

## Online Appendix

### Is Political Skill Always Beneficial? Why and When Politically Skilled Employees Become Targets of Coworker Social Undermining

#### Appendix A

Appendix A contains regression results for Study 1 with all control variables (Table 1) and without control variables (Table 2).

**Table 1. Regression analyses for hypothesis testing (Study 1)**

	Model 1: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 2: Coworker social undermining		Model 3: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 4: Coworker social undermining		Model 5: Coworker social undermining	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Intercept	1.28**	0.37	2.94**	0.32	2.31**	0.31	3.09**	0.33	2.77**	0.31
Age	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Gender	0.31	0.18	-0.03	0.15	0.34*	0.14	0.04	0.15	0.03	0.14
Education	0.42**	0.11	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.03	0.10	0.01	0.09
Dyadic tenure	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01
Coworker political skill	0.32*	0.13	-0.06	0.11	0.02	0.11	-0.15	0.11	-0.22*	0.11
Employee task performance	-0.36**	0.10	0.12	0.09	-0.26**	0.08	0.12	0.09	-0.03	0.09
Employee political skill	<b>0.33*</b>	<b>0.15</b>	0.10	0.13	0.33**	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.08	0.12
Rivalry					0.41**	0.04	0.17**	0.05	0.44**	0.07
Employee political skill × Rivalry					<b>0.10*</b>	<b>0.05</b>	-0.02	0.05	-0.02	0.05
Coworker perception of status threat			<b>1.34**</b>	<b>0.06</b>			1.22**	0.07	1.00**	0.08
Coworker perception of status threat × Rivalry									<b>0.26**</b>	<b>0.05</b>
R <sup>2</sup>	0.20		0.76		0.48		0.77		0.81	

*Note.* N = 211. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ . *b* = unstandardized parameter estimates. SE = standard errors. Values in bold are relevant to hypothesis testing. Model 4 served as a baseline model for Model 5 for additional information.

**Table 2. Regression analyses for hypothesis testing (Study 1)**

	Model 1: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 2: Coworker social undermining		Model 3: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 4: Coworker social undermining		Model 5: Coworker social undermining	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Intercept	2.74**	0.09	3.18**	0.07	2.71**	0.07	3.18**	0.07	2.80**	0.09
Employee political skill	<b>0.29**</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.16*	0.08	0.15	0.08	0.15	0.08	-0.05	0.08
Rivalry					0.44**	0.04	0.15**	0.05	0.39**	0.06
Employee political skill × Rivalry					<b>0.11*</b>	<b>0.05</b>	0.00	0.05	-0.01	0.04
Coworker perception of status threat			<b>1.33**</b>	<b>0.05</b>			1.20**	0.07	1.02**	0.07
Coworker perception of status threat × Rivalry									<b>0.24**</b>	<b>0.04</b>
R <sup>2</sup>	0.04		0.76		0.44		0.77		0.80	

*Note.* N = 211. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ . *b* = unstandardized parameter estimates. SE = standard errors. Values in bold are relevant to hypothesis testing. Model 4 served as a baseline model for Model 5 for additional information.

## Appendix B

Appendix B contains regression results for Study 4 with all control variables (Table 3) and without control variables (Table 4).

**Table 3. Regression analyses for hypothesis testing (Study 4)**

	Model 1: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 2: Coworker social undermining		Model 3: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 3a: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 4: Coworker social undermining		Model 4a: Coworker social undermining	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Intercept	1.22**	0.18	1.94**	0.23	1.25**	0.18	1.23**	0.18	1.73**	0.25	1.83**	0.24
Age	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Gender	-0.03	0.11	-0.23	0.13	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.11	-0.18	0.13	-0.14	0.12
Education	0.14**	0.05	0.00	0.06	0.14**	0.05	0.13*	0.05	0.00	0.06	-0.02	0.06
Dyadic tenure	-0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02
Formal rank	-0.01	0.08	0.09	0.10	-0.03	0.08	-0.02	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.09
Formal rank of the employee	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.10
Interpersonal liking (Liking)	-0.25**	0.05	0.00	0.06	-0.26**	0.04	-0.25**	0.05	-0.03	0.06	-0.07	0.06
Coworker political skill	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.01	0.07
Employee task performance	-0.09	0.06	0.05	0.07	-0.11	0.06	-0.11	0.06	0.00	0.07	-0.04	0.07
Employee political skill	<b>0.33**</b>	<b>0.07</b>	0.04	0.09	0.18*	0.09	0.17	0.09	-0.16	0.11	-0.04	0.11
Rivalry condition	0.98**	0.13	0.08	0.17	0.96**	0.12	0.97**	0.12	0.25	0.18	0.20	0.18
Employee political skill × Rivalry condition					<b>0.26**</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.34**</b>	<b>0.12</b>	0.41**	0.12	0.25	0.15
Employee political skill × Liking							0.03	0.04			-0.01	0.04
Coworker perception of status threat			<b>0.90**</b>	<b>0.08</b>					0.54**	0.16	0.39*	0.16
Coworker perception of status threat × Rivalry condition									<b>0.39*</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.70**</b>	<b>0.19</b>
Coworker perception of status threat × Liking											0.17**	0.04
R <sup>2</sup>	0.51		0.57		0.52		0.52		0.60		0.63	

*Note.* N = 251. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ . *b* = unstandardized parameter estimates. SE = standard errors. Values in bold are relevant to hypothesis testing. Model 3a tests whether liking constitutes an alternative explanation for the moderating effect of rivalry in Model 3 on coworker perception of threat. Model 4a tests whether liking constitutes an alternative explanation for the moderating effect of rivalry in Model 4 on coworker social undermining. Rivalry was manipulated and was coded as 0 for “non-rival competition” and 1 for “rivalry.”

**Table 4. Regression analyses for hypothesis testing (Study 4)**

	Model 1: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 2: Coworker social undermining		Model 3: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 3a: Coworker perception of status threat		Model 4: Coworker social undermining		Model 4a: Coworker social undermining	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Intercept	1.45**	0.08	1.91**	0.10	1.46**	0.08	1.62**	0.09	1.66**	0.14	1.74**	0.14
Employee political skill	<b>0.10*</b>	<b>0.05</b>	0.10	0.06	-0.03	0.08	0.14	0.08	-0.17	0.09	-0.05	0.10
Rivalry condition	1.45**	0.11	0.13	0.17	1.45**	0.11	1.05**	0.12	0.35*	0.17	0.26	0.17
Employee political skill × Rivalry condition					<b>0.22*</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.34**</b>	<b>0.12</b>	0.43**	0.12	0.26	0.15
Liking							-0.27**	0.04			-0.08	0.06
Employee political skill × Liking							0.05	0.04			-0.01	0.04
Coworker perception of status threat			<b>0.89**</b>	<b>0.07</b>					0.52**	0.15	0.36*	0.15
Coworker perception of status threat × Rivalry condition									<b>0.44*</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.74**</b>	<b>0.18</b>
Coworker perception of status threat × Liking											0.17**	0.04
R <sup>2</sup>	0.40		0.54		0.41		0.50		0.57		0.60	

*Note.* N = 251. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ . *b* = unstandardized parameter estimates. SE = standard errors. Values in bold are relevant to hypothesis testing. Model 3a tests whether liking constitutes an alternative explanation for the moderating effect of rivalry in Model 3 on coworker perception of threat. Model 4a tests whether liking constitutes an alternative explanation for the moderating effect of rivalry in Model 4 on coworker social undermining. Rivalry was manipulated and was coded as 0 for “non-rival competition” and 1 for “rivalry.”

## Appendix C

### Items Used in Studies

#### Study 1

##### **Political Skill (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)**

1. This person understands people very well.
2. This person is particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.
3. This person has good intuition or savvy about how to present him/herself to others.
4. This person always seems to instinctively know the right things to say or do to influence others.
5. This person pays close attention to people’s facial expressions.
6. This person spends a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.
7. This person has developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who he/she can call on for support when he/she really needs to get things done.
8. This person is good at building relationships with influential people at work.
9. At work, this person knows a lot of important people and is well connected.
10. This person spends a lot of time at work developing connections with others.
11. This person is good at using his/her connections and network to make things happen at work.
12. This person is able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around him/her.
13. This person is able to communicate easily and effectively with others.
14. It is easy for this person to develop good rapport with most people.
15. This person is good at getting people to like him/her.
16. When communicating with others, this person tries to be genuine in what he/she says and does.
17. This person tries to be sincere in what he/she says and does.
18. This person tries to show a genuine interest in other people.

##### **Rivalry (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)**

1. I feel rivalry towards this person.
2. I have a history with this person that makes competitions against him or her more significant than competitions against other people.
3. I consider this person to be a personal rival.
4. Competitions against this person are more important to me because of the relationship that exists between us.

**Status Threat (1 = “Not at all” to 7 = “Very much”)**

1. This person constitutes a threat to your status at work.
2. This person constitutes a threat to your ability to access resources at work.
3. This person constitutes a threat to your ability to exert power at work.
4. This person constitutes a threat to your ability to achieve goals at work.

**Social Undermining (1 = “Never” to 7 = “All the time”)**

How often have you intentionally...

1. Hurt this person’s feelings?
2. Put this person down when she/he questioned work procedures?
3. Undermined this person’s effort to be successful on the job?
4. Let this person know you did not like him/her or something about him/her?
5. Talked bad about this person behind his/her back?
6. Insulted this person?
7. Belittled this person or his/her ideas?
8. Spread rumors about this person?
9. Made this person feel incompetent?
10. Delayed work to make this person look bad or slow him/her down?
11. Talked down to this person?
12. Gave this person the silent treatment?
13. Did not defend this person when people spoke poorly of him/her?

**Task performance (1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree”)**

1. This person adequately completes assigned duties.
2. This person performs all tasks that are expected of him/her.
3. This person fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.
4. This person meets formal performance requirements of the job.

**Participants Self-Reported Political Skill (1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree”)**

1. I understand people very well.
2. I am particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.
3. I have good intuition or savvy about how to present myself to others.
4. I always seem to instinctively know the right things to say or do to influence others.
5. I pay close attention to people’s facial expressions.
6. I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.
7. I have developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who I can call on for support when I really need to get things done.
8. I am good at building relationships with influential people at work.

9. At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected.
10. I spend a lot of time at work developing connections with others.
11. I am good at using my connections and network to make things happen at work.
12. I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me.
13. I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others.
14. It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people.
15. I am good at getting people to like me.
16. When communicating with others, I try to be genuine in what I say and do.
17. It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do.
18. I try to show a genuine interest in other people.

## Study 2

### **Political Skill Manipulation Check (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)**

1. Alex understands people very well.
2. Alex is very good at building relationships with influential people at work.
3. Alex is able to communicate easily and effectively with others.
4. When communicating with others, Alex tries to appear genuine in what to say and do.

*Note.* This manipulation check measure of political skill correlated significantly with the full scale at  $r = .93, p < .001$  in Study 1 and at  $r = .95, p < .001$  in Study 4.

### **Rivalry Manipulation Check (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)**

1. You feel rivalry towards Alex.
2. You have a history of competing with Alex that makes competitions against him or her more significant than competitions against other people.
3. You consider Alex to be a personal rival.
4. Competitions against Alex are important to you because of the relationship history that exists between you two.

### **Status Threat (1 = “*Not at all*” to 7 = “*To an extremely large extent*”)**

1. Alex will constitute a threat to your status at work.
2. Alex will constitute a threat to your ability to access resources at work.
3. Alex will constitute a threat to your ability to exert power at work.
4. Alex will constitute a threat to your ability to achieve goals at work.

### Study 3

#### Status Threat Manipulation Check (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)

1. Alex constitutes a threat to your status at work.
2. Alex constitutes a threat to your ability to access resources at work.
3. Alex constitutes a threat to your ability to exert power at work.
4. Alex constitutes a threat to your ability to achieve goals at work.

#### Rivalry Manipulation Check (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)

1. You feel rivalry towards Alex.
2. You have a history of competing with Alex that makes competitions against him or her more significant than competitions against other people.
3. You consider Alex to be a personal rival.
4. Competitions against Alex are important to you because of the relationship history that exists between you two.

#### Social Undermining (1 = “*Very unlikely*” to 7 = “*Very likely*”)

How likely would you intentionally ...

1. Hurt Alex’s feelings?
2. Put Alex down when she/he questioned work procedures?
3. Undermine Alex’s effort to be successful on the job?
4. Let Alex know you did not like him/her or something about him/her?
5. Talk bad about Alex behind his/her back?
6. Insult Alex?
7. Belittle Alex or his/her ideas?
8. Spread rumors about Alex?
9. Make Alex feel incompetent?
10. Delay work to make Alex look bad or slow him/her down?
11. Talk down to Alex?
12. Give Alex the silent treatment?
13. Will not defend Alex when people spoke poorly of him/her?

### Study 4

#### Political Skill (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)

1. This person understands people very well.
2. This person is particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.
3. This person has good intuition or savvy about how to present him/herself to others.
4. This person always seems to instinctively know the right things to say or do to influence others.
5. This person pays close attention to people's facial expressions.
6. This person spends a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.
7. This person has developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who he/she can call on for support when he/she really needs to get things done.
8. This person is good at building relationships with influential people at work.
9. At work, this person knows a lot of important people and is well connected.
10. This person spends a lot of time at work developing connections with others.
11. This person is good at using his/her connections and network to make things happen at work.
12. This person is able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around him/her.
13. This person is able to communicate easily and effectively with others.
14. It is easy for this person to develop good rapport with most people.
15. This person is good at getting people to like him/her.
16. When communicating with others, this person tries to be genuine in what he/she says and does.
17. This person tries to be sincere in what he/she says and does.
18. This person tries to show a genuine interest in other people.

**Status Threat (1 = “Not at all” to 7 = “Very much”)**

1. This person constitutes a threat to your status at work.
2. This person constitutes a threat to your ability to access resources at work.
3. This person constitutes a threat to your ability to exert power at work.
4. This person constitutes a threat to your ability to achieve goals at work.

**Interpersonal Liking (1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree”)**

1. I like this person.
2. This person is likable.
3. I dislike this person (reverse-coded).

**Social Undermining (1 = “Never” to 7 = “All the time”)**

How often have you intentionally. . .

1. Hurt this person's feelings?
2. Put this person down when she/he questioned work procedures?
3. Undermined this person's effort to be successful on the job?

4. Let this person know you did not like him/her or something about him/her?
5. Talked bad about this person behind his/her back?
6. Insulted this person?
7. Belittled this person or his/her ideas?
8. Spread rumors about this person?
9. Made this person feel incompetent?
10. Delayed work to make this person look bad or slow him/her down?
11. Talked down to this person?
12. Gave this person the silent treatment?
13. Did not defend this person when people spoke poorly of him/her?

**Task Performance (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)**

1. This person adequately completes assigned duties.
2. This person performs all tasks that are expected of him/her.
3. This person fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.
4. This person meets formal performance requirements of the job.

**Participants Self-Reported Political Skill (1 = “*Strongly disagree*” to 7 = “*Strongly agree*”)**

1. I understand people very well.
2. I am particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.
3. I have good intuition or savvy about how to present myself to others.
4. I always seem to instinctively know the right things to say or do to influence others.
5. I pay close attention to people’s facial expressions.
6. I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.
7. I have developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who I can call on for support when I really need to get things done.
8. I am good at building relationships with influential people at work.
9. At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected.
10. I spend a lot of time at work developing connections with others.
11. I am good at using my connections and network to make things happen at work.
12. I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me.
13. I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others.
14. It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people.
15. I am good at getting people to like me.
16. When communicating with others, I try to be genuine in what I say and do.
17. It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do.
18. I try to show a genuine interest in other people.