DR. DANIEL ZEISS
EXECUTIVE ADVISORY · FRANKFURT AM MAIN

REPORT · AUGUST 2026

LEADERSHIP CAPITAL

You scrutinize multimillion-euro investments one by one, each with a business case and a tracking process. You account for your people costs as an expense of the period. In accounting terms that is correct. In economic terms the effect runs for years. This report is about the gap between the two.

63 %
AFTER TEN MINUTES

CRISIS · PAGE 12

Letting people go without losing the ones who stay.

Two out of three people let go say the conversation was over in ten minutes. What that costs your reputation as an employer, and which part of the process determines the damage.

FOR EXECUTIVE AND SUPERVISORY BOARDS, MANAGING DIRECTORS, AND HR LEADERSHIP

ISSUE 01

CONTENTS

HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

Twenty-five minutes for chapters I through IV. Forty if you actually fill out the self-assessment on page 18, and do it alone, without your head of HR and without softening anything. Only then is the checklist on page 22 worth more than the paper. Every externally sourced figure carries a reference number and is documented in full on page 23.

EDITORIAL

Your people are accounted for as consumption. And managed as consumption.

On the income statement, personnel expense is an expense of the period, broken into wages, salaries, and social security contributions.[1] You are not allowed to capitalize it. Your people are not an asset, and the company holds no control over the future benefit they generate.[2] Correct under accounting law, and economically misleading.

Because what you are consuming keeps working for years: quality of judgment, retention, institutional knowledge, the ability of a team to hold together under pressure. None of that shows up on a balance sheet, so none of it gets managed. Capital spending above a certain threshold you run through a business case, an approval gate, and a tracking process. For the money you put into people, management stops at a training budget.

Training is necessary. It simply does not touch what actually costs money. A technical seminar does not stop a highly capable leader from dismantling a team in eighteen months. A competency model does not catch the handover mistake that lands three levels down as people not knowing where they stand.

Go talk to your HR team. Not about metrics. About what they see. You will hear about superbly credentialed people who are starting from zero when it comes to dealing with other human beings. About leaders who never address a conflict, they just wait it out until somebody quits.

Then test the second assumption that still holds in a lot of boardrooms: that there is enough good talent coming up in the market. Replacing people stopped being the cheap option a while ago.

This report runs a calculation almost nobody runs. It is meant to be uncomfortable. If you read it to the end and change nothing, at least you will have made that choice deliberately.

Dr. Daniel Zeiß

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY · FRANKFURT AM MAIN

TRUST THROUGH UNDERSTANDING.

I

THE CALCULATION NOBODY RUNS

You know your personnel expense down to the euro. What you do not know is how much of it buys nothing, because people are showing up without being in it anymore.

Five numbers that do not appear in your reporting

10 %[3]

of employees in Germany are highly engaged with their employer. 77 percent do what the job requires and nothing beyond it, and 13 percent have mentally checked out while staying on the payroll.

GALLUP, ENGAGEMENT INDEX GERMANY 2025

119–142[3]

billion euros in lost productivity hit the German economy in 2025 from that disengagement alone.

GALLUP, ENGAGEMENT INDEX GERMANY 2025

9.7 vs 5.7[3]

sick days a year: disengaged employees against highly engaged ones. A gap of 41 percent.

GALLUP, ENGAGEMENT INDEX GERMANY 2025

€347.20[3]

is what a single sick day costs the employer on average. Multiply that by the four-day gap and your headcount.

GALLUP, ENGAGEMENT INDEX GERMANY 2025

One in five[3]

new hires is already actively looking for another job inside the first year.

GALLUP, ENGAGEMENT INDEX GERMANY 2025

None of these numbers is new. What would be new is running them against your own organization and setting the total next to the line marked “personnel expense.”

One failed leadership hire, conservatively estimated

My own illustrative calculation for a leadership role with target annual compensation of €180,000. Every block is assumed separately and can be challenged separately. Deliberately not anchored to any of the rule-of-thumb multiples that circulate in consulting material, because I could not trace those to a sound primary source. Put your own numbers in.

COST BLOCK	ASSUMPTION
Search, selection, and closing the offer	**€40,000**
Compensation through to exit, twelve months on average	**€180,000**
Lost output during ramp-up and wind-down	**€63,000**
Exit, outside counsel, severance exposure	**€54,000**
Other leaders' time: escalations, cleanup, conversations	**€32,000**
Knock-on attrition in the team, two strong performers	**€108,000**
Recruiting and onboarding a replacement	**€45,000**
Total, order of magnitude roughly 2.9 times annual salary	**€522,000**

Left out: lost market timing, decisions that got pushed, client relationships that took damage, and what this does to your reputation with your own people. All real, none of it honestly quantifiable, so none of it is in the table.

The exact total is not the point. The point is that not one of these items ever shows up as its own line in your reporting. It spreads out quietly across departments, periods, and cost centers.

II

WHY TRAINING DOES NOT PROTECT THIS LINE ITEM

Technical skill is the layer that is easiest to buy and least often the thing that is broken.

Hired for expertise. Let go for behavior.

The line is worn thin enough that it barely registers anymore. It still pins down exactly where your money goes. Hiring processes reliably measure what is easy to measure: credentials, technical knowledge, experience in comparable organizations. They do a much worse job on what actually matters, namely whether someone can take an unwelcome truth without punishing the person who delivered it. Whether someone can work a conflict through instead of managing around it.

Training goes to work where you already measured. It builds technical depth, method, and command of the rules. But what runs up the cost of your people is not a knowledge gap. It is behavior under pressure.

Then there is something every HR team knows and rarely says out loud. A share of technically excellent young talent shows up in a first leadership role with almost no idea what being responsible for other people means. Not out of bad faith. Because for fifteen years the only thing anyone graded was their own output. Someone who has never had their result depend on how other people are doing will lead the way they studied: alone.

The second error is about the market. Roughly three quarters of employees rate their own prospects on the job market as good or very good[3], which means the leverage to walk sits with them, not with you. At the same time, on a model calculation by the Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft, German production potential in 2024 would have been roughly 49 billion euros higher had the demand for skilled labor been met[4].

The third is the assumption that a program can stand in for sustained support. Here I have no study to put in front of you, only an observation from engagements: what a module builds tends to hold for about as long as somebody keeps asking about it. What training cannot deliver does not have to be expensive. Somebody just has to actually do it.

THE UNCOMFORTABLE QUESTION

When did you last replace a leader for something other than technical shortcomings, because they simply could not handle people? And what had your training budget done about it beforehand?

The four layers of leadership capital

The deeper a layer sits, the more its loss costs you and the less budget can buy it back. Training reliably reaches only the top one.

LAYER 1

Knowledge

Technical depth, methods, regulation. Available through courses, certifications, or a new hire.

Time to rebuild: weeks · Lever: training

LAYER 2

Craft

Delegating, prioritizing, setting expectations, running a hard conversation. Trainable, but only on live cases.

Time to rebuild: months · Lever: training with follow-through

LAYER 3

Composure under pressure

How someone behaves when it gets tight: tolerating dissent, owning a mistake, managing closeness and distance, working conflicts through instead of waiting them out.

Time to rebuild: years · Lever: sustained one-on-one support

LAYER 4

Trust in the system

The leadership capital an organization accumulates over years: that commitments hold, that bad news travels upward, that people stay when it gets uncomfortable.

Time to rebuild: no reliable estimate · Lever: how leaders behave, daily

On Gallup's finding, engagement does not come from programs or exhortation. It comes from what people experience day to day at work, which means from how leadership is actually practiced[3].

So the question that matters is not how much you spend on development. It is which layer the money lands on. Most budgets land on layer 1.

III

THE FIRST TWELVE MONTHS

A leadership transition is the one window where an organization is genuinely open to something new. It does not stay open long, and in that role it does not open twice.

What gets decided in the first twelve months

Michael Watkins put the decisive phase of a role change at the first ninety days[5]. In practice it does not end there. That is where the trajectory for everything that follows gets set.

Day 0-30

They are watching you, not your strategy

Who gets asked first. How the new leader takes the first piece of bad news. Who they bring with them and who they pass over. These add up to a story about them that is very hard to rewrite later.

Day 30-90

The first real decision

Usually a people decision, usually on incomplete information, with a predecessor's promises still sitting in the room. This is where they establish authority, or where they set a precedent that everything after gets measured against.

Month 4-8

The retreat into the technical

When leading gets exhausting, a lot of people fall back on what they are sure of, which is the technical work. From the outside it reads as commitment. Inside, a layer of the organization is suddenly running without a leader.

Month 9-12

The quiet departures

The loud ones do not leave first. The ones who can land somewhere else tomorrow do. In your numbers it reads as ordinary attrition. It is the bill for the nine months before it.

OBSERVATION FROM ENGAGEMENTS

I usually get the call once the story has already hardened, which is to say somewhere after month nine. The point of maximum leverage is before the first day. That is my own experience from engagements, not a study finding.

IV

THE EXIT

Letting someone go is one of the few leadership acts your entire workforce judges without having been in the room. What determines the damage is not the decision. It is how you carry it out.

Ten minutes

63 %[6]

of people let go say the conversation ran ten minutes or less.

34 %[6]

of them got to say anything about how they saw it.

Ten minutes is shorter than the prep meeting where somebody decided the seating. Before you file this under bad execution: it is not bad execution. A conversation that ends in ten minutes was not run efficiently. It was cut off before the uncomfortable part could start.

My experience: the person cutting it off is not cold. They cannot sit with it, and because they cannot sit with it they cut short their contact with the feeling. That is exactly layer 3 from the model on page 9: behavior under pressure, not knowledge. Anyone who has had to do it already knows you owe someone whose livelihood you are taking away the chance to be heard.

And you are not having a private conversation. You are having it in front of an audience. Within forty-eight hours the department knows how it went, and the people still there draw no conclusions about the person who left. They draw conclusions about what they can expect when it is their turn.

What happens next is well documented. A meta-analysis across 37 samples with 11,256 participants puts the correlation between perceived fairness and commitment to the company at $\rho = 0.40$, and it holds for the people let go and the people who stay alike[7]. Among those who stay, the fairness of the process weighs more heavily than the fairness of the outcome itself.

THE MOST UNCOMFORTABLE FINDING IN THIS CHAPTER

The fairness effect is stronger when the headcount reduction serves an earnings target than when it is genuinely unavoidable[7]. If your company is up against the wall, people cut you more slack on a hard process. If you are cutting for margin, the process decides nearly everything. Whoever can most easily afford to do this well can least afford not to.

What the reduction you already made is costing you

Three levels, all documented. Not one of them shows up as its own line in your reporting.

The people who stay quit anyway

Voluntary attrition rises after a headcount reduction, and it runs through the collapse in engagement rather than through the cut itself[8]. Procedural fairness cushions it. A secondary finding in the same work should give you pause if you sign off on development budgets: the downsizing-turnover relationship was strongest in organizations with extensive career-development practices. Develop your people well and you have made them marketable.

Reputation does not suffer because of the cut

A study of why headcount reductions damage corporate reputation did not support the efficiency explanation. Reputation drops because people attach a moral judgment to the company[9]. Which is exactly why the how, not the whether, determines the damage. On the review platforms you can watch it happen: after a round of layoffs the rating falls 0.13 stars, 0.16 among current employees, and at the end of the twenty-four-month observation window it still had not climbed back to where it was; carry the observed recovery rate forward and you get past thirty-two months[10]. You pay for years.

Fairness matters most when the outcome cannot be saved

Across 45 independent samples the pattern holds: the worse the outcome is for the people affected, the more the fairness of the process drives how they respond[11]. That is the only good news in this chapter. You cannot change the message. Everything around it you can.

WHAT IS NOT BEING CLAIMED HERE

The industry that sells transition support likes to argue that good outplacement cuts the number of legal challenges to dismissal. I am not aware of an independent study that establishes it, and the savings figures in circulation are vendor models. How many people who are let go take legal action at all is also contested, and the available numbers are far apart. So this chapter makes no cost argument out of litigation exposure. It argues from engagement and reputation, where the evidence actually holds.

Three questions to settle before the conversation

Not a script. Scripts exist, they are fine, and they rarely change the outcome, because the problem is not a knowledge problem. My experience from engagements: these conversations almost never fail because somebody did not know what to say. They get cut short at the point where guilt, pity, or the leader's own fear gets uncomfortable. Which of the three it is, the leader usually does not know going in either.

1 **What exactly do you hold against yourself?**

As long as it stays unsaid, it runs the conversation. Usually the charge is partly fair, which is exactly why it gets avoided. Name it beforehand and you do not have to defend against it in the room.

2 **What can you say honestly, and what can you not?**

Deliver a rationale you do not believe yourself and the person across the table will know. From that point on you are not getting fairness back. If there is something you are not permitted to disclose, you can say so without explaining why.

3 **Who talks to the people who stay, when, and with which sentence?**

This one usually gets pushed to the following week. By the following week the story is already written. The sentence has to exist before the conversation, not after the first question in the hallway.

Settle these three and you can stay in the conversation for twenty minutes instead of ten. That those particular minutes are the ones that matter is my observation from engagements, not a measured quantity. What is documented is only how short these conversations actually run and how rarely the person being let go gets a word in[6].

The ten minutes are not a scheduling problem and not a skills problem. They are the same pattern this report has been about since page one: something uncomfortable gets avoided, the action gets cut short, and the bill arrives later, somewhere else, under another name.

“The most expensive mistake is asking too late”

Dr. Daniel Zeiß on the limits of programs, what HR actually sees, and why leaders so rarely pick up the phone for themselves. Interview by the editors of this report.

You bring up personnel expense with management boards. What is the usual reaction?

Agreement. Everyone knows the order of magnitude. It gets interesting on the second question: so how do you manage that line? Then I get a list, objectives, training, engagement surveys. All of it in place. None of it reaching the place where the cost is actually created. The tools are there. They all just point at the same layer.

Where is it created?

In relationships. In how a leader handles dissent, how they handle a mistake, whether anyone tells them what they do not want to hear. It never costs much on any given day. It costs a little every day. And because it never lands in a cost center, it never surfaces. What you end up with is a number in personnel expense that nobody can trace to a cause.

HR would flag that, surely.

HR sees it first. HR teams know with real precision where the fires are. But what they have is an observation, which is hard to evidence and easy to wave off. When a leader is making their numbers, a behavioral observation does not carry much. So my advice is to stop asking HR for metrics and start asking what they see. You get a different answer, and it is usually an uncomfortable one.

Why do leaders so rarely reach out themselves?

Because the moment when it would be easy does not feel like a reason to call. Nobody calls when things are going well. They call after something has already happened. That is the most expensive mistake on the table, and not in human terms, in business terms. Ask early and you still have room to decide. Ask late and all you are doing is managing consequences.

Are you asking leaders to show weakness?

No. I work with people who carry responsibility and take it seriously. Decide alone long enough and you end up with nobody left to think honestly in front of. That is not a weakness, it is a structural feature of the job. Coaching is where that thinking can happen without immediate consequences for anyone.

What makes an engagement different from a leadership program?

A program has a curriculum and ends on a set date. An engagement has a question and ends when the question is answered, usually somewhere between six and twelve months. I cannot back that with a study, only with observation: development holds for about as long as somebody keeps asking about it. That is not an argument against programs. It is an argument for staying.

How do you know when an engagement is not the right thing?

When the decision was made months ago and I am there to put a stamp on it. When somebody was sent instead of coming. And when what is actually going on belongs in treatment, because coaching is not therapy, and I say so early. In all three cases I turn it down. That is part of doing this seriously.

What do you promise the client?

Nothing that depends on another human being. The change is not my work, it is the work of the person sitting across from me. What I can commit to is reliability, confidentiality, a clear method, and transparency on scope, goals, and progress, agreed with the leader and not over their head. What gets said in the room stays in the room. Anyone promising more than that is selling something other than coaching.

One sentence to a chief executive who just finished this report?

Look at one position. Who in your organization steps into a new leadership role in the next six months? Then decide whether that person should do it alone.

EXPERIENCE. UNDERSTANDING. CLARITY.

Dr. Daniel Zeiß works with leaders in Frankfurt am Main and across Germany. More about him on page 21.

Twelve statements about your leadership bench

Check what is true, for your organization, not for the version you would present. No benchmark, no scoring logic from outside. Just your own read, in writing. How to read it is on the next page.

STATEMENT	YES	PARTLY	NO
For every leader reporting to me, I could describe how they handle dissent.	☐	☐	☐
Bad news reaches me while it is still fixable.	☐	☐	☐
For the last three strong performers who left, I know the real reason.	☐	☐	☐
New leaders get support before day one, not after something goes wrong.	☐	☐	☐
Our hiring process tests behavior under pressure, not just credentials.	☐	☐	☐
There is at least one leader I know is damaging their team, and I have put off dealing with it.	☐	☐	☐
My head of HR would bring me an uncomfortable observation without being asked.	☐	☐	☐
I know how many leadership roles will change hands in the next twelve months.	☐	☐	☐
On handovers, we establish what the predecessor promised.	☐	☐	☐
I have someone I can think out loud with, in confidence and without consequences.	☐	☐	☐
Our development budget demonstrably goes beyond technical skill.	☐	☐	☐
I could put a number on what our last failed leadership hire cost us.	☐	☐	☐

What your answers mean, and what they do not

If almost all of it is true

Your organization has real access to layers 3 and 4. Go back over statements 6 and 10 on their own anyway. In my experience those are the two where people are most generous with themselves.

If it comes out mixed

That is where most organizations land. You have the tools, but no reliable read on what actually goes on between people. That is not a leadership failure. It is a gap between what you spend on people and what you actually govern.

If you hesitated more than once

You are flying blind on your people costs. That need not signal an acute crisis. It does mean you will find out once it has already gotten expensive, and not before.

WHAT THIS CAN AND CANNOT TELL YOU

This is not a validated diagnostic, it produces no score, and there is deliberately nothing to add up. It is a structured self-report, built out of the questions that have repeatedly opened the most revealing conversations in my engagements. The value is not in a total. It is in the one statement where you hesitated.

THE NEXT STEP

Take the one statement where you hesitated and put it in front of your head of HR. Not as an accusation. As a question: do you see it that way too? That conversation costs twenty minutes and is the cheapest thing in this entire report.

What an engagement is, and what it is not

Three situations, one framework, limits stated up front. Everything else we settle in a first conversation.

OCCASION I

Stepping into a new role

Support from the moment the decision is made through the transition and past it. Ideally starting before day one.

OCCASION II

Succession and handover

Preparing a handover, for the person stepping out as much as the person stepping in, including in family-owned businesses.

OCCASION III

Carrying the role

Regular thinking time for people whose decisions nobody inside the organization will openly test with them anymore.

FRAMEWORK

Length	Six to twelve months
Cadence	Usually every two to three weeks
Where	Frankfurt am Main, on site with you, or remote
Getting started	A first conversation, about 45 minutes
Who engages me	The company or the individual; we settle roles at the outset

LIMITS, STATED PLAINLY

Coaching is not a substitute for psychotherapy or medical care.

No outcomes are promised. The change is the work of the person I am working with.

What gets said in the room is confidential. The client gets scope, goals, and progress, as agreed with the leader.

I decline engagements meant to put a stamp on a decision already made.

PUTTING THE COST IN PERSPECTIVE

An engagement costs a small fraction of the amount shown on page 6 for a single failed leadership hire. That is not a savings claim or a promise. It is a ratio you can check yourself.

Dr. Daniel Zeiß

I work with people who carry responsibility for others: management board members, managing directors, division heads, and the next generation in family-owned businesses. The work starts where the numbers stop telling you anything, which is at the decisions nobody can take off your hands, and at what those decisions do to the person making them.

I am not a trainer handing out models. I listen first, for a long time, and then I ask the question nobody inside the company is asking anymore. What you do with the answer is yours.

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY
FRANKFURT AM MAIN

I listen.

No agenda, no diagnosis prepared in advance, and no rush.

I probe.

Especially where it gets uncomfortable. That is the whole point.

I stay.

For the length of an engagement, not the length of a meeting.

WHY THIS REPORT EXISTS

Because the conversations I get called into almost always start too late. If this report sets off one conversation inside your company that would not have happened otherwise, with your head of HR, with one of your leaders, or with yourself, then it did its job. Whether you have that conversation with me is a separate question.

TEAR OUT

Twelve questions before your next leadership hire

Not for the interview. For the meeting where you make the call.

- [ ] What behavior, not what credentials, does this role need? In writing, before the first résumé.
- [ ] Why did the last person in this role succeed or fail, and who actually knows?
- [ ] Who on the team will this decision cost us? And can we afford to lose them?
- [ ] What did the predecessor promise that is still sitting out there?
- [ ] How are we testing behavior under pressure, beyond the references the candidate handed us?
- [ ] Who can tell this person the truth in the first ninety days without taking a risk?
- [ ] What is the first hard decision headed their way? Do we know, and do they?
- [ ] Does support start before day one, or only once something surfaces?
- [ ] What would warn us at six months, and are we actually watching it?
- [ ] What does this hire cost us if it fails at twelve months? Write the number down before you decide.
- [ ] Are we picking the strongest candidate or the right one, and do we know the difference here?
- [ ] Who in the room disagrees, and did they get to say so?

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

ROLE · DATE

If more than four of these do not have a solid answer, you are not ready to make this call.

LESS, BUT DONE RIGHT.

Sources, citation practice, and method

1 German Commercial Code (HGB), section 275(2) no. 6: structure of the income statement under the total-cost format, line item "personnel expense" (wages and salaries; social security contributions and pension expense). Under the cost-of-sales format in section 275(3), personnel expense does not appear as a separate line in the income statement and must instead be disclosed in the notes under section 285 no. 8(b). See additionally HGB section 255(2) on the inclusion of personnel cost within production cost.

2 International Accounting Standards Board (IASB): IAS 38 *Intangible Assets*, IAS 38.15: in the case of a team of skilled staff, an entity generally has insufficient control over the expected future economic benefits to meet the definition of an intangible asset, so recognition does not arise. This is the governing authority for the absence of control referred to in the editorial.

3 Gallup Inc. (2026): *Engagement Index Deutschland 2025*, published March 2026. Representative telephone survey of 1,700 employees aged 18 and over in Germany, fielded 17 November to 20 December 2025. Figures used: highly engaged 10 percent, low engagement 77 percent, actively disengaged 13 percent; lost productivity 119 to 142 billion euros; days absent 9.7 against 5.7, a difference of 41 percent; average employer cost per day of absence 347.20 euros; own labor-market prospects rated good or very good roughly three quarters; roughly one in five new hires actively looking for another job within the first year. All figures taken from the original report.

4 Burstedde, A. / Kolev-Schaefer, G. (2024): *Die Kosten des Fachkräftemangels*, IW-Kurzbericht, Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln. Model calculation: had demand for skilled labor been met, German production potential in 2024 would have been roughly 49 billion euros higher. To be read as a model calculation, not as a realized loss.

5 Watkins, M. D. (2013): *The First 90 Days. Proven Strategies for Getting Up to Speed Faster and Smarter*, updated and expanded edition, Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

6 HR WORKS GmbH (2026): *Kündigungsreport 2026. Wenn Unternehmen entlassen*, Freiburg im Breisgau. Standardized online survey conducted by the market research institute Bilendi in April 2026; 6,093 employees in Germany aged 18 to 69, including 825 people dismissed within the preceding five years. Figures used: conversation lasting ten minutes or less 63 percent; got to present their own view 34 percent. Note on commissioning: the survey was commissioned by a vendor of HR software and has not been externally peer reviewed. Further individual figures from this survey that circulate in press coverage are not used here, as they could not be verified against the freely available publication.

7 van Dierendonck, D. / Jacobs, G. (2012): *Survivors and Victims. A Meta-analytical Review of Fairness and Organizational Commitment after Downsizing*, British Journal of Management, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 96–109. Meta-analysis across 37 samples with 11,256 participants; correlation between perceived fairness and organizational commitment $\rho = 0.40$. Among those who stay, procedural justice weighs more heavily than distributive justice; the moderator finding on the stated rationale for the reduction is from the same source.

8 Trevor, C. O. / Nyberg, A. J. (2008): *Keeping Your Headcount When All About You Are Losing Theirs. Downsizing, Voluntary Turnover Rates, and the Moderating Role of HR Practices*, Academy of Management Journal, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 259–276.

9 Love, E. G. / Kraatz, M. (2009): *Character, Conformity, or the Bottom Line? How and Why Downsizing Affected Corporate Reputation*, Academy of Management Journal, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 314–335.

10 Glassdoor Economic Research (2025): *Layoffs Cast a Long Shadow*. Analysis of 304 layoff events at 197 companies drawing on 298,314 reviews, controlling for employer, month, and occupation; a fall of 0.13 stars overall and 0.16 among current employees. The observation window covers 24 months, at the end of which the prior level had not been regained. The figure of more than 32 months given in the text is an extrapolation assuming recovery continues into the third year at the rate observed in the second, and is not an observed value. An analysis by the platform operator of its own data, not externally peer reviewed; no comparable data exists for Germany.

11 Brockner, J. / Wiesenfeld, B. M. (1996): *An Integrative Framework for Explaining Reactions to Decisions. Interactive Effects of Outcomes and Procedures*, Psychological Bulletin, vol. 120, no. 2, pp. 189–208. Analysis across 45 independent samples.

NOTE ON METHOD

Every externally sourced figure in the text carries a superscript reference number and is documented in full here. Every reference points to a primary source. Secondarily cited figures for which no primary source could be traced were removed from this issue. The calculation on page 6 is my own illustrative example and does not replace a company-specific calculation; it deliberately uses no rule-of-thumb multiple from consulting material, because no sound primary source could be traced for the ranges in circulation. Statements resting on my own engagement experience are marked as such in the text and are not empirically evidenced. Three claims circulating in this field were deliberately not used, for lack of a sound basis: a quantified increase in recruiting cost as a result of poor employer ratings, a causal effect of rating stars on applicant volume, and the assumption that high performers leave disproportionately after layoffs. This report contains no promises of outcome, success, or cure, and no comparative claims about third parties.

CONTACT

One role. Six months. A call you can make today.

Who in your organization steps into a new leadership role in the next six months, and who are you letting go in the next six months? Send me the situation in three sentences. I reply personally, and I will tell you straight whether support makes sense, including when it does not.

DIRECTLY TO ME

contact@danielzeiss.com

A subject line is enough: “Leadership Capital.” I usually reply within two business days.

FIRST CONVERSATION

danielzeiss.com

45 minutes. For you, or for the leader in question.

/EN/REPORT

DID THIS REACH YOU AS A FORWARD?

Then your name is on no list.

This report goes out every one to two months to a limited list, and each issue takes one question all the way through. Get it directly and it reaches you before anyone forwards it, along with the notes that did not make the issue. Your address is never sold or shared. One-click unsubscribe.

danielzeiss.com/en/report

DR. DANIEL ZEISS

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY · FRANKFURT AM MAIN

EXPERIENCE. UNDERSTANDING. CLARITY.

CREATING CLARITY.

Published by and editorially responsible: Dr. Daniel Zeiß EU, Niedenau 36, 60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany · danielzeiss.com · contact@danielzeiss.com · Editorial close: August 2026 · Source documentation and notes on method on page 23.