**Online Appendix**

**Table A-1**. **Sources for operationalization of transformational leadership and focus in relation to conceptualization**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Original version*** | ***LEAP version*** | ***Source*** | ***Focus*** |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1. Clearly articulates his/her vision of the future | Concretizes a vision for the organization’s future | Modified from Moynihan et al., 2012 | Develop |
| 1. Communicates an exciting vision of the future of the organization | Communicates a clear vision of the organization’s future | Modified from House 1998 | Share |
| 1. Articulates and arouses enthusiasm for a shared vision and mission | Makes a continuous effort to generate enthusiasm for the organization’s vision | Modified from Bettencourt, 2004 | Sustain |
| 1. Has a clear sense of where our organization should be in 5 years | Has a clear sense of where he/she believes our organization should be in 5 years | Modified from Moynihan et al., 2012 | Develop/share |
| 1. Facilitating the acceptance of group goals | Seeks to make employees accept common goals for the organization | Modified from MacKenzie et al., 2001 | Share/sustain |
| 1. Gets the group to work together for the same goal | Strives to get the organization to work together in the direction of the vision | Modified from Podsakoff et al., 1990 | Share/sustain |
| 1. N.A. | Strives to clarify for the employees how they can contribute to achieve the organization’s goals | Own. | Share |

Note: In the questionnaire organization is replaced by the specific sector organization, e.g., “school” for the school sector.

**Table A-2**. **Sources for operationalization of transactional leadership and focus in relation to conceptualization**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Original version*** | ***LEAP version*** | ***Source*** | ***Focus*** |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1. N.A. | Rewards the employees’ performance when they live up to the leader’s requirements. | Own | Pecuniary reward |
| 1. Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs. | Rewards the employees’ dependent on how well they perform their jobs. | Trottier et al., 2008 | Pecuniary reward |
| 1. Rewards us when we do what we are supposed to do. | Points out what employees will receive if they do what is required. | Bass and Avolio, 1989 | Pecuniary reward |
| 1. N.A. | Lets employees’ effort determine received rewards. | Own | Pecuniary reward |
| 1. Gives me positive feedback when I perform well. | Gives individual employees positive feedback when they perform well. | House, 1998 | Non-pecuniary reward |
| 1. Commends me when I do a better than average job. | Actively shows his/her appreciation of employees who do their jobs better than expected. | House, 1998 | Non-pecuniary reward |
| 1. Frequently does not acknowledge my good performance. | Generally does not acknowledge individual employees’ even though they perform as required (R). | House, 1998 | Non-pecuniary reward |
| 1. Personally compliments me, when I do outstanding work | Personally compliments employees when they do outstanding work. | House, 1998 | Non-pecuniary reward |
| 1. Dismisses teachers, if they do not perform satisfactorily over an extended period. | Makes sure that it has consequences for the employees if they do not consistently perform as required. | Jacobsen and Andersen, 2015 | Sanctions |
| 1. In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve. | Takes steps to deal with poor performers who do not improve. | Trottier et al., 2008 | Sanctions |
| 1. N.A. | Gives negative consequences to the employees if they perform worse than their colleagues. | Own | Sanctions |
| 1. N.A. | Gives negative consequences to his/her employees if they do not perform as the leader requires. | Own | Sanctions |

Note: In the questionnaire organization is replaced by the specific sector organization, e.g., “school” for the school sector.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A-3. Employee Ratings. Measurement Model of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Across Sectors. Confirmatory Factor Analysis with Standardized Factor Loadings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Upper Secondary Schools | | Lower Secondary Schools (public) | | Lower Secondary Schools (private) | | Day Care (public) | | Day Care (Private) | | Tax | | Bank | |
|  | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post |
| **Transformational Leadership** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Concretizes a clear vision for the [ORGANIZATION’S] future” | .789 | .779 | .809 | .810 | .897 | .844 | .763 | .797 | .722 | .859 | .779 | .790 | .782 | .787 |
| “Seeks to make employees accept common goals for the [ORGANIZATION]” | .791 | .777 | .760 | .762 | .806 | .850 | .741 | .745 | .744 | .845 | .812 | .800 | .785 | .876 |
| “Strives to get the [ORGANIZATION’S] employees to work together in the direction of the vision” | .859 | .892 | .880 | .898 | .900 | .891 | .844 | .839 | .880 | .892 | .857 | .869 | .806 | .855 |
| “Strives to clarify for the employees how they can contribute to achieving the [ORGANIZATION’S] goals” | .834 | .858 | .852 | .852 | .891 | .918 | .845 | .837 | .887 | .880 | .848 | .821 | .858 | .829 |
| N (Employees) | 1,255 | 1,094 | 2,566 | 1,870 | 406 | 241 | 2,564 | 1,600 | 230 | 142 | 1,855 | 1,549 | 433 | 166 |
| N (Organizations) | 41 | 35 | 105 | 78 | 37 | 28 | 186 | 144 | 49 | 32 | 140 | 121 | 43 | 22 |
| Chi-squared | 130.68 | 147.89 | 220.82 | 150.40 | 103.27 | 102.28 | 232.34 | 125.84 | 67.98 | 111.41 | 181.36 | 179.38 | 103.47 | 83.11 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) | .031 | .037 | .033 | .029 | .043 | .055 | .034 | .027 | .026 | .079 | .033 | .036 | .042 | .050 |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | .960 | .941 | .962 | .969 | .956 | .936 | .958 | .973 | .988 | .915 | .932 | .915 | .914 | .935 |
| Standardized Root Mean Square of Approximation (SRMR) | .036 | .046 | .031 | .033 | .072 | .101 | .049 | .041 | .113 | .174 | .065 | .065 | .075 | .174 |
| Note: Confirmatory factor analysis based on asymptotic distribution free estimator. All standardized factor loadings are statistically significant at the .001-level. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A-3. Employee Ratings. Measurement Model of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Across Sectors. Confirmatory Factor Analysis with Standardized Factor Loadings (Cont.)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Upper Secondary Schools | | Lower Secondary Schools (public) | | Lower Secondary Schools (private) | | Day Care (public) | | Day Care (Private) | | Tax | | Bank | |
|  | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post | Pre | Post |
| **Transactional Leadership: Non-Pecuniary Rewards** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Gives individual employees positive feedback when they perform well” | .914 | .911 | .902 | .923 | .935 | .927 | .922 | .923 | .938 | .963 | .905 | .910 | .917 | .941 |
| “Actively shows his/her appreciation of employees who do their jobs better than expected” | .894 | .891 | .903 | .922 | .907 | .918 | .893 | .890 | .926 | .903 | .893 | .883 | .888 | .883 |
| “Personally compliments employees when they do outstanding work” | .925 | .929 | .931 | .938 | .949 | .959 | .939 | .917 | .897 | .946 | .940 | .933 | .938 | .963 |
| **Transactional Leadership: Pecuniary Rewards** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Rewards the employees’ performance when they live up to his/her requirements” | .889 | .878 | .904 | .913 | .947 | .926 | .916 | .920 | .940 | .962 | .865 | .872 | .902 | .933 |
| “Rewards the employees’ dependent on how well they perform their jobs” | .871 | .844 | .900 | .890 | .886 | .867 | .900 | .910 | .829 | .887 | .844 | .856 | .882 | .823 |
| “Points out what employees will receive if they do what is required” | .765 | .746 | .789 | .783 | .833 | .754 | .795 | .797 | .802 | .839 | .635 | .636 | .669 | .830 |
| **Transactional Leadership: Sanctions** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Gives negative consequences to the employees if they perform worse than their colleagues” | .746 | .787 | .820 | .768 | .726 | .791 | .782 | .809 | .739 | .799 | .782 | .839 | .763 | .746 |
| “Makes sure that it has consequences for the employees if they do not consistently perform as required” | .869 | .840 | .892 | .896 | .883 | .909 | .879 | .878 | .887 | .927 | .881 | .900 | .892 | .920 |
| “Gives negative consequences to employees if they do not perform as he/she requires” | .883 | .891 | .871 | .873 | .757 | .829 | .889 | .887 | .876 | .903 | .878 | .921 | .859 | .905 |
| N (Employees) | 1,255 | 1,094 | 2,566 | 1,870 | 406 | 241 | 2,564 | 1,600 | 230 | 142 | 1,855 | 1,549 | 433 | 166 |
| N (Organizations) | 41 | 35 | 105 | 78 | 37 | 28 | 186 | 144 | 49 | 32 | 140 | 121 | 43 | 22 |
| Chi-squared | 130.68 | 147.89 | 220.82 | 150.40 | 103.27 | 102.28 | 232.34 | 125.84 | 67.98 | 111.41 | 181.36 | 179.38 | 103.47 | 83.11 |
| Degrees of Freedom | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) | .031 | .037 | .033 | .029 | .043 | .055 | .034 | .027 | .026 | .079 | .033 | .036 | .042 | .050 |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | .960 | .941 | .962 | .969 | .956 | .936 | .958 | .973 | .988 | .915 | .932 | .915 | .914 | .935 |
| Standardized Root Mean Square of Approximation (SRMR) | .036 | .046 | .031 | .033 | .072 | .101 | .049 | .041 | .113 | .174 | .065 | .065 | .075 | .174 |
| Note: Confirmatory factor analysis based on asymptotic distribution free estimator. All standardized factor loadings are statistically significant at the .001-level. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A-4. Leader Ratings. Measurement Models of Transformational and Transactional Leadership. Confirmatory Factor Analysis with Standardized Factor Loadings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 2 | |  | 2.1 | |  | 2.2 | |  | 2.2.1 | |  | 2.2.2 | |
|  | Full Sample | |  | Pre | |  | Post | |  | Post (Treatment) | |  | Post (Control) | |
| **Transformational Leadership** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Concretize a clear vision for the [ORGANIZATION’S] future” | .520 |  |  | .516 |  |  | .534 |  |  | .599 |  |  | .416 |  |
| “Seek to make employees accept common goals for the [ORGANIZATION]” | .675 |  |  | .674 |  |  | .690 |  |  | .726 |  |  | .822 |  |
| “Strive to get the [ORGANIZATION’S] employees to work together in the direction of the vision” | .765 |  |  | .745 |  |  | .788 |  |  | .831 |  |  | .807 |  |
| “Strive to clarify for the employees how they can contribute to achieving the [ORGANIZATION’S] goals” | .712 |  |  | .716 |  |  | .752 |  |  | .725 |  |  | .790 |  |
| **Transactional Leadership: Non-Pecuniary Rewards** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Give individual employees positive feedback when they perform well” | .808 |  |  | .817 |  |  | .786 |  |  | .749 |  |  | .894 |  |
| “Actively show my appreciation of employees who do their jobs better than expected” | .743 |  |  | .709 |  |  | .798 |  |  | .805 |  |  | .820 |  |
| “Personally compliment employees when they do outstanding work” | .756 |  |  | .704 |  |  | .764 |  |  | .746 |  |  | .885 |  |
| **Transactional Leadership: Pecuniary Rewards** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Reward the employees’ performance, when they live up to my requirements” | .841 |  |  | .832 |  |  | .884 |  |  | .894 |  |  | .749 |  |
| “Reward the employees’ dependent on how well they perform their jobs” | .783 |  |  | .803 |  |  | .757 |  |  | .735 |  |  | .903 |  |
| “Point out what employees will receive if they do what is required” | .626 |  |  | .661 |  |  | .623 |  |  | .645 |  |  | .658 |  |
| **Transactional Leadership: Sanctions** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| “Give negative consequences to the employees if they perform worse than their colleagues” | .593 |  |  | .602 |  |  | .611 |  |  | .576 |  |  | .747 |  |
| “Make sure that it has consequences for the employees if they do not consistently perform as required” | .709 |  |  | .755 |  |  | .635 |  |  | .627 |  |  | .773 |  |
| “Give negative consequences to employees if they do not perform as I require” | .751 |  |  | .785 |  |  | .696 |  |  | .712 |  |  | .796 |  |
| N (Observations) | 982 |  |  | 581 |  |  | 401 |  |  | 288 |  |  | 113 |  |
| N (Leaders/Organizations) | 597 |  |  | 581 |  |  | 401 |  |  | 288 |  |  | 113 |  |
| Chi-squared | 130.13 |  |  | 88.43 |  |  | 111.92 |  |  | 101.88 |  |  | 128.69 |  |
| Degrees of Freedom | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |
| Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA) | .035 |  |  | .029 |  |  | .047 |  |  | .050 |  |  | .102 |  |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | .933 |  |  | .956 |  |  | .913 |  |  | .923 |  |  | .907 |  |
| Standardized Root Mean Square of Approximation (SRMR) | .084 |  |  | .131 |  |  | .146 |  |  | .150 |  |  | .389 |  |
| Note: Confirmatory factor analysis based on asymptotic distribution free estimator. All standardized factor loadings are statistically significant at the .001-level. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A-5. Intercorrelations and Estimates for Discriminant Validity and Reliability. Leader Ratings.** | | | | | | | |
|  | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 |
| 1.Transformational Leadership | (.747)/(.455) | | .160 | | .052 | | .149 |
| 2.Contingent Non-pecuniary Rewards | .400 | \*\*\* | (.804)/(.592) | | .064 | | .068 |
| 3.Contingent Pecuniary Rewards | .229 | \*\*\* | .252 | \*\*\* | (.780)/(.571) | | .141 |
| 4.Contingent Sanctions | .386 | \*\*\* | .260 | \*\*\* | .376 | \*\*\* | (.717)/(.473) |
| Note: \*\*\* *p* < .001. N = 982. Subdiagonal entries are correlations between latent constructs. Entries above the diagonal are the squared correlation estimates (shared variance). The first entry on the diagonal is Cronbach’s alpha for composite reliability. The second entry in the diagonal is the average variance extracted (average of squared factor loadings) for each latent construct. Jöreskog’s Rho for reliability is: Transformational leadership = .766, Contingent non-pecuniary rewards = .813, Contingent pecuniary rewards = .797, and Contingent sanctions = .727. | | | | | | | |