural PsyCap (0.241) and turnover intention (0.138) showed moderate predictive accuracy of the model (Cohen,1988). The f² values indicate that TL (0.318) has a moderate effect on cross-cultural PsyCap and a minimal effect (0.117) on TI (Cohen, 1988). The endogenous latent variables (cross-cultural PsyCap, turnover intention) achieved Q² scores larger than zero, at 0.094 and 0.063, indicating the model's clear predictive relevance (Hair et al., 2017a). Table 3 shows results of the criteria evaluation.

DISCUSSIONS

The study aimed to see how frontline employees' perceptions of TL influenced their degree of cross-cultural PsyCapand intention to leave. H1 demonstrates that the relationship between frontline employees' perceptions of TL and cross-cultural PsyCap are significant and positive. The association implies that employees' positive feeling towards their leaders/supervisors enhances their cross-cultural PsyCap. The result is expected as TL's motivational tendency is integrated with cross-cultural PsyCap's motivational direction (Sesen et al., 2019). The findings are also in line with Sesen et al. (2019), Schuckert et al. (2019), and Wu & Chen (2019). (2018). Following the JD-R theory, the results manifest holistically on the TL and cross-cultural PsyCap as job and personal resources (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Bakker et al., 2017).

The finding for H2 shows TL's relationship with turnover intention was significantly negative. In other words, the employees perceived their supervisor's TL favorably, which means the supervisors treated their employees well. Thus, the hypothesis's findings agree with Chen and Wu (2017) and Waldman et al (2015). Similar to H1, the findings support the JD-R theory, which elucidates how the interaction of job demands and resources can influence work results (Bakker et al., 2017; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007; Karatepe&Olugbade, 2009). Drawing on the COR theory, the accumulation of resources would help the employees meet their job demands and challenges, which lead to reduced turnover intention.

The finding on H3 suggests that cross-cultural PsyCap does not influence TI level of the frontline employees. Workers with greater levels of cross-cultural PsyCap will still leave the organization. Previous research has shown that cross-cultural PsyCap and TI are negatively related (Tuzun, Cetin, and Basim, 2014; Avey et al.,...
2011; Newman, 2014; Nolzen, 2018) which contradicts the current findings. The insignificant relationship could be attributed to several factors. First, employees with a high cross-cultural PsyCap exudes confidence in them to face challenges and belief in their capabilities, leading them to leave their organization for better job opportunity (Gist, 1987). Second, most of the respondents of the study belong to the millennial generation. Given the high cross-cultural PsyCap, employees from this generation would leave the organization for a more challenging career path (Kong, 2015). Finally, the hotel industry seemingly accepts employee turnover as a norm (Davidson, Timo & Wang 2010). Employees moving from one hotel to another are tacitly understood in the hotel fraternity (Zopiatis et al., 2014). This study has contributed to the current literature by investigating the relationship between frontline employees' perceptions of TL, cross-cultural PsyCap, and TI. Based on the JD-R and COR theories, a research model that investigated the relationships between TL (as job resources) and cross-cultural PsyCap (as personal resources) and the outcome (TI) was developed and tested. Based on our findings, the JD-R and COR theories' motivational processes received partial support. The effect of TL's support on followers' cross-cultural PsyCap and TI is consistent with earlier research (Waldman et al., 2015; Chen & Wu, 2017; Gooty et al. 2009). The non-significant result between cross-cultural PsyCap and TI, on the other hand, differs from previous results by Avey et al., (2011) and Tuzun et al. (2014). The result is unexpected, although such a non-significant finding also has been observed in recent research by Kang, Busser & Choi (2018). One potential reason for the inconsistency is that the study's limited sample size might have affected the results as compared to empirical studies with large sample sizes. The findings indicate that hotel managers/supervisors engaging in TL behaviors are more likely to develop good supervisor-employee exchange relationship, influence employee-employer relationship further, and decrease turnover intention. Hotel management needs to consider TL's application in their training programs and executive meetings to raise awareness and importance of this leadership in influencing the cross-cultural PsyCap and turnover intention.

Our data, obtained from the hotels (4- and 5-star) in Sabah, Malaysia, may be too narrow to generalize and extend the research model to other social contexts. Additionally, this study applies a cross-section study from single-source data; future study may use longitudinal design, with data obtained from a different source. Given the hotel's inability to provide direct access to the targeted respondents, the survey's administration was limited to the assumption of responsibility by each coordinator at the participating hotel.

CONCLUSION
The study explains the empirical relationship between TL, cross-cultural PsyCap, and intent to leave FLE working in hotels in the Sabah hotel industry. The findings revealed that FLE has positive perceptions of their supervisor's transformational leadership, which improves their cross-cultural PsyCap and lowers their intention to leave. However, there is no correlation between cross-cultural PsyCap and TI, implying that FLE will leave the company regardless of whether they have a high or low degree of cross-cultural PsyCap.
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