Supplementary Materials

A. Study Materials

Stress Mindset Manipulation

We adapted the stress mindset priming manipulation from Ben-Avi et al. (2018). The exact wording can be found in the supplemental materials of Ben-Avi et al. (2018) and is not repeated here for brevity. Participants were informed that everyone experiences stress in different domains of life and that stress can have different effects on functioning, emotions, and thoughts. They were then invited to remember a stressful situation from their work life, in which stress had either affected them in a negative, debilitating way (stress-is-debilitating [SID] mindset condition) or in a positive, enhancing way (stress-is-enhancing [SIE] mindset condition). In line with the between-subject design of our study, each participant was only presented with one of the two manipulations. Participants were asked to briefly describe this situation in 5-7 sentences and include the circumstances as well as the positive/negative consequences of experiencing this stressful situation. Afterwards, they completed four sentences regarding their feelings, thoughts, behaviors, and body sensations in this situation: "When stress affects me in a *negative/positive* way, (a) it makes me feel… (b)…it makes me think that… (c)…it affects my behavior in the following way… (d)…I feel the following physical sensations…" The term "negative" in the statements was used in the SID condition and the term "positive" was used in the SIE condition.

Team Identification Manipulation

In Study 3, we adapted the identification manipulation from Schuh et al. (2016). Each

participant was told that they were the leader of a team with which they either strongly identified or did not identify with at all: “Thinking about your time working with this team, you realize that you *strongly identify* with it. When someone praises the team, it feels like a personal compliment to you. In fact, you see the team’s successes as your successes. And when someone criticizes the team, it feels like a personal insult. / Thinking about your time working with this team, you realize that you *don’t really identify* with it. When someone praises the team, it doesn’t feel like a personal compliment to you. In fact, you don’t see the team’s successes as your successes. And when someone criticizes the team, it doesn’t feel like a personal insult.” Again, we applied a between-subject design and participants were presented with only one of the two manipulations.

Vignette of the Employee Ben

In the second part, participants were asked to imagine that they were either the leader of their current team (Study 1 and Study 2) or of a fictitious team (Study 3), with “Ben” being one of their employees. They then read a vignette describing this fictitious employee Ben (based on the vignette used by Ben-Avi et al., 2018):

“Ben, age 40, married with three young children, lives in a big city in the United States/in Germany. He is an engineer with 15 years of seniority. As part of his work, Ben is responsible for several projects and reports to the operational department manager and the district manager. In an average day, Ben participates in 5-6 meetings and answers 50-70 emails. He communicates with a large number of customers and employees. He also has routine meetings with his managers twice a week. Ben spends long hours at the office (8-10 hours on average, 5 days a week) and completes additional work at home in the evenings, after his children fall asleep. In addition to his routine work, Ben is currently working on a yearly work plan for 2019 during the weekends. He is also helping his wife in preparing their elder son’s birthday event, a celebration that involves the participation of many friends and family members.” The location “United States” was used in the studies conducted in the United States (Studies 1 and

3), while the location "Germany" was chosen in Study 2, which was carried out in Germany.

B. Additional Information on the Data Analysis

Exclusion Criteria and Handling of Outliers

Prior to the data collection, we specified exclusion criteria and determined how outliers were to be defined and handled. These exclusion criteria were also described in the study preregistrations. Regarding the exclusion of participants, we excluded those participants finishing the questionnaire in less than 50% of the average time needed for completing the questionnaire, as we assumed that it was hardly possible to seriously answer the questionnaire in such a short time[1]. Furthermore, we integrated attention check items (e.g., "For quality assurance please tick '1 = strongly disagree' for this item.") to ensure that participants completed the survey thoroughly. Participants who answered these check items incorrectly were excluded. In addition, participants who indicated that they were not working at the moment (unemployed, etc.) were excluded from the analyses, as we believed that it is important to be in a work situation in order to put oneself into the scenario effectively. Finally, two independent judges rated the open answers for the stress mindset manipulation and participants who obviously did not appropriately follow the instruction of the manipulation (e.g., by giving senseless answers in the stress mindset manipulation, which suggests careless processing) were also excluded. To identify outliers, we inspected boxplots of the dependent variables in each condition. If there were any outliers, we ran the analyses with and without these outliers and report both sets of results in case they diverge with regard to the outcomes of the significance tests.

C. Additional Variables and Analyses

The studies were carried out in the context of master theses of students from the Goethe University in Frankfurt, Germany. For this purpose, we added additional variables. These

[1] To apply this criterion, we chose the median instead of the mean since the participants were able to pause their participation and continue it later. This sometimes resulted in long processing times, which would have biased the mean value.

additional variables were in Study 2 participants' self-care, ego-depletion, organizational identification, and empathy, as we expected that these personal characteristics might influence the projection process of one's stress mindset onto others. In addition, we measured participants' intention to voluntarily help the employee as an alternative dependent variable. In Study 3, we assessed participants' empathy and mindfulness as additional moderators.

Measures of Additional Variables

Participants' *self-care* was assessed using 13 items based on Franke et al. (2014). A sample item is "I try to reduce my demands by optimizing my personal work-life balance" (Study 2: ω = .88). Participants' *ego-depletion* was assessed with five items (Lanaj et al., 2016). A sample item is "I feel drained right now" (Study 2: ω = .91). Participants' organizational identification was measured using three items by Doosje et al. (1995). A sample item is "I identify with my organization/company" (Study 2: ω = .92). Participants' *empathy* was measured using nine items from the Questionnaire of Cognitive and Affective Empathy (Reniers et al., 2011). A sample item is "I can pick up quickly if someone says one thing but means another" (Study 2: ω = .68; Study 3: ω = .66). Participants' mindfulness was measured using five items of the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (Brown & Ryan, 2003). A sample item is "It seems I am 'running on automatic' without much awareness of what I am doing" (reversed scored; Study 3: ω = .90). Intention to help the employee was assessed with seven items of interpersonal organizational citizenship behavior (Williams & Anderson, 1991; see also Ben-Avi et al., 2018). A sample item is "As his leader, I would help him with his heavy workload" (Study 2: ω = .82). All measures were presented using a five-point rating scale ranging from *1 = strongly disagree/never/not at all* to *5 = strongly agree/always/very much*.

We also assessed participants' intended leadership behavior toward the employee by asking them about their performance expectations with two self-designed items ("Imagine the following situation: Ben is expected to brainstorm about ideas for a new project and present

them to you (his manager). Please set a target of how many ideas he should at least come up with“ and “What level of performance ought Ben to show for you to be satisfied with him?”). Unfortunately, these two items showed a very low correlation (Study 1: $r = .02$, $p = .802$; Study 2: $r = .08$, $p = .185$; Study 3: $r = .17$, $p = .007$) and thus do not represent the same construct, which is why we refrained from analyzing these items.

In addition, we measured participants' optimism and their own stress level as well as their mood after reading the vignette (the measures are described in the paper). Due to the experimental approach that we took and because of randomizing our participants to one of the two study conditions, we did not expect any differences either in terms of these variables or in demographic variables (age and gender). Examining whether participants in the two stress mindset conditions differed on these variables showed no significant differences between study conditions, proving our randomization successful. Therefore, we deemed it not necessary to include any of these variables as control variables. An exception was mood in Study 3, in which participants differed in the two groups, and therefore we included mood as a covariate in the analyses.

Additional Results

In the following, we report the significant results of the additional analyses. All additional results can be requested from the corresponding author.

Study 2

The results of the additional analyses in Study 2 showed that only participants' self-care significantly moderated the relationship between reported stress mindset and perception of work engagement (see Table S1). Participants with high self-care showed a stronger relationship between their reported stress mindset and the perception of work engagement ($b = 0.23$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.35], $SE = 0.07$, $p < .001$) than participants with low self-care ($b = 0.06$, 95% CI [-0.07, 0.20], $SE = 0.08$, $p = .229$). Neither participants' empathy or ego-depletion nor their organizational identification moderated the relationship between their

reported stress mindset and their perception of well-being. The results for helping behavior as a dependent variable showed no significant relationships between the perception of well-being and the intention to help the employee, as well as no indirect effects of the stress mindset condition via reported stress mindset and any of the well-being variables on helping intentions.

We also checked our dataset for outliers and their potential effects on the results. The visual inspection of boxplots of the dependent variables indicated $n = 25$ cases as potential outliers (more than 1.5 the interquartile range away from the lower or upper quartile). As a deviation of data points from others does not necessarily indicate error outliers (e.g., Aguinis et al., 2013), we did not automatically remove these cases, but rather checked whether the deviations were caused by possible data error (e.g., coding errors or inaccuracies while answering the questionnaire, i.e. short time for completing, clear response pattern). Since this seemed not to be the case and the exclusion of these cases did not substantially change the results, these cases were kept in the main analyses. We also tested whether excluding participants who indicated student status ($n = 26$) changed the results, which was not the case.

Study 3

The results of the additional moderator analyses in Study 3 revealed that only participants' mindfulness significantly moderated the relationship between reported stress mindset and perception of somatic symptoms (see Table S2). Participants who indicated that they were particularly mindful showed a stronger relationship between their reported stress mindset and the perception of somatic symptoms ($b = -0.17$, 95% CI [-0.29, -0.05], $SE = 0.07$, $p = .010$) than participants with low mindfulness ($b = 0.11$, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.27], $SE = 0.10$, $p = .151$). Participants' empathy did not significantly moderate the relationship between reported stress mindset and perception of well-being.

The results of the hypothesis tests for team identification as moderator without mood as control variable can be found in Table S3. These results are similar to the findings where

mood was controlled, which are reported in the paper.

Similar to Study 2, we investigated possible outliers by visual inspection of boxplots of the dependent variables. In total, $n = 16$ cases were more than 1.5 the interquartile range away from the lower or upper quartile. The analyses without these cases showed quite similar results, with only some small differences (see Table S4). However, since these outliers were not due to data errors but seem to be based on actual differences, we have kept them in the main analyses. Examining whether excluding participants who indicated student status ($n = 1$) changed the results did not show substantial differences.

Exploratory Analysis

We conducted an exploratory analysis with the data of only those individuals from all three studies who actually held a leadership position in their current job. We used the same analytic strategy as in Studies 2 and 3. We tested the overall model for all mediators, the moderator, and the outcome variables simultaneously. Because we had not collected certain variables in some studies (e.g., team identification and perceived somatic symptoms in Study 1), we used the full information maximum likelihood method in Mplus to estimate parameters based on the incomplete data matrix (Lüdtke et al., 2007).

We included 99 leaders from Study 1, 92 leaders from Study 2, and a total of 142 leaders from Study 3. The total sample consisted of 333 individuals holding a leadership position, with an average age of 38.56 years ($SD = 10.98$), and 57% were female (one person indicated "other" as gender).

The manipulation check revealed that, as intended, participants in the SIE condition reported higher stress mindset scores, indicating a stronger SIE mindset ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.71$) than participants in the SID condition ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.77$, $t(331) = -10.58$, $p < .001$). Participants in the two conditions did not significantly differ in gender, age, stress level, optimism, or mood ($p > .05$ for all variables). Thus, all analyses are reported without covariates.

The overall model showed a good fit to the data: $\chi^2(16) = 36.86$, $p = .002$, RMSEA = 0.06, CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.86, SRMR = 0.05. The results can be found in Table S5 and support most findings from the three studies. The simple slope analyses revealed that for strongly identified participants, the relationship between their reported stress mindset and perceived emotional exhaustion was stronger ($b = -0.43$, 95% CI [-0.56, -0.30], $SE = 0.08$, $p < .001$) than for participants with low team identification ($b = -0.14$, 95% CI [-0.27, -0.01], $SE = 0.08$, $p = .035$). Similarly, the relationship between reported stress mindset and perceived somatic symptoms was stronger for those with high team identification ($b = -0.29$, 95% CI [-0.43, -0.15], $SE = 0.08$, $p < .001$) than for participants with low team identification ($b = -0.09$, 95% CI [-0.22, 0.05], $SE = 0.08$, $p = .151$).

D. Preregistrations

Study 2

Impact of Stress Mindset on Leaders' Behavior (#12248)

Created: 06/27/2018 06:05 AM (PT)
Public: 11/05/2021 10:53 AM (PT)

Author(s)
Antonia J. Kaluza (Goethe University Frankfurt am Main) - kaluza@psych.uni-frankfurt.de
Pauline Raesch (Goethe University Frankfurt am Main) - pauline.raesch@stud.uni-frankfurt.de
Sebastian C. Schuh (China Europe International Business School) - sschuh@ceibs.edu
Nina M. Junker (Goethe University Frankfurt am Main) - junker@psych.uni-frankfurt.de
Rolf van Dick (Goethe University Frankfurt am Main) - van.dick@psych.uni-frankfurt.de

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
We want to examine the effects of holding a stress-is-enhancing versus stress-is-debilitating mindset on the perception of a target's well-being (work engagement, emotional exhaustion) and on the perceiver's consequent leadership style. We expect people holding a stress-is-enhancing mindset (as compared to people holding a stress-is-debilitating mindset) to be less likely to judge a target experiencing heavy workload as suffering from emotional exhaustion, but more likely to rate them as highly work engaged. Hence, we expect people holding a stress-is-enhancing mindset to show less health-oriented leadership behavior and higher performance expectations. Finally, we expect the association between stress mindset and the perception of the target's work engagement and emotional exhaustion to be moderated by the perceiver's self-care and team identification.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
We will use the following measures to assess our dependent variables: Health-oriented leadership (Health-oriented Leadership questionnaire [HoL], Franke et al., 2014), high performance expectations (subscale High Performance Expectations from the Transformational Leadership Inventory [TLI], Podsakoff et al., 1990); Promotability (Hoobler et al., 2009; Tiedens, 2001); task for target (self-designed item: "Imagine the following situation: Ben is expected to brainstorm about ideas for a new project and present them to you (his manager). Please set a target of how many ideas he should at least come up with.") & performance expectations (self-designed item: "What level of performance is Ben ought to show, for you to be satisfied with him?").
We will measure the well-being variables with the following instruments: Work engagement (Utrecht Work Engagement Scale [UWES], Schaufeli et al., 2006), emotional exhaustion (subscale Emotional Exhaustion from the Maslach Burnout Inventory [MBI], Maslach et al., 1996).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
Participants will be randomly assigned to one of the two stress-mindset manipulation conditions (stress-is-enhancing vs. stress-is-debilitating mindset).

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
The effect of stress mindset condition on perceivers' judgments of the target's work engagement and emotional exhaustion will be analyzed using one-way ANOVAs or – in case of strong correlation between the dependent variables – one-way MANOVAs. We will test whether demographic variables or one of the other control variables (perceiver's optimism, stress level or mood) significantly relate to any of the outcome variables. If so, they will be included as covariates in our analyses.
The downstream, indirect effect of stress mindset condition on health-oriented leadership and high performance expectations will be analyzed separately and simultaneously for the two mediators (the target's perceived work engagement and emotional exhaustion) using mediator analyses.
The moderating effect of the perceiver's self-care and identification on the expected association between stress mindset and perception of the target's work engagement and emotional exhaustion will be analyzed using moderator analyses.
All analyses will be one-tailed, with the level of significance set at $p < .05$.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We will inspect boxplots of the dependent variables in each condition. If there are any outliers (more than 1.5 the interquartile range away from the lower or upper quartile), we will run the analyses with and without them and report both sets of results in case they diverge with regard to the outcomes of the significance tests.
Participants finishing the questionnaire in less than 50% of the average time needed for completing the questionnaire will be excluded from the analysis, as we suppose that it is hardly possible to seriously answer the questionnaire in that little time.
Participants indicating that they are not working at the moment (unemployed, student only, etc.) will be excluded from the analyses.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.
Expecting medium effect sizes as found in previous studies (e.g., Ben-Avi et al., 2018), the power analysis using the G*Power 3.1 program (Faul et al., 2009) revealed that a sample size of 252 is needed for analyzing the mediator effects simultaneously and a sample size of 230 is needed for analyzing the mediator effects separately to detect an effect of 80% of power. To account for the potential need to exclude certain participants (because of failure to complete the study or missing data, see point 6), we target a somewhat larger sample size of 270.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
We will include the perceiver's empathy, identification with the organization, and ego depletion as moderator variables for exploratory purposes. We will include the perceived target's somatic symptoms as additional mediator variable for exploratory purposes. Moreover, we will include the perceiver's intention to voluntary help the target as possible alternative dependent variable for exploratory purposes. Finally, we will assess the control variables already mentioned above (perceiver's optimism, stress level or mood).

Study 3

Leaders' Stress Mindset and Identification Predicting Leader Behavior (#13770)

Created: 09/04/2018 01:36 PM (PT)
Public: 11/05/2021 10:57 AM (PT)

Author(s)
Antonia J. Kaluza (Goethe University Frankfurt am Main) - kaluza@psych.uni-frankfurt.de
Sebastian C. Schuh (China Europe International Business School) - sschuh@ceibs.edu
Rolf van Dick (Goethe University Frankfurt am Main) - van.dick@psych.uni-frankfurt.de

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
We want to examine the effects of holding a stress-is-enhancing versus stress-is-debilitating mindset on the leader's perception of an employee's well-being (work engagement, emotional exhaustion, somatic symptoms) and on the consequent leadership behavior, depending on the leader's identification with his/her team.
We expect people holding a stress-is-enhancing mindset (as compared to a stress-is-debilitating mindset) to be less likely to judge a target experiencing heavy workload as suffering from emotional exhaustion and somatic symptoms, but more likely to rate them as highly work engaged. Hence, we expect those people to show less health-oriented leadership behavior and higher performance expectations. Finally, we expect the association between stress mindset and the perception of the target's well-being to be moderated by the perceiver's identification with his/her team.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
We will use the following measures to assess our dependent variables: Health-oriented leadership (Health-oriented Leadership questionnaire [HoL], Franke et al., 2014), high performance expectations (subscale High Performance Expectations from the Transformational Leadership Inventory [TLI], Podsakoff et al., 1990); Promotability (Hoobler et al., 2009; Tiedens, 2001); task for target (self-designed item: "Imagine the following situation: Ben is expected to brainstorm about ideas for a new project and present them to you (his manager). Please set a target of how many ideas he should at least come up with.") & performance expectations (self-designed item: "What level of performance is Ben ought to show, for you to be satisfied with him?").
We will measure the well-being variables with the following instruments: Work engagement (Utrecht Work Engagement Scale [UWES], Schaufeli et al., 2006), emotional exhaustion (subscale Emotional Exhaustion from the Maslach Burnout Inventory [MBI], Maslach et al., 1996) and somatic symptoms (Somatic Symptom Scale-8 [SSS-8], Gierk et al., 2014).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
Participants will be randomly assigned to one of the two stress-mindset manipulation conditions (stress-is-enhancing vs. stress-is-debilitating mindset) and one of the two team identification manipulation conditions (high vs. low team identification).

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
The effect of stress mindset condition and team identification condition on perceivers' judgments of the target's well-being will be analyzed using two-way ANOVAs or – in case of strong correlation between the dependent variables – two-way MANOVAs. We will test whether demographic variables or one of the other control variables (perceiver's optimism, stress level or mood) significantly relate to any of the outcome variables. If so, they will be included as covariates in our analyses.
The downstream, indirect effect of stress mindset condition and team identification condition on health-oriented leadership and high performance expectations will be analyzed separately and simultaneously for the three mediators (the target's perceived emotional exhaustion, work engagement and somatic symptoms) using mediator analyses.
All analyses will be one-tailed, with the level of significance set at $p < .05$.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
We will inspect boxplots of the dependent variables in each condition. If there are any outliers (more than 1.5 the interquartile range away from the lower or upper quartile), we will run the analyses with and without them and report both sets of results in case they diverge with regard to the outcomes of the significance tests.
Participants finishing the questionnaire in less than 50% of the average time needed for completing the questionnaire will be excluded from the analysis, as we suppose that it is hardly possible to seriously answer the questionnaire in that little time.
We will run the analyses with and without participants indicating that they are not working at the moment (unemployed, student only, etc.) to test if that influences the results.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.
Expecting medium effect sizes as found in previous studies (e.g., Ben-Avi et al., 2018), the power analysis using the G*Power 3.1 program (Faul et al., 2009) revealed that a sample size of 145 is needed for the multivariate analysis for determining the significance of the interaction and a sample size of 252 is needed for analyzing the mediator effects simultaneously to detect an effect of 80% of power. This corresponds with Fritz and MacKinnon's (2007)

simulation-based recommendations that a sample size of around 300 is needed to detect mediation effects with 80% power and small to moderate paths, using bias-corrected bootstrapping approach.
To account for the potential need to exclude certain participants (because of failure to complete the study or missing data, see point 6), we target a somewhat larger sample size of 320.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
We will include the perceiver's empathy and mindfulness as moderator variables for exploratory purposes. Moreover, we will assess the control variables already mentioned above (perceiver's optimism, stress level or mood).

References

Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R. K., & Joo, H. (2013). Best-practice recommendations for defining, identifying, and handling outliers. *Organizational Research Methods*, *16*(2), 270–301. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112470848

Ben-Avi, N., Toker, S., & Heller, D. (2018). "If stress is good for me, it's probably good for you too": Stress mindset and judgment of others' strain. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *74*, 98–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.09.002

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(4), 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822

Doosje, B., Ellemers, N., & Spears, R. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *31*(5), 410–436. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1995.1018

Franke, F., Felfe, J., & Pundt, A. (2014). The impact of health-oriented leadership on follower health: Development and test of a new instrument measuring health-promoting leadership. *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung*, *28*(1/2), 139–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/239700221402800108

Lanaj, K., Johnson, R. E., & Lee, S. M. (2016). Benefits of transformational behaviors for leaders: A daily investigation of leader behaviors and need fulfillment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(2), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000052

Lüdtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Trautwein, U., & Köller, O. (2007). Umgang mit fehlenden Werten in der psychologischen Forschung: Probleme und Lösungen [Handling of missing data in psychological research: Problems and solutions]. *Psychologische Rundschau*, *58*(2), 103–117. https://doi.org/10.1026/0033-3042.58.2.103

Reniers, R. L. E. P., Corcoran, R., Drake, R., Shryane, N. M., & Völlm, B. A. (2011). The QCAE: A questionnaire of cognitive and affective empathy. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *93*(1), 84–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2010.528484

Schuh, S. C., Van Quaquebeke, N., Göritz, A. S., Xin, K. R., Cremer, D. de, & van Dick, R. (2016). Mixed feelings, mixed blessing? How ambivalence in organizational identification relates to employees' regulatory focus and citizenship behaviors. *Human Relations*, *69*(12), 2224–2249. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716639117

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *17*(3), 601–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305

Table S1

Results for Self-Care as Moderator in Study 2.

	Reported stress mindset *b (SE)*
Intercept	-0.29 (0.05)**
Stress mindset condition	0.58 (0.08)**
R^2	.17 (0.04)**

	Perceived work engagement *b (SE)*	Perceived emotional exhaustion *b (SE)*	Perceived somatic symptoms *b (SE)*
Intercept	3.29 (0.04)***	3.30 (0.04)**	2.85 (0.04)**
Reported stress mindset	0.15 (0.06)**	-0.30 (0.06)**	-0.33 (0.06)**
Self-care	0.04 (0.06)	-0.06 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)
Interaction	0.14 (0.08)*	-0.07 (0.09)	-0.11 (0.09)
R^2	.03 (0.02)*	.09 (0.03)**	.10 (0.03)**

	Health-oriented leadership behavior intentions *b (SE)*	High performance expectation intentions *b (SE)*	Promotion intentions *b (SE)*
Intercept	3.15 (0.29)**	2.46 (0.37)**	2.83 (0.47)**
Perceived work engagement	0.08 (0.05)†	0.07 (0.07)	0.17 (0.08)*
Perceived emotional exhaustion	0.13 (0.06)*	0.10 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.09)
Perceived somatic symptoms	0.13 (0.05)**	0.04 (0.07)	0.12 (0.08)†
Stress mindset condition	0.02 (0.06)	-0.11 (0.08)†	-0.12 (0.10)
R^2	.09 (0.03)**	.02 (0.02)	.03 (0.02)†
Indirect effect via perceived work engagement	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)†
Indirect effect via perceived emotional exhaustion	-0.02 (0.01)*	-0.02 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)
Indirect effect via perceived somatic symptoms	-0.02 (0.01)*	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.02)†

Notes. Unstandardized coefficients reported. Stress mindset condition: 0 = SID, 1 = SIE. Interaction: Interaction of reported stress mindset and self-care.
$\chi^2(14) = 42.65$, $p < .001$, RMSEA = 0.08, CFI = 0.92, TLI = 0.77, SRMR = 0.05.
$^{\dagger}p < .10$, $^{*}p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, one-tailed.

Table S2

Results for Mindfulness as Moderator in Study 3.

	Reported stress mindset
	b (SE)
Intercept	-0.51 (0.07)**
Stress mindset condition	1.02 (0.09)**
R^2	.32 (0.05)**

	Perceived work engagement	Perceived emotional exhaustion	Perceived somatic symptoms
	b (SE)	*b (SE)*	*b (SE)*
Intercept	3.60 (0.04)**	3.33 (0.06)**	2.53 (0.05)**
Reported stress mindset	0.06 (0.05)	-0.16 (0.07)**	-0.03 (0.06)
Mindfulness	0.04 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.19 (0.06)**
Interaction	0.08 (0.05)†	-0.07 (0.07)	-0.14 (0.06)*
R^2	.02 (0.02)	.03 (0.02)†	.06 (0.03)*

	Health-oriented leadership behavior intentions	High performance expectation intentions	Promotion intentions
	b (SE)	*b (SE)*	*b (SE)*
Intercept	2.54 (0.37)**	1.60 (0.36)**	2.12 (0.36)**
Perceived work engagement	0.24 (0.07)**	0.37 (0.07)**	0.43 (0.07)**
Perceived emotional exhaustion	0.16 (0.06)**	0.03 (0.06)	0.15 (0.06)**
Perceived somatic symptoms	-0.01 (0.07)	0.12 (0.06)*	0.02 (0.06)
Stress mindset condition	0.01 (0.09)	0.08 (.09)	0.07 (0.09)
R^2	.06 (0.03)*	.11 (0.04)**	.14 (0.04)**
Indirect effect via perceived work engagement	0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)
Indirect effect via perceived emotional exhaustion	-0.03 (0.02)*	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.03 (0.02)*
Indirect effect via perceived somatic symptoms	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.00)

Notes. Unstandardized coefficients reported. Stress mindset condition: 0 = SID, 1 = SIE. Interaction: Interaction of reported stress mindset and mindfulness.
$\chi^2(14) = 54.43$, $p < .001$, RMSEA = 0.11, CFI = 0.91, TLI = 0.72, SRMR = 0.05.
$^{\dagger}p < .10$, $^{*}p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, one-tailed.

Table S3

Results for Team Identification as Moderator in Study 3 Without Mood as Control Variable.

	Reported stress mindset
	b (SE)
Intercept	-0.51 (0.07)**
Stress mindset condition	1.02 (0.09)**
R^2	.32 (0.05)**

	Perceived work engagement	Perceived emotional exhaustion	Perceived somatic symptoms
	b (SE)	*b (SE)*	*b (SE)*
Intercept	3.59 (0.04)**	3.35 (0.06)**	2.53 (0.06)**
Reported stress mindset	0.06 (0.05)	-0.18 (0.06)**	-0.08 (0.06)
Team identification	0.11 (0.03)**	-0.00 (0.04)	-0.00 (0.04)
Interaction	0.05 (0.03)†	-0.08 (0.04)*	-0.05 (0.04)†
R^2	.06 (0.03)*	.05 (0.03)*	.01 (0.02)

	Health-oriented leadership behavior intentions	High performance expectation intentions	Promotion intentions
	b (SE)	*b (SE)*	*b (SE)*
Intercept	2.54 (0.37)**	1.60 (0.36)**	2.12 (0.36)**
Perceived work engagement	0.24 (0.07) **	0.37 (0.07)**	0.43 (0.07)**
Perceived emotional exhaustion	0.16 (0.06)**	0.03 (0.06)	0.15 (0.06)**
Perceived somatic symptoms	-0.01 (0.07)	0.12 (0.06)*	0.02 (0.06)
Stress mindset condition	0.01 (0.09)	0.08 (0.09)	0.07 (0.09)
R^2	.06 (0.03)*	.11 (0.04)**	.14 (0.04)**
Indirect effect via perceived work engagement	0.01 (0.01)	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)
Indirect effect via perceived emotional exhaustion	-0.03 (0.02)*	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.03 (0.02)*
Indirect effect via perceived somatic symptoms	0.00 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)

Notes. Unstandardized coefficients reported. Stress mindset condition: 0 = SID, 1 = SIE. Interaction: Interaction of reported stress mindset and team identification.
$\chi^2(14) = 32.43$, $p = .004$, RMSEA = 0.07, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.87, SRMR = 0.04.
$^{\dagger}p < .10$, $^{*}p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, one-tailed.

Table S4

Results for Team Identification as Moderator in Study 3 Without Outliers (N = 234).

	Reported stress mindset *b (SE)*
Intercept	-1.10 (0.17)**
Stress mindset condition	0.92 (0.10)**
Mood	0.19 (0.05)**
R^2	.35 (0.05)**

	Perceived work engagement *b (SE)*	Perceived emotional exhaustion *b (SE)*	Perceived somatic symptoms *b (SE)*
Intercept	3.12 (0.16)**	3.87 (0.22)**	3.30 (0.21)**
Reported stress mindset	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.15 (0.07)*	-0.00 (0.07)
Team identification	0.12 (0.03)**	-0.00 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)
Mood	0.14 (0.04)**	-0.15 (0.06)**	-0.22 (0.06)**
Interaction	0.04 (0.03)†	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)
R^2	.12 (0.04)**	.07 (0.03)*	.07 (0.03)*

	Health-oriented leadership behavior intentions *b (SE)*	High performance expectation intentions *b (SE)*	Promotion intentions *b (SE)*
Intercept	2.73 (0.35)**	1.84 (0.37)**	2.11 (0.37)**
Perceived work engagement	0.27 (0.06)**	0.33 (0.07)**	0.44 (.07)**
Perceived emotional exhaustion	0.13 (0.06)**	0.02 (0.06)	0.15 (0.06)**
Perceived somatic symptoms	-0.01 (0.06)	0.10 (0.06) †	0.05 (0.06)
Stress mindset condition	0.09 (0.08)	0.14 (0.09)†	0.13 (0.09)†
Mood	-0.06 (0.04) †	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)
R^2	.09 (0.04)**	.11 (0.04)**	.17 (0.05)**
Indirect effect via perceived work engagement	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)
Indirect effect via perceived emotional exhaustion	-0.02 (0.01) †	0.00 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01) †
Indirect effect via perceived somatic symptoms	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)

Notes. Unstandardized coefficients reported. Stress mindset condition: 0 = SID, 1 = SIE. Interaction: Interaction of reported stress mindset and team identification.
$\chi^2(14) = 28.31$, $p = .013$, RMSEA = 0.07, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.88, SRMR = 0.04.
$^{\dagger}p < .10$, $^{*}p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, one-tailed.

Table S5

Results Only for Those Participants who Actually Held a Leadership Position in Their Current Job (N = 333).

	Reported stress mindset *b (SE)*
Intercept	-0.44 (0.06)**
Stress mindset condition	0.86 (0.08)**
R^2	.25 (0.04)**

	Perceived work engagement *b (SE)*	Perceived emotional exhaustion *b (SE)*	Perceived somatic symptoms *b (SE)*
Intercept	3.59 (0.04)**	3.24 (0.04)**	2.54 (0.05)**
Reported stress mindset	0.07 (0.05) †	-0.29 (0.05)**	-0.19 (0.06)**
Team identification	0.06 (0.04)*	-0.02 (0.04)	0.001 (0.04)
Interaction	0.03 (0.04)	-0.11 (0.04)**	-0.08 (0.04)*
R^2	.02 (0.02)	.10 (0.03)**	.05 (0.03)†

	Health-oriented leadership behavior intentions *b (SE)*	High performance expectation intentions *b (SE)*	Promotion intentions *b (SE)*
Intercept	2.50 (0.31)**	1.85 (0.33)**	1.57 (0.36)**
Perceived work engagement	0.25 (0.06)**	0.32 (0.06)**	0.55 (0.07)**
Perceived emotional exhaustion	0.15 (0.06)**	0.11 (0.07)*	0.20 (0.07)**
Perceived somatic symptoms	0.003 (0.07)	0.003 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.08)
Stress mindset condition	0.09 (0.08)	-0.05 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.09)
R^2	.07 (0.03)*	.08 (0.03)**	.18 (0.04)**
Indirect effect via perceived work engagement	0.02 (0.01) †	0.02 (0.01) †	0.03 (0.02) †
Indirect effect via perceived emotional exhaustion	-0.04 (0.02)*	-0.03 (0.02) †	-0.05 (0.02)**
Indirect effect via perceived somatic symptoms	-0.001 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)

Notes. Unstandardized coefficients reported. Stress mindset condition: 0 = SID, 1 = SIE. Interaction: Interaction of reported stress mindset and team identification.

$N = 234$ for perceived somatic symptoms, team identification and the interaction, $N = 330$ for high performance expectation intentions and promotion intentions. Full Information Maximum Likelihood Method in Mplus was used to estimate parameters based on incomplete data matrix.

$\chi^2(16) = 36.86$, $p = .002$, RMSEA = 0.06, CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.86, SRMR = 0.05

$^{\dagger}p < .10$, $^{*}p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$, one-tailed.