

Electronic Supplementary Material for

Fehn, T., & Schütz, A. (2022). How to Deal With a Difficult Boss: The Roles of Leaders' Narcissistic Rivalry and Followers' Behavior in Abusive Supervision Intentions. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 230(4). <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000503>

Development of Experimental Vignettes

In a pretest, we presented 10 work-related situations (e.g., a follower did not follow the leader's instructions when preparing a project outline) to 24 participants and asked them to rate how realistic and how meaningful they thought these situations were on a 5-point Likert scale. As a first step in constructing our vignettes, we picked the three situations that were perceived as the most realistic ($M_1 = 3.75$, $SD_1 = 0.94$; $M_2 = 3.75$, $SD_2 = 1.00$; $M_3 = 3.50$, $SD_3 = 0.83$) and that did not differ greatly in perceived meaningfulness ($M_1 = 3.60$, $SD_1 = 0.82$; $M_2 = 4.00$, $SD_2 = 0.78$; $M_3 = 3.92$, $SD_3 = 0.83$). Second, participants rated nine follower reactions (three submissive, e.g., the follower apologizes and takes all the blame; three constructive, e.g., the follower calmly suggests that the incident should be analyzed and a solution should be found; three dominant, e.g., the follower blames and provokes the leader) on an 11-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (*submissive*) to 11 (*dominant*) with the goal of narrowing the items down to one submissive (lowest score), one constructive (middle score), and one dominant (highest score) follower reaction. We then randomly combined the previously chosen situations with one submissive and one dominant follower reaction in order to construct one vignette describing submissive behavior ($M = 1.88$, $SD = 1.36$) and one describing dominant behavior ($M = 10.33$, $SD = 0.87$). As the reactions that were intended to be constructive all had a mean higher than 7.40 and were thus too close to the dominant end of the range, we rephrased these items and tested them again in a sample of 11 participants. The follower behavior resulting in a mean of 5.91 ($SD = 1.30$) on the submissive-dominant scale was chosen to construct the third vignette, which described constructive behavior.

Content of Experimental Vignettes***Submissive Follower Behavior***

Chris, one of your employees, submits a project outline too late and you have to justify the delay to your client. You call Chris into your office to talk about the incident. Chris is very meek when you talk to him and his apology sounds like he is intimidated. Chris expresses that such an incident will never happen again and sneaks away looking crestfallen.

Constructive Follower Behavior

Uli, one of your employees, has given false delivery data to a customer for a larger order, which has led to misunderstandings and a complaint from the customer. You call Uli into your office to talk about the incident. Uli says that it is important to analyze the incident and look for causes. Uli would like to find a solution that is acceptable to all that can prevent such incidents in the future.

Dominant Follower Behavior

Alex, one of your employees, is instructed to read up on a specific topic. When the correspondent knowledge is required at a later point in time, it becomes clear that your instructions were ignored. You call Alex into your office to talk about the incident. Alex does not apologize to you and blames you for the incident because you had given unclear instructions. Alex provokes you and threatens to contact your manager if there is another lapse on your part.