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1. Data

The data collected on the following constructs: customer-defined market orientation (CDMO) [1], customer inspiration (CI) [2], and customer loyalty (CL) [3].

1.1. Demographic characteristics of respondents

In order to verify the construct validation of customer inspiration, the data collected from two generations members – ‘Millennial’ and ‘Generation Z’ in two survey studies (see Fig. 1). The reason to
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choose Millennial to get response for the auto industry as they reached the age of job/business, therefore, most of them own the vehicle to commute in Malaysia. On the other hand, Generation Z members getting education and living away from their hometown/parents, hence, all respondent had smartphone to communicate with family and friends. The respondents belonged to 11 states of Malaysia. The data consist of 271 responses of Millennial in data 1, and 252 responses of Generation Z in data 2 [4]. recommended that number of respondents should be at least 100 [5]. argued that the number of respondents should be at least 200, and [6] claimed the minimum desirable number of respondents to be 250 [7] offered a rough rating scale for adequate sample sizes in factor analysis: 100 = poor, 200 = fair, 300 = good, 500 = very good, 1000 or more = excellent.

The data collection took 42 days for both studies. The questionnaire was self-administrative and in the English language. Data collection adhere all ethical consideration suggested by prominent studies [8,9]. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the details of the demographics of respondents of both studies.

2. Experimental design, materials and methods

All items were adopted from reliable studies measure through reflective scale. Table 3 and Table 4 provide the constructs detail, source, coding, loading values, reliability and convergent validity of both studies. Table 5 and Table 6 show the discriminant validity of data 1 and data 2. Furthermore, all items gauge on five-points Likert scale. A PLS-SEM was applied using ADANCO 2.0. Present study model consists of CuO, CoO, and InF (sub-constructs of CDMO), InB and InT (sub-constructs of CI) and CL. All measures were subjected to check the reliability and validity. We employ Jöreskog’s rho to check reliability [10]. We adopt convergent validity, with average variance extracted (AVE) and discriminant validity, with the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlation (HTMT) [10]. The minimum threshold of Jöreskog’s rho is more than 0.7, AVE is at most 0.85, and HTMT at least 0.5. All results are delineated evidence for the proposed model constructs, which allow further analysis [11]. For data 1, the Jöreskog’s rho value is between 0.8555 and 0.9259, AVE is between 0.5853 and 0.7958, and HTMT correlation is at least 0.5 between all variables. For data 2, the Jöreskog’s rho value is between 0.8138 and 0.9275, AVE is between 0.6394 and 0.7984, and HTMT correlation is at least 0.5 between all variables.
The all direct and indirect relationships were significant, portray in Tables 7 and 8 for both studies. For data 1, Cohen’s $f^2$ is between 0.1282 (CoO -> InB) to 0.4105 (CoO -> InT), $\beta$ is between 0.1377 (CoO -> InB) to 0.4927 (CuO -> InB), and t-value is between 1.9597 (InT -> CL) to 8.0484 (CoO -> InB). For data 2, Cohen’s $f^2$ is between 0.148 (InB -> CL) to 0.4262 (CoO -> InT), $\beta$ is between 0.1665 (InF -> InT) to 0.5229 (CoO -> InT), and t-value is between 2.288 (InT -> CL) to 6.8271 (CoO -> InT) [12–15].

2.1. Mediation results

This study tested three sequential mediation results in each of the dataset. In data 1 and 2, the relationships checked are: CuO -> InB -> InT -> CL, CoO -> InB -> InT -> CL, and InF -> InB -> InT -> CL.

### Table 1
Millennial sample characteristics for study 1 ($n = 271$).

| Category                        | Description            | Numbers | %    |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------|------|
| Gender                          | Male                   | 184     | 67.90|
|                                 | Female                 | 87      | 32.10|
| Education level                 | Never attended school  | 0       | 0    |
|                                 | Attended school        | 13      | 4.80 |
|                                 | Diploma                | 82      | 30.26|
|                                 | Degree                 | 129     | 47.60|
|                                 | Masters                | 47      | 17.34|
| States and federal territories  | Johor DarulTa’zim      | 3       | 1.11 |
|                                 | Kedah Darul Aman       | 2       | 0.73 |
|                                 | Kelantan DarulNaim     | 5       | 1.85 |
|                                 | Malacca                | 1       | 0.37 |
|                                 | Pahang                 | 4       | 1.48 |
|                                 | DarulMakmur            | 15      | 5.54 |
|                                 | Penang                 | 15      | 5.54 |
|                                 | Perak DarulRidzuan     | 78      | 28.78|
|                                 | Perlis InderaKayangan  | 2       | 0.73 |
|                                 | Sabah                  | 8       | 2.95 |
|                                 | Sarawak                | 1       | 0.37 |
|                                 | Selangor Darul Ehsan   | 77      | 28.41|
|                                 | Kuala Lumpur           | 75      | 27.68|
### Table 2
Generation Z sample characteristics for study 2 (n = 252).

| Category                     | Description         | Numbers | %    |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------|------|
| Gender                       | Male                | 93      | 36.90|
|                              | Female              | 159     | 63.40|
| Education level              | Never attended school| 0       | 0    |
|                              | Attended school     | 22      | 8.73 |
|                              | Diploma             | 144     | 57.14|
|                              | Degree              | 86      | 34.13|
| States and federal territories| Johor DarulTa’zim  | 6       | 2.38 |
|                              | Kedah Darul Aman    | 3       | 1.19 |
|                              | Kelantan DarulNaim  | 18      | 7.14 |
|                              | Malacca             | 4       | 1.59 |
|                              | Pahang              | 6       | 2.38 |
|                              | DarulMakmur         | 24      | 9.52 |
|                              | Penang              | 67      | 26.59|
|                              | Perak DarulRidzuan  | 66      | 26.59|
|                              | Perlis InderaKayangan| 3     | 1.19 |
|                              | Sabah               | 4       | 1.59 |
|                              | Sarawak             | 3       | 1.19 |
|                              | Selangor Darul Ehsan| 57     | 22.62|
|                              | Terengganu Darul Iman| 9    | 3.57 |
|                              | Kuala Lumpur        | 46      | 18.25|
|                              | Putrajaya           | 2       | 0.79 |

### Table 3
AVE and reliability results and evaluation of the measurement model for study 1.

| Construct          | Source | Item Coding | Loading | Jöreskog’s rho ($r_c$) | AVE  |
|--------------------|--------|-------------|---------|------------------------|------|
| Customer orientation | [1]   | CuO1        | 0.7132  | 0.8621                 | 0.5853|
|                     |        | CuO2        | 0.7493  |                        |      |
|                     |        | CuO3        | 0.7389  |                        |      |
|                     |        | CuO4        | 0.7352  |                        |      |
|                     |        | CuO5        | 0.8433  |                        |      |
|                     |        | CuO6        | 0.8024  |                        |      |
| Competitor orientation | [1]  | CoO1        | 0.9282  | 0.9259                 | 0.7958|
|                     |        | CoO2        | 0.9175  |                        |      |
| Interfunctional coordination | [1] | InF1        | 0.9224  | 0.9108                 | 0.7627|
|                     |        | InF2        | 0.8933  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InF3        | 0.9379  |                        |      |
| Inspired by         | [2]   | InB1        | 0.7974  | 0.8991                 | 0.6241|
|                     |        | InB2        | 0.7230  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB3        | 0.7902  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB4        | 0.8470  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB5        | 0.7556  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB6        | 0.8059  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB7        | 0.8453  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB8        | 0.7523  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB9        | 0.7610  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB10       | 0.8007  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB11       | 0.8162  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InB12       | 0.7752  |                        |      |
| Inspired to         | [2]   | InT1        | 0.8977  | 0.9071                 | 0.6863|
|                     |        | InT2        | 0.7694  |                        |      |
|                     |        | InT3        | 0.9011  |                        |      |
In data 1, CuO -> CL, CoO -> CL, and InF -> CL relationships is partially mediated by InB -> InT by 32.71%, 41.84%, and 36.82% respectively. In data 2, CuO -> CL, CoO -> CL, and InF -> CL relationships also partially mediated by InB -> InT by 38.81%, 51.78%, and 26.39%. All results are illustrate in Tables 7 and 8.

### Table 3 (continued)

| Construct                  | Source        | Item Coding | Loading | Joreskog's rho (ρc) | AVE    |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| Customer loyalty [3]       | InT4          | 0.8607      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InT5          | 0.7685      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InT6          | 0.7594      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CL1           | 0.7051      |         | 0.8555              | 0.6279 |
|                            | CL2           | 0.7965      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CL3           | 0.8495      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CL4           | 0.7989      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CL5           | 0.8048      |         |                     |        |

### Table 4

AVE and reliability results and evaluation of the measurement model for study 2.

| Construct                  | Source        | Item Coding | Loading | Joreskog's rho (ρc) | AVE    |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| Customer orientation [1]   | CuO1          | 0.7269      |         | 0.8138              | 0.6394 |
|                            | CuO2          | 0.8087      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CuO3          | 0.7604      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CuO4          | 0.7914      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CuO5          | 0.8918      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CuO6          | 0.8090      |         |                     |        |
| Competitor orientation (CO) [1] | CoO1        | 0.9106      |         | 0.9275              | 0.7984 |
|                            | CoO2          | 0.9381      |         |                     |        |
| Interfunctional coordination [1] | InF1        | 0.9172      |         | 0.8908              | 0.7846 |
|                            | InF2          | 0.8777      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InF3          | 0.8659      |         |                     |        |
| Inspired by [2]            | InB1          | 0.8047      |         | 0.8284              | 0.6582 |
|                            | InB2          | 0.8496      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB3          | 0.8498      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB4          | 0.8372      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB5          | 0.8220      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB6          | 0.7883      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB7          | 0.8257      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB8          | 0.7506      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB9          | 0.7164      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB10         | 0.8428      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB11         | 0.8299      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InB12         | 0.8771      |         |                     |        |
| Inspired to [2]            | InT1          | 0.8795      |         | 0.8471              | 0.6808 |
|                            | InT2          | 0.7456      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InT3          | 0.8866      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InT4          | 0.8854      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InT5          | 0.7405      |         |                     |        |
|                            | InT6          | 0.7981      |         |                     |        |
| Customer loyalty [3]       | CL1           | 0.8833      |         | 0.8842              | 0.6817 |
|                            | CL2           | 0.8620      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CL3           | 0.8546      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CL4           | 0.7768      |         |                     |        |
|                            | CL5           | 0.7425      |         |                     |        |
### Table 5
Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlation results for study 1.

| Construct                  | CuO | CoO | InC | InB | InT | CL   |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Customer orientation (CuO)|     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Competitor orientation (CoO)| 0.5980 |       |     |     |     |      |
| Interfunctional coordination (InC) | 0.5701 | 0.4594 |     |     |     |      |
| Inspired by (InB)         | 0.7954 | 0.5563 | 0.5935 |     |     |      |
| Inspired to (InT)         | 0.7925 | 0.7991 | 0.5984 | 0.7209 |     |      |
| Customer loyalty (CL)     | 0.8209 | 0.6642 | 0.6184 | 0.7607 | 0.7781 |      |

### Table 6
Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlation results for study 2.

| Construct                  | CuO | CoO | InC | InB | InT | CL   |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Customer orientation (CuO)|     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Competitor orientation (CoO)| 0.6363 |       |     |     |     |      |
| Interfunctional coordination (InC) | 0.5725 | 0.5758 |     |     |     |      |
| Inspired by (InB)         | 0.6144 | 0.6313 | 0.5461 |     |     |      |
| Inspired to (InT)         | 0.6411 | 0.8473 | 0.5351 | 0.7176 |     |      |
| Customer loyalty (CL)     | 0.6509 | 0.7172 | 0.6409 | 0.7212 | 0.7502 |      |

### Table 7
Effect size, direct and indirect effects of the measurement model for study 1.

| Effect                | Cohen's $\hat{f}^2$ | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | Total Effect |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
|                       | $\beta$ | Mean | t-value | $\beta$ | Mean | t-value | $\beta$ | Mean | t-value |
| CuO -> InB            | 0.3334 | 0.4927 | 0.4969 | 8.0484 | - | - | - | 0.4927 | 0.4969 | 8.0484 |
| CuO -> InT            | 0.2487 | 0.3653 | 0.3655 | 7.7565 | - | - | - | 0.3653 | 0.3655 | 7.7565 |
| CuO -> CL             | 0.2189 | 0.3268 | 0.3240 | 3.5221 | 0.1589 | 0.1626 | 3.4086 | 0.1377 | 0.1389 | 2.1229 |
| CoO -> InB            | 0.1282 | 0.1377 | 0.1389 | 2.1229 | - | - | - | 0.1377 | 0.1389 | 2.1229 |
| CoO -> InT            | 0.4105 | 0.4506 | 0.4472 | 7.3925 | - | - | - | 0.4506 | 0.4472 | 7.3925 |
| CoO -> CL             | 0.2008 | 0.1283 | 0.1343 | 1.8732 | 0.0923 | 0.0893 | 2.8341 | 0.2206 | 0.2235 | 3.2942 |
| InC -> InB            | 0.1807 | 0.2272 | 0.2228 | 3.6988 | - | - | - | 0.2272 | 0.2228 | 3.6988 |
| InC -> InT            | 0.2614 | 0.1702 | 0.1722 | 3.7861 | - | - | - | 0.1702 | 0.1722 | 3.7861 |
| InC -> CL             | 0.2066 | 0.1261 | 0.1242 | 2.6330 | 0.0735 | 0.0737 | 2.8264 | 0.1996 | 0.1979 | 3.8807 |
| InB -> CL             | 0.2551 | 0.2207 | 0.2262 | 3.5030 | - | - | - | 0.2207 | 0.2262 | 3.5030 |
| InT -> CL             | 0.2157 | 0.1374 | 0.1329 | 1.9597 | - | - | - | 0.1374 | 0.1329 | 1.9597 |

### Table 8
Effect size, direct and indirect effects of the measurement model for study 2.

| Effect                | Cohen's $\hat{f}^2$ | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | Total Effect |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
|                       | $\beta$ | Mean | t-value | $\beta$ | Mean | t-value | $\beta$ | Mean | t-value |
| CuO -> InB            | 0.1914 | 0.2820 | 0.2819 | 3.9532 | - | - | - | 0.1982 | 0.1990 | 3.1772 |
| CuO -> InT            | 0.1598 | 0.1982 | 0.1990 | 3.1772 | - | - | - | 0.2550 | 0.2563 | 4.3923 |
| CuO -> CL             | 0.2337 | 0.1563 | 0.1549 | 2.3858 | 0.0987 | 0.1014 | 2.4399 | 0.1612 | 0.1596 | 2.9655 |
| CoO -> InB            | 0.1770 | 0.2557 | 0.2618 | 3.0344 | - | - | - | 0.2557 | 0.2618 | 3.0344 |
| CoO -> InT            | 0.4262 | 0.5229 | 0.5234 | 6.8271 | - | - | - | 0.5229 | 0.5234 | 6.8271 |
| CoO -> CL             | 0.3248 | 0.1501 | 0.1518 | 2.5822 | 0.1612 | 0.1596 | 2.9655 | 0.3113 | 0.3114 | 3.3294 |
| InC -> InB            | 0.1774 | 0.2414 | 0.2379 | 3.1996 | - | - | - | 0.2414 | 0.2379 | 3.1996 |
| InC -> InT            | 0.1487 | 0.1665 | 0.1659 | 2.7640 | - | - | - | 0.1665 | 0.1659 | 2.7640 |
| InC -> CL             | 0.2885 | 0.2336 | 0.2313 | 3.8675 | 0.0838 | 0.0841 | 2.3120 | 0.3175 | 0.3154 | 4.4342 |
| InB -> CL             | 0.1480 | 0.2032 | 0.2109 | 2.3162 | - | - | - | 0.2032 | 0.2109 | 2.3162 |
| InT -> CL             | 0.3383 | 0.2089 | 0.1991 | 2.2880 | - | - | - | 0.2089 | 0.1991 | 2.2880 |
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