Online Supplement

Table S1. *Study 1: Standardized Factor Loadings in the Stacked Measurement Model.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Items | C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3)  | C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) | E being ostracized (Wk 5) | E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #1 |  .85\*\* |  |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #2 |  .89\*\* |  |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #3 | .86\*\* |  |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #4 | .92\*\* |  |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #5 | .88\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) #1 |  | .84\*\* |  |  |
| C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) #2 |  | .78\*\* |  |  |
| C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) #3 |  | .87\*\* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #1 |  |  | .78\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #2 |  |  | .85\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #3 |  |  | .89\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #4 |  |  | .94\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #5 |  |  | .92\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #6 |  |  | .91\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #7 |  |  | .91\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #8 |  |  | .95\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #9 |  |  | .93\*\* |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) #10 |  |  | .83\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #1 |  |  |  | .83\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #2 |  |  |  | .87\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #3 |  |  |  | .91\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #4 |  |  |  | .93\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #5 |  |  |  | .85\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table S1. *Continued.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Items | E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality(Wk 6) |
|  |  |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #1 |  .88\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #2 |  .91\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #3 | .90\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #4 | .91\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #5 | .86\*\* |
|  |  |
|  |  |

*Note.* N= 294;\*\* *p* < .01; # item number; E = the employee; C = the coworker.

Table S2. *Study 1: Empirical Distinctiveness of the Latent Constructs.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Factor correlations* |
|  | C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) | C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) | E being ostracized(Wk 5) | E’s self-perception of poor voice quality(Wk 6) | E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality(Wk 6) |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) | -- |  |  |  |  |
| C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) |  .40\*\* | -- |  |  |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) | .32\*\* |  .25\*\* | -- |  |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) | .33\*\* | .08 | .47\*\* | -- |  |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) | .24\*\* | .07 | .42\*\* | .62\*\* | -- |
|  | *Change in χ2 after the two scales were combined to represent one construct* |
|  | C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) | C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) | E being ostracized(Wk 5) | E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) | E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) | -- |  |  |  |  |
| C’s judgment of E’s incompetence (Wk 4) |  381.64\*\* | -- |  |  |  |
| E being ostracized (Wk 5) | 1293.55\*\* |  446.24\*\* | -- |  |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) | 1377.69\*\* | 1464.49\*\* | 1248.58\*\* | -- |  |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) | 1494.18\*\* | 1569.28\*\* | 1345.31\*\* | 929.28\*\* | -- |

*Note.* N= 294;\*\* *p* < .01; \* *p* < .05; E = the employee; C = the coworker; χ 2 = chi-squared value.

Table S3. *Study 1: Standardized Factor Loadings in the Measurement Models of Poor Voice Quality Scales.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Univariate measurement models: |
| Items | C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) | E’s self-perception of poor voice quality(Wk 6) | E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk6) |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #1 |  .85\*\*  |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #2 |  .89\*\* |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #3 | .86\*\* |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #4 | .92\*\* |  |  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #5 | .88\*\* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #1 |  | .83\*\* |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #2 |  | .87\*\* |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #3 |  | .90\*\* |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #4 |  | .94\*\* |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #5 |  | .85\*\* |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #1 |  |  | .88\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #2 |  |  | .91\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #3 |  |  | .90\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #4 |  |  | .92\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #5 |  |  | .85\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |
| χ2 (df)  | 58.03\*\* (5) | 97.22\*\* (5) | 38.94\*\* (5) |
| TLI  | .92 | .87 | .95 |
| CFI | .96 | .94 | .98 |
| RMSEA | .19 | .25 | .15 |
| SRMR | .02 | .03 | .02 |

Table S3. *Continued.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | C’s perception E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3), E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) | C’s perception E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3), E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) | E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6), E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) | All three scales of poor voice quality  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #1 |  .85\*\*  |  .85\*\*  |  |  .85\*\*  |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #2 |  .89\*\* |  .89\*\* |  |  .89\*\* |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #3 | .86\*\* |  .86\*\* |  | .86\*\* |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #4 | .92\*\* |  .92\*\* |  |  .92\*\* |
| C’s perception of E’s poor voice quality (Wk 3) #5 | .88\*\* |  .88\*\* |  |  .88\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #1 | .83\*\* |  | .83\*\* | .83\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #2 | .87\*\* |  | .87\*\* | .87\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #3 | .91\*\* |  | .91\*\* | .91\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #4 | .94\*\* |  | .93\*\* | .93\*\* |
| E’s self-perception of poor voice quality (Wk 6) #5 | .85\*\* |  | .86\*\* | .85\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #1 |  | .88\*\* | .88\*\* | .88\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #2 |  | .91\*\* | .91\*\* | .91\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #3 |  | .90\*\* | .91\*\* | .91\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #4 |  | .92\*\* | .91\*\* | .91\*\* |
| E’s perception of C’s poor voice quality (Wk 6) #5 |  | .85\*\* | .86\*\* | .86\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| χ2 (df)  | 190.81\*\* (34) | 121.53\*\* (34) | 188.40\*\* (34) | 303.95\*\* (87) |
| TLI  | .93 | .96 | .93 | .94 |
| CFI | .95 | .97 | .95 | .95 |
| RMSEA | .13 | .09 | .12 | .09 |
| SRMR | .04 | .03 | .03 | .04 |

*Notes*. \*\* *p* < .01; # item number; E = the employee; C = the coworker; χ 2 = chi-squared value; df = degree of freedom; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual.