APPENDIX
CHAPTER 2

Measure of Ethical leadership

*Ethical leadership* was measured using ten items of a validated German version of the Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS-D; Rowold, Borgmann, & Heinitz, 2009), adapted from the English version by Brown, Treviño, and Harrison (2005). The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (very often).

1. Listens to what employees have to say.
2. Disciplines employees who violate ethical standards.
3. Conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner.
4. Has the best interests of employees in mind.
5. Makes fair and balanced decisions.
6. Can be trusted.
7. Discusses business ethics or values with employees.
8. Sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics.
9. Defines success not just by results but also the way that they are obtained
10. When making decisions, asks “what is the right thing to do?”

**Toxic leadership** was measured using 23 items of the Toxic Leadership Scale developed by Schmidt (2008). The items were translated to German by two bilingual translators, following a translation-back translation procedure (Brislin, 1970). The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (very often).

1. Controls how subordinates complete their tasks.
2. Invades the privacy of subordinates.
3. Does not permit subordinates to approach goals in new ways.
4. Will ignore ideas that are contrary to his/her own.
5. Is inflexible when it comes to organizational policies, even in special circumstances.

6. Determines all decisions in the unit whether they are important or not.

7. Has a sense of personal entitlement.

8. Assumes that he/she is destined to enter the highest ranks of my organization.

9. Thinks that he/she is more capable than others.

10. Believes that he/she is an extraordinary person.

11. Thrives on compliments and personal accolades.

12. Drastically changes his/her demeanor when his/her supervisor is present.


14. Will only offer assistance to people who can help him/her get ahead.

15. Accepts credit for successes that do not belong to him/her.

16. Acts only in the best interest of his/her next promotion.

17. Has explosive outbursts.

18. Allows his/her current mood to define the climate of the workplace.

19. Expresses anger at subordinates for unknown reasons.

20. Allows his/her mood to affect his/her vocal tone and volume.

21. Varies in his/her degree of approachability.

22. Causes subordinates to try to “read” his/her mood.

23. Affects the emotions of subordinates when impassioned.

*Need for autonomy* was measured using three items of a sub-facet of the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) developed by Steers and Braunstein (1976). Following a translation-back translation procedure, the items were translated into German by two bilingual translators (Brislin, 1970). The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (very often).
1. In my work assignments, I try to be my own boss.
2. I go my own way at work, regardless of the opinions of others.
3. I disregard rules and regulations that hamper my personal freedom.

LMX was measured using nine items developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). The items were translated into German by two bilingual translators, following a back translation procedure (Brislin, 1970). The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (very often).

1. I like my supervisor very much as a person.
2. My supervisor is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
3. My supervisor is a lot of fun to work with.
4. My supervisor defends my work actions to a superior even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.
5. My supervisor would come to my defense if I were “attacked” by others.
6. My supervisor would defend me to others if I made an honest mistake.
7. I am impressed with my supervisor’s knowledge of his job.
8. I respect my supervisor’s knowledge and competence on the job.
9. I admire my supervisor’s professional skills.

Work engagement was assessed with the nine-item version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli et al., 2006; translated version taken from Hering, 2008). The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (very often).

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
3. I am enthusiastic about my job.
4. My job inspires me.
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
7. I am proud of the work that I do.
8. I am immersed in my work.
9. I get carried away when I am working.

Exhaustion was measured using the sub-facet exhaustion of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1993). The items were translated into German by two bilingual translators, following a back translation procedure (Brislin, 1970). The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (very often).

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
4. Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
5. I feel burned out from my work.
6. I feel frustrated by my job.
7. I feel I’m working too hard on my job.
8. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
9. I feel like I’m at the end of my rope.
CHAPTER 3

Leaders’ and followers’ work engagement was measured with the nine-item version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006; translated version taken from Hering, 2008). The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 6 (never).

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
3. I am enthusiastic about my job.
4. My job inspires me.
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
7. I am proud of the work that I do.
8. I am immersed in my work.
9. I get carried away when I am working.

LMX was measured by asking the followers to rate three items originally developed by Scandura and Graen (1984) and adapted by Bauer and Green (1996) on a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (fully agree) to 6 (fully disagree). The items were translated into German by two bilingual translators, following a back translation procedure (Brislin, 1970).

1. My direct supervisor understands my problems and needs.
2. My supervisor recognizes my potential well
3. I would characterize the working relationship I have with my supervisor as extremely effective.

Turnover Intention was measured using a single item adapted from Spector, Dwyer, and Jex (1988): “During the last six months, how often did you think about quitting your job?” We
used a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 6 (never). The item was translated into German by two translators following a back translation procedure (Brislin, 1970).

*Performance* was measured by asking the respondents to indicate their annual performance assessment.
CHAPTER 4

*Work engagement* was assessed with the ENG-I. The response format was a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 6 (never). Second, we also used the nine-item version of the UWES (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006; translated version taken from Hering, 2008; overall $\alpha = .92$). The response format was a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 6 (never).

ENG-I:

1. I work on my tasks in a persistent and goal-oriented manner.
2. I have a strong drive to achieve high quality work results.
3. My colleagues can rely on my support even under difficult circumstances.
4. I am willing to give my best for the achievement of team goals.
5. I use my competencies in order to perform my job well.
6. I actively participate in meetings.
7. In everyday work life I actively contribute in order to excite my colleagues for ideas.
8. I actively contribute to successful information exchange within the team.
9. I encourage colleagues to do their utmost to support team goals.
10. I identify with the mission of my organization.
11. I support changes in my organization as much as possible.
12. I align my daily work with the goals of my organization.
13. If I had the choice once more today, I would again choose my organization as an employer.
14. Overall, I can manage my workload (amount and quality) well.
15. I am convinced that I can handle my job requirements in the long run.
16. I actively contribute to the compatibility of my work and private obligations.
17. At work I have the possibility to do what I can do best.
18. In my current job, I can adequately contribute my expectations and ideas.
19. My work is more than just a job for me.

UWES:

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
3. I am enthusiastic about my job.
4. My job inspires me.
5. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
6. I feel happy when I am working intensely.
7. I am proud of the work that I do.
8. I am immersed in my work.
9. I get carried away when I am working.

*Performance* was assessed by asking participants to indicate the result of their annual performance assessment they receive from their supervisor.

*Turnover intentions* were assessed using a single item adapted from Spector, Dwyer, and Jex (1988): “During the last six months, how often did you think about quitting your job?” We applied a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 6 (never). The item was translated into German by two translators following a translation-back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1970).
CHAPTER 5

Work engagement was assessed using 19 ENG-I items. The response format was a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very often) to 6 (never).

1. I work on my tasks in a persistent and goal-oriented manner.
2. I have a strong drive to achieve high quality work results.
3. My colleagues can rely on my support even under difficult circumstances.
4. I am willing to give my best for the achievement of team goals.
5. I use my competencies in order to perform my job well.
6. I actively participate in meetings.
7. In everyday work life I actively contribute in order to excite my colleagues for ideas.
8. I actively contribute to successful information exchange within the team.
9. I encourage colleagues to do their utmost to support team goals.
10. I identify with the mission of my organization.
11. I support changes in my organization as much as possible.
12. I align my daily work with the goals of my organization.
13. If I had the choice once more today, I would again choose my organization as an employer.
14. Overall, I can manage my workload (amount and quality) well.
15. I am convinced that I can handle my job requirements in the long run.
16. I actively contribute to the compatibility of my work and private obligations.
17. At work I have the possibility to do what I can do best.
18. In my current job, I can adequately contribute my expectations and ideas.
19. My work is more than just a job for me.

Customer satisfaction was assessed by four items in n = 200 customer interviews for each of the 156 organization (in sum, 31,200 interviews) which are conducted each year by an
external provider. The customers were asked for their satisfaction concerning the placing of unemployed employees, the possibility to gather information, the satisfaction with the employees of the organization, and with the general circumstances. The response format corresponded to that of the work engagement scale with a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very satisfied) to 6 (not satisfied at all).

**Job Placement Success.** We matched our data to an objective performance measure of each sub-organization, namely their job placement success. This rate describes the amount of unemployed persons that could be placed in an employment again assisted by the employees of the organizations investigated. The performance measure on job placement success takes into account the employment market of the regions so that the rate is well comparable between each sub-organization. The measure ranges from 0 to 100, representing percentages.
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