Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire.

ESM 1. Careless response detection.

In this ESM we describe the procedures we followed to detect careless responses. We tried to detect careless responses in Study 1 and Study 2 by following the procedures recommended by Meade and Craig (2012).

Study 1

First, we identified and excluded striking outlier cases by computing the Mahalanobis distance over all items ($n = 23$). This means, we considered the pattern of responses across the entire series of items in the questionnaire for every case and identified the Mahalanobis distance to a certain pattern of the normal distribution of responses in the sample (χ^2). The respective cut-off for excluding a case was defined as $p < .001$ for the χ^2 value as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Second, we tested zero-within-variance in responses ($n = 0$; i.e., we did not have to exclude anyone based on this criterion).

Study 2

We requested an individual statement on whether we should use the data at the end of the survey. The statements led to the exclusion of four cases of careless respondents. We also identified and excluded striking outlier cases by computing Mahalanobis distance over all items ($n = 26$) as described above. Finally, we tested zero-within-variance in responses for every scale. If responses had no variance within a particular scale, we recoded the detected values of this respondent as missing values. Depending on the scale, one to 27 respondents were affected.

References:

Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data.

Psychological Methods, *17*(3), 437–455. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028085

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.