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ABSTRACT

Two leadership approaches, transformational leadership and Leader-member exchange (LMX) are considered to be important to creativity. Little is known, nonetheless, as to how team leadership affect team performance and the extent that leadership theories at the individual or dyadic levels can explain leader-creativity relationship at the team level. This research examined the integrative effect of transformational leadership and LMX on creative performance at the team level by testing the mediating and the moderating role of mean LMX in the leadership-creativity relationship. Thirty-six teams were sampled from companies in Mainland China. Results support mean LMX acts as a moderator rather than a mediator. Explanations, theoretical as well as practical contributions are discussed.

Key words: Transformational leadership, Leader-member exchange (LMX), creative performance

INTRODUCTION

In today’s rapidly changing work environment, it is critical for organizations to engage in “out-of-the-box” thinking to be adaptive. Extensive use of teams in organizations requires managers to lead and motivate not only individuals but also teams as a whole (Hackman, 2002; Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). As Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta & Kramer (2004) argued, “Of all of the forces that impinge on people’s daily experience of the work environment in the organizations, one of the most immediate and potent is likely to be the leadership of these teams...” (p. 6), and many of past researches (e.g., Shalley & Gilson, 2004) have also found that leaders indeed play a key role in encouraging followers’ creativity, through two major leadership approaches, namely, leader-focused (transformational leadership) and relationship-based (leader-member exchange theory) theories. However, little has been done to identify what processes leaders can actually employ to influence team performance or to what extent leadership theories, originally focusing on individual or dyadic levels, can be extended to explain the leader-performance relationship at the team level.

More specifically, little is known about how the two leadership approaches would interact with each other to influence followers’ creative performance, to say nothing of knowledge about their joint effects on creativity at the team level. Zaccaro, Rittman & Marks (2001) indicated that little is known about how leaders create and manage effective teams despite of the ubiquity of leadership influences on organizational team performance, and extensive literature on both leadership (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2002) and team/group dynamics (Forsyth, 1999; McGrath, 1984).
The purpose of this paper is therefore twofold: (1) to add to the paucity of empirical studies examining the team leadership and team creative performance relationship; (2) to test two competing integrative models (i.e., a mediating or moderating model) of team transformational leadership and mean LMX on team creative performance. We make two major contributions to the literature. First, we respond to the call for more research in team leadership. Previous studies on team leadership have not explained fully how theories of leadership developed at the individual level can be extended to the team setting. To advance leadership theories further into the team setting, we aim at incorporating the theory of collective mental model to enrich our understanding of team leadership (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994). Second, this study seeks to clarify how team leadership, together with mean LMX affect team outcomes. Specifically, the present study incorporates mean LMX as a potential moderator, or rather a mediator of team transformational leadership to team creative performance. Findings of the present study can inform us regarding which of the two models can better capture the leadership-creativity process.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Team Transformational Leadership and mean LMX

Although there is a call for team leadership research (Dionne, Yammarino, Howell & Villa, 2005), not much has been done to develop the theoretical basis of team leadership. In the literature, a few studies try to delineate team leadership as “coleadership” (Bales, 1954); different members of the work unit enact the leader behaviors contemporaneously (House & Aditya, 1997); the collective influence of members in a team on each other (Sivasubramaniam, Murry, Avolio & Jung, 2002). Leader’s role in these studies is shared by team members. However, leaders are believed to play an important role on encouraging and managing team creative performance (e.g., Shalley & Gilson, 2004). Hence more works are expected to be done to develop the theoretical basis of team leadership which leader is still the focal person providing leadership. Most of other researches on teams other than defining team leadership as shared leadership by members simply assume that knowledge on leading individuals can be transferred and extended to the team level (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Scholars criticized such an approach because it conceptualizes “… leadership at one level and then studying it at another” (Day, Gronn & Salas, 2006, p. 212) and Burke et al. (2006) said that it is
important to develop “team leadership theories” as opposed to the predominant focus on “theories of leadership” applied in team settings. We argue that one possible way to study leadership at the team level is to treat team leadership as a collective mental model (Klimoski & Mohammed, 1994) of a leader operating alongside followers. The model reflects a collective cognition which refers to an understanding or mental representations of knowledge that is shared by team members.

Shared collective mental models occur when team members coordinate their behaviors in a manner that results in achievement of positively valued objectives. Once such mental models are developed and socially legitimized, they will operate in a way that transcends thinking based only on individual mental models and are strongly persistent (Mezias, Grinyer, & Guth, 2001). Team effectiveness will improve if team members have an adequate understanding of the task, team, equipment and situation which they share in common (e.g. Duncan et al., 1996) and, particularly in this case, with their leaders. Team transformational leadership, conceptualized by the collective mental model, refers to the shared or organized understanding among team members about their leader’s behaviors and its transformational impact. In this sense, members collectively believe that their leaders can identify a vision, foster the acceptance of group goals, expect high performance, provide a model, individualized support, and intellectual stimulation. These leadership qualities have been found to positively relate to followers’ creative behaviors (e.g., Shin & Zhou, 2003). According to Chan (1998), “(The direct consensus model) uses within-group consensus of the lower level units as the functional relationship to specify how the construct conceptualized and operationalized at the lower level is functionally isomorphic to another form of the construct at the higher level” (p. 237). Hence team transformational leadership, which is here proposed to be functionally isomorphic to transformational leadership at the individual level, can enhance the team creativity.

LMX at the team level, namely mean LMX, is an aggregation of every dyadic relationship between a leader and his/her follower of a work team to the overall work relationship of the leader to all followers. This aggregated relationship is characterized by mutual trust, respect and obligation evidenced in the work team when the leader makes the offer of partnership to all subordinates. Under this situation, we refer to it as high mean LMX, which indicates all team members are “in group”. The high mean LMX is conducive to a work
environment in which support, encouragement and career investments are provided by the leader, and in-
group members engage in more responsible activities than would out-group members in low quality
exchanges (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The levels of analysis, thus is shifted from that of dyadic level to team
level. The notion of in-group versus out-group membership distinction, which is a key component of the
LMX theory at the dyadic level, is thus, not relevant at the team level. Yet, the connotation of the construct,
nevertheless, remains the same, that is, a high mean LMX indicates high overall exchange qualities, with
exchanges not exclusively bound to a leader-member dyad, but encompassing the whole team. It is difficult
to say if mean LMX is indeed functionally isomorphic to LMX at this point. While high exchange quality at
the team level may lead to good business results similar to what has been found at the dyadic level, an
expanded and overall exchange quality may possibly lead to a “clan” culture characterizing a friendly and
social environment which fosters complacence but not results-oriented and market-driven outcomes
(Cameron & Quinn, 1999).

**Transformational leadership, LMX and Creative Performance at the individual level**

There is an emerging literature examining the relationship between leadership and creativity at work
(e.g., Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Most of the studies adopt either transformational leadership or LMX
theory as the predictors of subordinates’ creative behaviours. In the case of transformational leadership, Bass
(1985) delineated transformational leaders as those who are proactive in their thinking, creative in their ideas,
radical in ideology, and uninhibited in their search for solutions. Through transcending followers’ self-
interest, and altering their portfolio of needs, transformational leaders influence followers to do more than
they were originally expected, and become innovative. Findings generally lent support to the positive
influence of transformational leadership on followers’ creative behaviors (e.g., Krause, 2004; Sosik, Avolio
& Kahai, 1997). In the case of LMX theory, it is posited that leaders often develop, with a selected group of
followers, high-quality exchange relationships which provide privileged followers with challenging
responsibilities (Liden & Graen, 1980), task-related resources (Graen & Scandura, 1987), opportunities for
risk-taking (Graen & Cashman, 1975), and encouragement for innovation (Amabile, 1988). Research on the
LMX and creativity supported a positive relationship between these two (e.g., Gerstner & Day, 1997; Scott
In sum, transformational and LMX models of leadership were found to be instrumental in understanding followers’ creative performance. However, little research effort has been put to integrate these two leadership approaches in this area. The integration of these two major leadership approaches has been proposed by Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) and Gerstner & Day (1997). Subsequent to their recommendations, there have been some recent works integrating the two on a variety of work outcomes (e.g., Basu & Green, 1997; Chang, 2006; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang & Chen, 2005). The integration can mainly be classified into two kinds: a mediating model and a moderating model.

Two models integrating Transformational leadership and LMX

James and Brett (1984) distinguished a mediator from a moderator that the former is to represent the generative mechanism through which the focal independent variable is able to influence the dependent variable of interest and the latter affects the magnitude of the relationship between a predictor variable and a criterion variable. When apply to areas of leadership, the mediating model using a relation-based leadership channeling the effects of behavioral leadership to work outcomes represents what some researchers considered it as “social exchange perspective” (e.g., Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Deluge, 1992; Graen, 1976; Wang et al., 2005), whereas the moderation model falls into the traditional contingency leadership perspectives such as Kerr & Jermier’s (1978) substitution of leadership.

Mediating Model. Lee (2005) and Wang et al. (2005) proposed an integration model using LMX as a mediator between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. The researcher reasoned that transformational leaders develop relationships with their followers that go beyond pure economic exchanges and that leads to high exchange quality between leader and followers. This high exchange quality relationships implied followers’ trust and reverence for their leaders. These positive sentiments aroused by the leader will induce a strong sense of affective attachment with their organizations. Besides, Wu and Wu (2007) also found LMX mediated the relationship between relationship-oriented transformational leadership and followers organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) but LMX failed to mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and followers’ in-role performance. Although the aforementioned
studies all examined the mediating role of LMX in the transformational leadership and various work outcome relationships, unfortunately, none of them examined the effects of the two leadership models on creativity.

Moderating Model. Instead of testing the mediating role of LMX on relationship between transformational leadership and creativity, another approach is to examine the joint effect of these two on creative performance. A few of studies have been done to investigate the joint effect on other constructs. For instance, a test of moderation was conducted in a recent study on turnover intention by Chang (2005). Results indicated that when LMX is high, there is a strong positive relationship between transformational leadership and intention to stay, but when the LMX is low, there is no relationship. Another study done by Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) tested LMX as a boundary condition of transformational leadership effects on followers’ core job characteristic perception and task performance. Influences of transformational leadership on core job characteristic are stronger when LMX is high rather than low. Again, to date, no research has been conducted to examine such joint effect on creative performance.

Apart from studies at the individual or dyadic levels, there are also a few researches studying team leadership and team outcomes. Among the few, Sivasubramaniam et al. (2002) tested the longitudinal model of team leadership on group potency and group performance. The results suggest that perceptions of team leadership early on have a significant indirect impact on final outcomes through mediating variables like group potency. In addition, Boies and Howell (2006) examined the interaction between team-level LMX and within-team differentiation on team potency and conflict. They found mean LMX positively influences team potency. Among the scant studies on team leadership, again, no research studies the integrative effect of both transformational leadership and LMX at the team level, neither was anything done on team creative performance. More researches on team leadership to add the paucity, therefore, are needed. Based on the above discussions, two alternative hypotheses are hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1a: Mean LMX mediates the relationship between team transformational leadership and team creative performance.

Or: Hypothesis 1b: Mean LMX moderates the relationship between team transformational leadership and team creative performance.
METHODS

Sample and Procedure

The data used in this study were collected as a general survey on work outcomes and performance conducted among members of middle to senior management teams of some Chinese Mainland companies in the telecommunication, manufacturing, pharmaceutical, and financial industry. A contact person of each company distributed questionnaires to their team members and then collected after completion. Of the total of 52 teams were asked to participate, 45 teams responded resulting in a team response rate of 86.5 percent. Out of the 45 teams, 2 teams were dropped because data of team leaders were missing, and thus, ended up with 43 teams with 43 team leaders and 211 members. The team size ranged from 5 to 7. Of the 43 leaders, 58.1 percent were male; participants’ age ranged from 23 to 48 years (\(M = 35.0, SD = 6.81\)); and their organizational tenure ranged from less than 1 year to 26 years (\(M = 6.81, SD = 5.69\)). Of the 211 team members, 57.1 percent were male; their ages ranged from 21 to 59 years (\(M = 33.15, SD = 7.8\)); and their organizational tenure ranged from less than 1 year to 33 years (\(M = 6, SD = 6.7455\)).

Measures

To assure equivalence of the following measures in the Chinese and the English versions of the survey instrument, we conducted a back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1980). All scales were measured by a 7-point Likert Scale unless specified. Responses for each item on a 7-point format ranged from 1, “strongly disagree,” to 7, “strongly agree”. Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) of all the measures were run using AMOS5. Prior to aggregating at the team level, the \(r_{wg}\) index is used as a measure of agreement (James, Demaree & Wolf, 1984). \(r_{wg}\) of all variables were calculated and teams with \(r_{wg} < .5\) in either team transformational leadership or mean LMX were dropped, resulting in 36 teams in the final sample.

Team Transformational Leadership. We adopted 18 items to measure how individual team members perceived their leader behaviour from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter (1990)’s transformational leadership behaviour inventory. The CFA results suggested that the six-factor of transformational leadership (\(\chi^2 = 219.307, d.f. = 120; RMSEA = .055; CFI = .957, GFI = .893\)) fitted the data better than a one-factor model (\(\chi^2 = 639.439, d.f. = 135; RMSEA = .134; CFI = .783, GFI = .724\)).
However, a composite variable combining all 6 leadership dimensions showed a high level of internal consistency reliability (i.e., $\alpha = .932$), hence, subsequent analyses would adopt the composite variable rather than the six separate leadership dimensions. The sample items include “My leader: Inspires others with his/her plans for the future; insists on only the best performance”. Team transformational leadership was derived from aggregating individual scores on this composite measure. ICC[1] and ICC[2] result is .31 and .68 respectively and a mean $r_{wg}$ value of .964.

**Mean LMX.** LMX at the individual level was assessed through the use of the LMX-7 measure which contains seven items that tap the quality of the working relationship between leader and follower. Team members were asked to assess the quality of LMX by using the 5-point scale developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). A sample item is “How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?” Mean LMX was obtained from the aggregation of individuals’ scores. The one factor model of LMX was confirmed by CFA, ($\chi^2 = 23.49, d.f. = 14; RMSEA = .062; CFI = .979, GFI = .961$). Cronbach’s alpha is .865, ICC[1] and ICC[2] is .24 and .60 respectively, and a mean $r_{wg}$ value of .916.

**Team Creative Performance.** The measures of creativity were adapted from the 13-item scale developed by Zhou and George (2001). 36 team leaders provided their assessments of team creative performance. A sample item is “Comes up with creative solutions to problems”.

**Control Variables.** Team-member exchange (TMX) was assessed using a 10-item measure developed by Seers (1989). Respondents assessed their relationships using a 5-point scale. Jordan, Field and Armenakis (2006) reported that mean TMX was positively associated with team performance hence TMX was controlled. Items of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-Form 5x; Bass & Avolio, 1989) were obtained to assess Contingent reward (CR). Previous studies have found CR was positively related to job performance (e.g., Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995) so that CR was also controlled.

**RESULTS**

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations and zero-order Pearson correlations among all variables. As predicted, team creative performance was found to relate to team transformational leadership ($r = .629, p < .01$) and mean LMX ($r = .510, p < .01$). The two leadership approaches were related highly ($r = .720, p$
<.01). In order to avoid multi-collinearity, all independent and control variables were centred (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

Table 2 presents the results of the regression analyses. Hypothesis 1a posits that mean LMX serves as a mediator of the leadership-creativity relationship. While there was an overall treatment effect between team transformational leadership and team creative performance, as well as a significant relationship between team transformational leadership and mean LMX, the relationship between mean LMX and team creative performance was not significant, which failed to meet Baron and Kenny (1986)’s requirements for the mediating test procedure. Hence, hypothesis 1a was rejected. Hypothesis 1b predicted that mean LMX moderates the relationship between team transformational leadership and team creative performance. Findings showed a significant overall interaction effect ($\beta_{\text{interaction}} = -.911, p < .05$). Simple slope tests showed that a positive relationship between team transformational leadership and creative performance at low mean LMX condition ($\beta = 3.353, p < .01$), but not at the high mean LMX condition. To facilitate interpretation, we plotted the interaction indicating high and low levels of mean LMX by values one standard deviation above and below the mean (Aiken & West, 1991). Results support the moderating model and hence hypothesis 1b was supported.

DISCUSSION

Leadership is defined as the ability to influence people. Little is known, nonetheless, how team leadership can affect team performance and to what extent leadership theories of individual or dyadic levels can explain the leader-performance relationship at the team level. This study, aiming at examining how leader-focused and relationship-based theories influence followers’ team behaviors, tested two integrative leadership models, using mean LMX (a) as a mediator channeling effects of team transformational leadership on team creativity, and (b) as a moderator regulating the relationship. Findings did not seem to be in favor with the mediating model but lent support to the moderating model. Mean LMX was found to moderate but not to mediate the leadership-creativity relationship. When the overall exchange quality with the leader was
good, it did not matter whether followers perceived their leader was transformational or not, team creative performance remained at a relatively high level. Whereas when the overall exchange quality was poor, a leader whose leadership was viewed as transformational could enhance team creative performance.

Results shed light on how the joint effect of team transformational leadership and mean LMX influence team creative performance. The “social exchange” perspective presumes that it is the exchange quality between leader and follower through which transformational leadership behaviours influence follower performance. Wang et al. (2005) proposed that transformational leadership is “personalized” through LMX. This personalization process results from transformational leader’s individualized dyadic relationship between leader and follower creating mutual trust, respect and loyalty (Deluga, 1992) or the leader’s charismatic appeal which enhances followers’ receptivity to social exchange. All these are fundamental to the development of an affective bonding between leader and follower, thus, subsequently to the creation of organizational commitment and betterment of work performance (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Dvir et al., 2002). The above assertions underpinning the mediating model, which are believed to be valid in the context of one-on-one reciprocal social exchanges between leader and follower, may not apply in a group context. Nevertheless, the positive relationship between transformational leadership and LMX found in the literature at dyadic the level also appeared at the team level. However, a high overall exchange quality at the team level may not necessarily lead to high team performance since a “clan” culture might have been resulted from a mere relational oriented team atmosphere (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). It is particularly true that when team transformational leadership is controlled, mean LMX was not found to affect team creative outcome.

In contrast, the moderating model, which emphasizes that there is not a “one best way” for leadership but depends on a match of factors for leadership effectiveness, is preferred over a mediating model. Here, we used Kerr and Jermier’s (1978) substitute of leadership theory to illustrate the interaction effect. The theory posited that particular variables could substitute for or neutralize leadership, thereby weakening a leader’s ability to influence followers’ behaviours. They described “neutralizers create an influence vacuum and reflect characteristics that make leadership effects impossible”. Substitutes are “not only tend to affect which
leader behaviours are influential, but will also tend to impact upon the criterion variable” (p. 395). Among the 14 possible neutralizers and substitutes proposed in the theory, two elements, namely, spatial distance and cohesive work groups between leader and follower can be conceptually linked to mean LMX. Mean LMX reflects “group cohesiveness” because the assumption that a leader who serves as a focal person binds everyone vertically if not horizontally together in a team. In addition, the distance assessed by mean LMX reflects the distance in a psychological sense, though not in a physical sense. As a potential neutralizer, mean LMX could be either positive or negative. In the presence of a strong social cohesion and psychological closeness, leadership has little effect on team creative performance. It matters little how followers’ think of their leader as strong or weak in transformational leadership orientation. When comes to development of high exchange quality, it is possible, for example, to build up good relationship with a leader with weak transformational leadership. As long as the leader makes them feel trusted and respected, think less the need to compete with each other and obtain the necessary resources to get their job done, followers will probably work as a team and perform creatively. A leader deemed as visionary, fostering group-goal acceptance, expecting high performance, providing a model, individualized consideration as well as intellectual stimulation can make a big difference even in work situation which is not very favourable.

The present study enriches the literature of team creative performance. Most of previous researches were focusing on creative performance at the individual level. Only a few researches studied the team performance, but not stressing on creativity. Besides, this study adds to the paucity of research on team leadership and found some empirical support that leadership and creative performance is related at the team level. Results show that what was found applicable at the individual level may not apply at the team level. Most importantly, we found a contingency model of leadership is more appropriate than a mediating model.

Apart from theoretical contributions, the present study also provides practical implications to the practitioners. The findings suggest that at the team level, relations may be more important than transformational leadership to influence team creativity. This may be especially true in a context featured by valuing interpersonal relationship, long-term orientation and collectivism. However, we are not saying that transformational leadership is unimportant. There are times that a work situation is unfavourable to a leader
(i.e., poor leader-member relations and unclear work instructions). For example, a new manager recruited from outside to take over an existing team. In this case, the exchange quality will probably be low, at least in the beginning. In another scenario, the leader has to carry out some new initiatives, (even unpopular initiatives) and by so doing, hurts the exchange quality between the leader and members. However, the leader, with his or her foresights should not compromise outcomes for surface harmony. In all these scenarios, transformational leaders, are once again, proven to be effective in such an unfavourable situation. This is in line with previous studies reporting that a transformational leader works best at times of crisis. Knowing that there are work situations which are unfavourable, organizations should be more conscious to match a transformational leader with these unfavourable situations. However, transformational leaders cannot be produced overnight. Organizations should put resources in selecting and training of transformational leadership and reward those who possess these qualities. Transformational leadership is a rare commodity. Once a team develops good exchange qualities with a transformational leader, this leader should look for a successor who is capable of maintaining similar level of relationship (probably by promoting within the same team) and then moves on to take charge of another team to perform creative works.

**Limitations and Future Research Directions**

The current study has several limitations that should be attempted to deal with in future research. First, the design of this study is cross sectional, which cannot examine the reverse causality (team that performs creatively leads to good relations with the leader and members attribute good qualities to the leader). Second, our relatively small sample size may raise concerns of statistical power. Third, common method variance is another concern about the reliability of the study even though aggregated data at team level is lesser of a problem compared to individual level. Further, the impact of common method variance should be less serious on moderation as that on mediation. Future researches should collect data from different sources or at different time intervals. Fourth, the sample was collected in China. Findings from the Chinese context may not be generalized to other cultures since relation is prime in a long-term oriented and a collectivist society. Thus, the role of LMX may probably be amplified in the Chinese context. Future study should be conducted in a less collectivistic society such as United States.
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Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contingent Reward</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TMX</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.464(*)</td>
<td>.653(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LMX</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.339(*)</td>
<td>.533(**)</td>
<td>.720(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Creativity</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.401(*)</td>
<td>.629(**)</td>
<td>.510(**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 36
* p < .05 (two-tailed tests)
**p < .01 (two-tailed tests)

Table 2
Results of multiple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1. Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMX</td>
<td>.854*</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>-.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2. Independent variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership (TL)</td>
<td>1.059*</td>
<td>.940*</td>
<td>.723*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3. Moderator variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Leader-member exchange (Mean LMX)</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4. Cross-level two-way interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL x Mean LMX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.911*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized regression coefficient are shown; N = 36
* p < .05 (two-tailed tests)
Figure 1
Interaction Plot of Team Transformational Leadership and Mean LMX on Team Creative Performance