**Political Skills at Work: The Case of Outstanding Employees**

# Abstract

Studies have suggested that political skills are an important work asset. Yet, research on the underlying mechanism that integrates them with outstanding performance and personality traits is scarce. The present study fills this gap. Our paired sample consists of 980 participants, 288 employee–supervisor dyads, and a control group of 202 employee–supervisor dyads. The results show that in their supervisors’ evaluation, outstanding employees score higher on apparent sincerity compared to other employees. Outstanding employees who score high on extroversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability also score high on political skills. We infer from this that employees’ political skills should be organizationally enhanced because of their extensive practical implications. Accordingly, employees who score high on political skills may be given chances to enrich and cultivate those skills. This may contribute to their advancement at work and the subsequent transfer of their knowledge to colleagues, thereby facilitating the success of their organizations. Employees who lack political skills may be trained to acquire and develop them.
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# Practitioner Notes

**What is currently known**

* Political skills is one of the most fruitful research concepts to have emerged in the context of the employee performance debate.
* Clarifying the interaction of political skills, personality traits, and outstanding employees is crucial for understanding what those employees and their supervisors should do to improve organizational performance and benefit from politically built relationships.

**What this paper adds**

* Outstanding employees score high on apparent sincerity.
* Outstanding employees score high on extroversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability.

**Implications for practitioners**

* The model presented in this paper suggests that outstanding employees should be trained in political skills to improve their political actions in the workplace and to contribute to organizational outcomes.
* Human resources management should analyze the political skills and personality traits profiles of their employees to better formulate political skills training programs.

**Political Skills at Work: The Case of Outstanding Employees**

Human resource management practices concerning performance remain ineffective unless organizational politics are applied. These represent the unofficial or informal actions or behaviors that employees perform to promote their personal goals (Rughoobur-Seetah, 2021). Organizational politics have been the object of intensive research over the last two decades (Andrews et al., 2009), and political skills is one of the most fruitful concepts to emerge (Yates & Hartley, 2021). Political skills represent the ability to understand others at work and to employ this knowledge to influence them to act in specific ways (Jabid et al., 2021). The notion of political skills was first introduced by Pfeffer (1981) to theorize on the interaction abilities whereby employees understand, influence, manage, and control others. These skills, Pfeffer contended, allow employees to achieve personal or organizational goals as required by different circumstances (Pfeffer, 1981). Since then, many scholars have established that political skills play a major role in personal career development (Robert, 2013), as they are positively correlated with performance (Chen et al., 2021). Thus, an understanding of how political skills are acquired or enhanced is a valuable asset (Yates & Hartley, 2021).

Research on political skills has grown over the last decade (Chen & Gao, 2020). However, most studies have centered on supervisors’ perspectives and the impact of their political skills on their subordinates’ outcomes; studies on the complementary role played by the political skills of subordinates are scarce (Wei et al., 2010). Scholars agree that the absence of these skills may lead to problems in achieving positive outcomes such as high job performance and positive supervisor assessment (Bağış Öztürk & Emirza, 2021). Accordingly, clarifying the interaction of political skills and positive outcomes is crucial for understanding how outstanding employees and their supervisors can improve organizational performance and benefit from politically built relationships.

Studies have shown ‎that political skills interact with two of the personality traits in the well-known five-factor model (FFM): ‎extroversion and agreeableness (Blickle, 2008, as cited in ‎Kranefeld et al., 2020). In this context, the present research has two innovative ‎goals. First, it clarifies the relationship between political skills and the traits of openness to experiences, neuroticism, and conscientiousness. Second, it clarifies how the intersection of political skills and the FFM ‎affects performance and, more specifically, the performance of outstanding employees. ‎Our model can be used by HRMs for better strategic decision-making, including in relation to the long temporal orientation perspective of managers (Lin et al., 2019).

# Theoretical Background

Organizational politics is a widely studied phenomenon (Ferris et al., 2019). Organizations are political environments, which compels employees to develop and engage in political behavior in the workplace. Once effectively employed, political skills can contribute significantly to career development (Sunindijo & Maghrebi, 2020), as they impact organizations and individuals favorably (Hochwarter, 2018; Park & Lee, 2020). More concretely, individuals who score high on political skills are likely to emphasize interpersonal interactions. Studies have defined political skills as an interpersonal effectiveness construct in which social understanding and the purposive capacity to adjust one’s behavior are combined (Wei et al., 2010). In addition, political skills involve the social ability that allows employees to employ influence mechanisms to gain organizational power (Sunindijo & Maghrebi, 2020).

Moreover, political skills are the strongest predictor of job performance (Ferris et al., 2019). Their effectiveness is greater than that of emotional intelligence, leadership, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring (Kranefeld et al., 2020). In addition, competency in political skills influences supervisors’ subjective perception and appreciation of employee job performance, thereby creating real performance differences (Blickle et al., 2012). In this context, politically skilled individuals are perceived as highly genuine persons with integrity. This allows them to gain the confidence of their colleagues and to shape reality accordingly (“Political Skills in Organizations: Do Personality and Reputation Play a Role?,” 2008). Thus, this study deepens understanding of outstanding performance and political skills at work by clarifying how supervisors’ appreciation of their subordinates’ political skills relates to and contrasts with the subordinates’ self-reports of their own political skills and performance.

## Performance

The notion of performance defines the way employees fulfill their job duties (Desa & Asaari, 2020; Habeeb, 2020; Motowidlo & Kell, 2012; Sanchez et al., 2019) along with the expected outcomes of their work behavioral attitudes (Van Laethem et al., 2019). More concretely, performance is a multifaceted construct, as different employees may exhibit different performance-related behaviors at different times and in different situations (Harzer et al., 2021). In other words, performance can be measured (Desa & Asaari, 2020; Sanchez et al., 2019) according to individual or organizational criteria (Habeeb, 2020), which entails identifying behavioral patterns that directly impact and improve the production of services and goods (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019) along with quantity and quality output rates (Widodo & Wiardi, 2019). Consequently, performance is a key notion that allows organizations to distinguish between common and outstanding employees, keep track of past and future achievements (Bellé et al., 2017; van der Hoek et al., 2018), obtain regular feedback, revise and reformulate goals (Belardinelli et al., 2018; Micheli & Pavlov, 2020), and predict future employee performance.

The present study makes use of Motowidlo et al.’s (1997) construct, which subdivides performance into task and contextual performance. *Task performance* represents an in-role conduct leading to required outcomes and behaviors that represent specific organizational policies and goals. It reflects how employees accomplish different duties pertaining to their jobs (Motowidlo et al., 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). *Contextual performance*refers toextra-role behaviors, among which one may count assisting others or volunteering (Motowidlo et al., 1997), as well as engaging in different kinds of interpersonal situations that exceed the specific functions of one’s position (Motowidlo et al., 2018). The notion of contextual performance was expanded by Organ et al. (2006) through the concept ‎of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), which defines discretionary acts of ‎cooperation and helpfulness, such as continuously promoting effective organizational functioning and performance (Yaakobi & Weisberg, 2020). OCB is subdivided into organizational citizenship behavior toward organizations (OCB-O) and organizational citizenship behavior toward individuals (OCB-I) (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Whereas OCB-O refers to behavior that allows organizations to improve, OCB-I represents the outcome of helping one’s colleagues to solve problems or suggesting ways for their development (de Geus et al., 2020).

### Performance of Outstanding Employees

Outstanding employees make effective use of their human capital to contribute to the improvement of general organizational performance (Eshet & Harpaz, 2021). Outstanding performance synthesizes abilities, personality qualities, and multiple attitudes (Elliot, 2005), including performing one’s duties with excellence (van Loon et al., 2018). As a result, outstanding employees score high on task and contextual performance (Eshet, 2020), and knowledge and contextual skills predict OCB (Motowidlo et al., 1997). More specifically, individuals who possess high self-efficacy skills are more likely to employ adaptive behavioral strategies. They are often acquainted with the type of citizenship behavior that best suits a specific workplace situation and know how to plan meticulously and deploy this effectively (Yaakobi & Weisberg, 2020). In this context, one may argue, performance is the most suitable parameter for assessing effectiveness and efficiency at the individual and organizational levels. Based on the above, we hypothesize:

###### *‎H1: Outstanding employees score high on performance compared to common employees.*

## Personality

The FFM is a comprehensive scientific tool designed to measure ‎psychological behavior (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Dimitriadis et al., 2017; Eshet & Harpaz, 2021) and identify relevant predictors of job performance (Harzer et al., 2021). Scholarly studies have shown that there ‎are positive correlations between the FFM and the notion of political skills (Blickle et al., 2008). In this context, ‎cross-sectional studies focusing on the FFM have provided evidence that political skills are also a significant ‎predictor of overall job performance ratings (Blickle et al., 2010).‎

The FFM divides personality into five domains. The first domain is openness to experiences. Individuals who possess this trait are characterized by their search for novelty and new experiences, for which flexibility and curiosity are crucial. The second domain is conscientiousness. This trait focuses on a person’s level of self-discipline, dutifulness, deliverability, responsibility, and goal achievement. The third domain is extroversion. This trait embodies the psychological inclination to be sociable, assertive, and energetic, and extroverted individuals tend to take initiatives that lead to change. The fourth domain is agreeableness. Agreeable individuals are compliant, sympathetic, altruistic, trusting, cooperative, and show prosocial attitudes. The fifth domain is emotional stability (the positive counterpart of neuroticism). Emotionally stable individuals are calm, show low levels of stress, and are characterized by ‎their confidence and optimism in challenging situations**‎**.

### Personality Traits and Outstanding Performance

As noted above, performance the key to measuring effectiveness and efficiency, both individually and organizationally. Motivation and personality are among the many factors that influence performance (Benuyenah, 2021). In this context, OCB is better predicted through personality traits than through characteristic individual differences (Pletzer et al., 2020). More specifically, conscientiousness and agreeableness are sound predictors of OCB (albeit to a lesser degree). Whereas agreeableness is a consistent predictor of OCB-I, conscientiousness is a consistent predictor of OCB-O (e.g., Borman et al., 2001; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Ilies et al.) Moreover, research has shown that emotional stability is substantially linked to task performance, OCB-I, and OCB-O (Chiaburu et al., 2011). On the other hand, neither extroversion nor openness to experiences exhibits a noticeable relationship with either form of OCB (Chiaburu et al., 2017), Thus, based on the above, we posit:

###### *H2: Outstanding employees will show higher levels of personality trait rates in performance than common employees.*

## Political Skills

As argued earlier, organizations are political settings (Blickler et al., 2018; Mintzberg, 1985; Waggoner, 2020) in which internal politics are commonly accepted and socially functional (Vigoda-Gadot & Yuval, 2003). Accordingly, political behavior is a factual and indispensable feature that determines organizational dynamics broadly construed (Oade & Oade, 2009). Politically skilled employees know how to understand social cues and elicit specific political and influential behaviors (Treadway et al., 2005). More specifically, what is characteristic of them is how they get along with their fellow workers. Employees who possess political skills know how to adjust effortlessly to political settings, and this allows them to make competent use of their social abilities to motivate colleagues or subordinates. An additional factor is their ability to feel comfortable in their work environment, which impacts positively on their performance (Siddiqui et al., 2021). Accordingly, political skills are an essential resource for employees to obtain greater success (Waggoner, 2020).

In this study, the political skills construct is subdivided into four major categories (Crawford et al., 2019; Kranefeld et al., 2020). The subdivision draws on the Political Skill Inventory (PSI) (Ferris et al., 2005), which has been widely validated across many different countries and cultures (González et al., 2020; Setyorini et al., 2020).

*Social astuteness* refers to the ability to perceive ‎others acutely and successfully and adjust oneself self-consciously to different social settings and circumstances (Shi et al., 2011). Research has shown (Ferris et al., 2005) that social astuteness predicts job performance ‎much more efficiently than the other dimensions of political skills (Shi et al., 2011).‎

*Interpersonal influence* theorizes that the behavioral style of politically ‎skilled individuals is strongly influential and allows them to adjust to different settings ‎and circumstances with the intention of eliciting favorable behaviors and responses from others (Ferris et al., 2007; Guo et al., 2020; Kimura, 2015).‎

*Networking ability* is found in highly politically skillful individuals who have ‎acquired the ability to identify and establish friendship connections or alliances (Ferris et al., 2007; Kimura, 2015). Studies have shown that informal workplace relationships have a significant impact on employee performance (Wei et al., 2012).

*Apparent sincerity* applies to highly politically skillful ‎individuals, as they possess the ability to appear genuine (Ferris et al., 2007; Kimura, 2015). As a result, they are evaluated positively by their colleagues and are perceived as ‎trusted individuals (Guo et al., 2020; Sunindijo & Maghrebi, 2020). More concretely, their behaviors are not regarded as manipulative, which leads others to have expectations about their future intentions and motivations (H. Chen et al., 2021).

## Outstanding Performance, Personality Traits, and Political Skills

Previous research showing positive correlations between political skills and the FFM is ‎scarce (Kranefeld et al., 2020; Ohlsson et al., 2017). Ohlsson et al. (2016) established that extroversion is associated with political skills, which, in turn, relate to team performance. Blickle et al. (2008, 2010) showed that individuals who score high on both agreeableness and political skills exhibit greater overall job performance than those who score low on either or both traits (Kimura, 2015). Other researchers (Ohlsson et al., 2017) have focused on openness and conscientiousness to establish a relationship among these traits, performance, and political skills. In addition, research dealing with extroversion and political skills has indicated that their interaction determines the performance rates of employees who score high on political skills (Ohlsson et al., 2017). Likewise, scoring low on political skills has been shown to have a negative effect on the performance of extroverted employees (Blickle et al., 2010). Thus, we posit:

*H3:High levels of political skills influence outstanding performance.*

### Political Skills and Outstanding Performance

Empirical studies have shown that political skills are associated with supervisor-rated performance (Kimura, 2015) and that they predict managerial ratings of performance (Ferris et al., 2005), as politically skilled employees know how to interact effectively with others and promote organizational and individual interests (Kimura, 2015). In this context, the four subcategories of political skills discussed above allow managers and entrepreneurs to regulate different political skills behaviors strategically according to situationally diverging and dynamic demands (Kranefeld et al., 2020). Accordingly, one may conclude that political skills are a key performance component.

Furthermore, politically skilled employees excel as negotiators in ambiguous and conflicting environments, thereby contributing to their organization’s success (Ferris et al., 2005). They influence people around them persuasively and purposively (Kolodinsky et al., 2007), and they promote personal and organizational objectives (Treadway et al., 2013). In addition, individuals who score high on political skills are likely to avoid engaging in self‐reported ingratiation with their supervisors, which often leads to high performance ratings (Breland et al., 2017). Thus, on the basis of the research literature, we posit:

###### *H4: Political skills mediate the correlation between the performance and personality traits of outstanding employees.*

# Materials and Methods

## Research Model

On the basis of the literature discussed above, the research model in Figure 1 presents the influence of personality traits and political skills on outstanding performance.‎

## Participants

A pilot study was conducted to test the reliability and validity of the research tools. The sample included 136 employees and 123 managers. The average time taken by an employee to fill the questionnaire was 16 minutes. The content validity of the pilot study was assessed using factor analysis. To obtain orthogonal factors, the default settings were initially used in the analysis. Subsequently, the rotated matrix of loadings (varimax rotation) was used. Factor loadings were defined to be no less than 0.4. In addition, a multicollinearity test was conducted to detect high correlation coefficients between independent variables. No multicollinearity was found between the independent variables. (All VIF values were lower than 2.5).

The innovative paired sample consisted of a total of 940 participants, including 288 pairs of outstanding employees and their supervisors, and 202 pairs of common employees and their supervisors as a control group. The sample was selected from the finalists of the Excellent Worker Prize of Israel sponsored by *Ma’ariv*, a daily Israeli newspaper. Outstanding employees were selected by a committee consisting of 18 experienced professional members and headed by the president of the National Labor Court. As a first step, department managers in each organization were asked to choose their best employees. A committee consisting of the human resources manager, the chairperson of the employees’ union or workers’ council, and the organization’s director general selected the most outstanding worker in their organization. Thus, each organization selected its top-performing employees, who were contacted by phone and invited to participate in the current study. After their permission was obtained, the questionnaire was sent to each of these employees via e-mail. The employees and their direct supervisors completed the questionnaires separately. In addition, each supervisor selected one common subordinate employee and evaluated his/her overall performance. The dropout rate was 38%.

As shown in Table 1, most of the outstanding employees are married with children (86%) and are member of a labor union (67%). About half of them are men (52%), and half have received an academic education (51%). The average age of the outstanding employees is 54.5 years (*SD* = 9.12), and their average tenure in the workplace as a public administration employee is 23 years (*SD* = 8.76). Cramér’s V shows a medium correlation between outstanding employees and the gender, education level, marital status, and labor union membership status of their supervisors.

## Measures

Seven-point Likert scales were used for all survey items, with anchors of 1 (strongly ‎disagree) and 7 (strongly agree).

### Performance

*Task performance* was measured using the seven-item scale of Williams and Anderson (1991; sample item, “The employee adequately completes assigned duties”). Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used to measure the reliability of the scale, and the value of alpha was 0.88 (Jawahar & Ferris, 2011). ‎*Contextual performance* was measured using the ten-item scale of Moorman and Blakely (1995; sample item, “Goes out of his/her way to help coworkers with work-related problems”). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.91.

### Political Skills

We employed the four categories of the PSI developed by Ferris et al. (2005). The questionnaire consisted of 18 items, and the validity of the scale for ‎supervisors’ ratings was confirmed by Blickle et al. (2011). An example of ‎a question measuring supervisors’ reports on employees and ‎employees’ self-reports on PSI is “I spend a lot of time and effort creating work networks with others.” The Cronbach’s ‎alpha coefficients were 0.90 for employees and 0.89 for supervisors.‎

### Personality

The Ten-Item ‎Personality Inventory (TIPI) developed by Gosling et al. (2003) for assessing the Big Five ‎personality factors was used in this study to measure personality traits. Employees provided self-reports on their ‎personality traits in relation to the positive and negative aspects of each. ‎Examples of items measuring the positive aspect of each trait are as follows: extroversion, “Extroverted, enthusiastic”; agreeableness, “Sympathetic, warm”; ‎conscientiousness, “Dependable, self-disciplined”; emotional stability, “Calm, ‎emotionally stable”; and openness to experiences, “Open to new experiences, ‎complex.” ‎The value of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this questionnaire was 0.72.‎

## Data Analysis

We analyzed the data using correlation tests and t-tests via SPSS version 2‎‏5‏‎, and ‎structural equation modeling (SEM) via AMOS version 25‎.

## Procedure

A pilot study was conducted to test the reliability and validity of the research tools translated into Hebrew. This sample consisted of 136 employees and 123 managers. The average time taken by an employee to fill the questionnaire was 16 minutes. The content validity of the pilot study was assessed using factor analysis. To obtain orthogonal factors, the default settings were used initially. Subsequently, a rotated matrix of loadings (varimax rotation) was used. Factor loadings were defined to be no less than 0.4. In addition, a multicollinearity test was conducted to detect high correlation coefficients between independent variables. No multicollinearity was found between the independent variables (all VIF values were lower than 2.5).

We contacted the HRM of each organization with outstanding employees mentioned in the Excellent Worker Prize of Israel and invited them to participate in the study. In addition, we asked managers to report on each pair of employees, one outstanding and the other common. All questionnaires were sent via e-mail after obtaining the permission of the participants (the outstanding employees, the common employees, and their managers). The questionnaires were completed separately by the employees and their direct supervisors using the online survey tool Qualtrics. All the employees were asked to complete the PSI and TIPI questionnaires. The managers were asked to complete the following questionnaires regarding their employees: the seven-item scale of Williams and Anderson (1991), the ten-item scale of Moorman and Blakely (1995), and the PSI. In addition, all employees and their managers were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire.

# Results
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Table 2 reports bivariate correlation coefficients among all the study variables and descriptive statistics for outstanding and common employees. No multicollinearity was found between the independent variables; all correlation coefficients were lower than 0.7. The results indicate that for outstanding employees, performance on OCB-I has a significant but weak positive correlation with the political skills of social astuteness (*r*= 0.119, *p* < 0.05). For common employees, OCB-I has a significant but weak positive correlation with the personality traits of agreeableness (*r* = 0.164, *p* < 0.05) and openness to experiences (*r* = 0.262, *p* < 0.001), as well as with all four subcategories of political skills, namely social astuteness (*r* = 0.299, *p* < 0.001), interpersonal influence (*r* = 0.175, *p* < 0.05), networking ability (*r* = 0.285, *p* < 0.001), and apparent sincerity (*r* = 0.201, *p* < 0.01). Our results also show that the OCB-O of outstanding employees has a significant but weak negative correlation with the personality trait of extroversion (*r* = -0.193, *p* < 0.001). The OCB-O of common employees has a significant but weak positive correlation with the political skill of networking ability (*r* = 0.172, *p* < 0.05).

In addition, the results indicate that there is a significant difference between outstanding and common employees regarding three personality traits (H2). Outstanding employees scored significantly higher than common employees for extroversion [*t*(488) = 2.78, *p* < 0.01], conscientiousness [*t*(488) = 2.57, *p* < 0.05], and emotional stability [*t*(488) = 2.24, *p* < 0.05]. There is a significant difference between outstanding and common employees in political skills (H3). Outstanding employees scored significantly higher than common employees for apparent sincerity [*t*(488) = 11.46, *p*< 0.001]. There is also a significant difference between outstanding and common employees in performance, with outstanding employees scoring significantly higher for OCB-O [*t*(488) = 3.15, *p* < 0.01] and task performance [*t*(488) = 2.84, *p* < 0.01], which partially confirms H1.
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Table 3 reports the results of the paired samples t-test for the political skills dimensions of the employees and their supervisors. The social astuteness of outstanding employees was evaluated at a higher level by the employees (*M* = 5.57) than by their supervisors (*M* = 5.35), and this result was significant (*t*(285) = 2.89, *p* < 0.01). In contrast, apparent sincerity was evaluated at a lower level by the employees (*M* = 5.33) than by their supervisors (*M* = 5.52); again, the result was significant (*t*(285) = -2.53, *p* < 0.05). The interpersonal influence, networking ability, and apparent sincerity of common employees were all evaluated at a lower level by the employees than their supervisors, and these results, too, were significant.

The performance variable was modeled according to the variables ‎of task performance, OCB-I, and OCB-O, as well as the latent variable of ‎personality traits (measured ‎‎by extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experiences, and emotional ‎stability), mediated by the latent variable of ‎‎political skills (‎‎measured as social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability, and apparent sincerity) (H4).‎ The data fit ‎the employee performance ‎model marginally well (χ2 = 214.511, N = 156, *df* = 102, *p* < 0.001, ‎CFI = 0.916, GFI = 0.931, ‎RMSEA = 0.048). The structural model of performance for the sample of outstanding employees is shown in Figure ‎‎2.‎

The results of the analysis indicate that there is a significant impact of personality traits on political skills (β = 0.42, *p* < 0.01). In other words, the higher the scores of outstanding employees for extroversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability, the higher their level of political skills (although no effect was found for conscientiousness in the outstanding employee sample). In addition, political skills have a significant impact on performance (β = 0.90, *p* < 0.01). In other words, the higher the scores of outstanding employees on one skill (social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability, or apparent sincerity), the higher their level of performance. No mediation path was found between personality traits, political skills, and outstanding employee performance. H4‎ is therefore not supported.

The results indicate that there is a significant impact of personality traits on the political skills of common employees (β = 0.78, *p* < 0.001). In other words, the higher the levels of agreeableness, openness to experiences, neuroticism, and extroversion for common employees, the higher their political skills. However, no direct effect of political skills on performance was found in the common employee sample (β = 0.28, *p* > 0.05), which confirms H3. Outstanding employees have higher levels of political skills, and the results show a significant difference between outstanding employees ‎and common employees (NFI Delta−1 = 0.045, CMIN = 66.51, *df* = 12, *p* < 0.01), which confirms H1‎.

# Discussion

This paper contributes to the research literature on political skills and outstanding performance. It determines how their similarities and differences facilitate a deeper understanding of the general phenomenon of politics at work. It also clarifies the extent to which supervisors’ ratings of their subordinates’ skills reflect the subordinates’ self-reports. This finding is of key importance, as previous research has established differences between supervisors’ reports and subordinates’ self-reports, particularly in relation to OCBs (Donia et al., 2016). In this context, a recent study has shown that although employees who score high on political skills tend to receive higher performance evaluations, managers often adjust their assessments by applying fairness criteria. As a result, the performance of employees who have better political skills is often underestimated (H. Chen et al., 2021). Moreover, research has shown that political skills have a positive outcome impact on employee–supervisor relationships (Bağış Öztürk & Emirza, 2021). Studies employing multiple data sources have hypothesized about similar relationships regardless of their reporting sources (O’Brien & Allen, 2007).

Drawing on the research literature (Eshet & Harpaz, 2021), our results establish that outstanding employees score significantly higher than common employees on OCB-O, which confirms H1. The reason for this may be that extra-role behavior is a strategy-based behavior that enables improvements in individual and organizational performance (Sumarmi & Tjahjono, 2021), which is associated with political skills (Chelagat et al., 2020). Individuals who score high on political skills are astute and savvy. They are characterized by their ‎ability to acknowledge the needs and interests of other people. They creates the ‎impression that they possess the means that others need to succeed, which captures ‎attention and interest (Jabid et al., 2021).

Moreover, our results show that outstanding employees score significantly higher than common employees on extroversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability, which partially confirms H2. This may be explained by these employees’ tendency and commitment to fulfill organizational needs. More specifically, these traits are connected to the psychological inclination to be sociable (extroversion), compliant, sympathetic, cooperative (agreeableness), and confident and optimistic when faced with challenging situations‎ (emotional stability).

In addition, our findings confirm that outstanding employees rate themselves higher on social astuteness than their supervisors rate them (H3). This may be because social astuteness boosts their personal ability to build ties within organizational environments (Guo et al., 2020), thereby influencing their workflow and understanding their peers’ needs and intentions (Bağış Öztürk & Emirza, 2021), which is connected to OCB. On the other hand, supervisors consider the apparent sincerity of outstanding employees to be higher than the employees’ self-reports suggest. This may be explained in terms of the commitment of these employees to performance and the sincerity of their connection with their supervisors (Bağış Öztürk & Emirza, 2021), which potentially creates confidence between them (Guo et al., 2020).

Our results do not support H4. Accordingly, there is no mediation path between personality traits, political skills, and outstanding employee performance‎. This may be explained by the fact that the main concern of outstanding employees is job performance per se; they are less interested in organizational politics and their own political skills. In other words, political skills may be dispensed with as a measure of the performance of outstanding employees.

## Practical Implications

Empirical studies have shown that scoring high on political skills benefits supervisors, employees, and workplaces (Bağış Öztürk & Emirza, 2021). Success at work requires individuals to apply and develop these competences (Ferris et al., 2002). Accordingly, a lack of these competences may lead to difficulties in achieving positive outcomes such as high job performance and positive supervisor assessments (Bağış Öztürk & Emirza, 2021). Moreover, political skills lead to positive performance outcomes at both the personal and organizational levels; it is therefore important to nurture them. Consequently, supervisors and HRMs must consider either evaluating the personality traits and political skills of potential employees during the recruitment and selection process or nurturing those skills during their employment. An additional practical recommendation supported by the findings of this study is that development programs focusing on political skills should be implemented for both managers and employees.

In summary, our study shows that employees’ political skills should be organizationally enhanced because of their extensive practical implications. Theoretical studies have indicated that political skills are a malleable asset (Hochwarter, 2018). Accordingly, employees who lack those skills should be trained to develop them. Likewise, employees who score high on political skills should be given the chance to further enrich and cultivate those skills. Accordingly, consideration should be given to professional development opportunities in the form of workshops or guided studies that make use of interpersonal influence.
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**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics for Employees and Supervisors*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Outstandingemployees | Commonemployees | Supervisors | Correlation |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | Female | 136 | 48% | 151 | 75% | 118 | 41% | 0.27\*\*\* |
| Male | 150 | 52% | 51 | 25% | 170 | 59% |
| Education | High school | 71 | 25% | 32 | 16% | 17 | 6% |  |
| Tertiary | 67 | 24% | 62 | 31% | 31 | 11% |  |
| Bachelor | 62 | 22% | 104 | 52% | 86 | 30% | 0.43\*\* |
| Master | 72 | 25% | 3 | 2% | 104 | 36% |  |
| PhD/MD | 12 | 4% | 0 | 0% | 31 | 11% |  |
| Marital status | Single | 13 | 5% | 113 | 56% | 20 | 7% |  |
| Married, no children | 2 | 1% | 18 | 9% | 0 | 0% |  |
| Married, children | 244 | 86% | 66 | 33% | 242 | 84% | 0.64\*\* |
| Divorced | 17 | 6% | 5 | 3% | 21 | 7% |  |
| Widowed | 8 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 2% |  |
| Labor union | Member | 193 | 67% | 40 | 20% | 154 | 57% | \*\*\*0.46 |
| Not a member | 94 | 33% | 157 | 80% | 118 | 43% |  |

*Note*. Outstanding employees and their supervisors, N = 288; common employees and their supervisors, N = 202. \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001.

**Table 2**

*Pearson Correlations and T-test Results*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables |  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |
| Personalitytraits | 1. Extroversion | == | .263\*\*\* | .015 | .147\* | .024 | -.001 | -.051 | .016 | .034 | -.110 | .047 | -.079 |
| 2. Agreeableness | .298\*\*\* | == | .150\* | -.008 | .177\* | .323\*\*\* | .148\* | .336\*\*\* | .101 | -.066 | .164\* | .034 |
| 3. Conscientiousness | .016 | -.022 | == | .133 | -.040 | .142\* | .031 | .062 | .068 | -.132 | .059 | -.031 |
| 4. Emotional stability | .272\*\*\* | .207\*\*\* | -.043 | == | -.217\*\* | -.099 | -.248\*\*\* | -.126 | -.243\*\* | -.072 | .023 | -0.73 |
| 5. Openness to experiences  | -.244\*\* | -.091 | -.061 | -.177\*\* | == | .265\*\*\* | .219\*\* | .283\*\*\* | .069 | .016 | .262\*\*\* | .084 |
| Politicalskills | 6. Social astuteness | .241\*\*\* | .264\*\*\* | .010 | .145\* | .103 | == | .550\*\*\* | .683\*\*\* | .199\*\* | .082 | .299\*\*\* | .124 |
| 7. Interpersonal influence | .290\*\*\* | .118\* | -.042 | .095 | .071 | .670\*\*\* | == | .600\*\*\* | .228\*\* | .052 | .175\* | .124 |
| 8. Networking ability | .333\*\*\* | .183\*\* | .055 | .114 | .014 | .653\*\*\* | .683\*\*\* | == | .180\*\* | .004 | .285\*\*\* | .172\* |
| 9. Apparent sincerity | .201\*\*\* | .293\*\*\* | .006 | .100 | -.052 | .341\*\*\* | .290\*\*\* | .370\*\*\* | == | .124 | .201\*\* | .135 |
| Performance | 10. Task performance | -.078 | -.007 | -.028 | .075 | .047 | .023 | -.002 | .014 | -0.26 | == | .286\*\*\* | .572\*\*\* |
| 11. OCB- I | -.013 | -.003 | -.033 | .077 | .101 | .119\* | .052 | .077 | -.033 | .512\*\*\* | == | .375\*\*\* |
| 12. OCB-O  | -.193\*\*\* | .078 | .021 | .016 | .059 | .002 | -.056 | -.034 | -.010 | .627\*\*\* | .486\*\*\* | == |
| Outstanding employees | Mean | 4.39 | 4.88 | 4.39 | 4.28 | 5.32 | 5.57 | 5.96 | 5.32 | 5.46 | 6.11 | 5.49 | 5.83 |
| Standard deviation | 1.09 | .84 | .82 | .85 | 1.12 | .92 | 0.93 | 1.09 | 1.06 | .74 | 1.09 | .83 |
| Common employees | Mean | 4.14 | 4.75 | 4.21 | 4.11 | 5.42 | 5.54 | 5.94 | 5.20 | 4.54 | 5.92 | 5.56 | 5.60 |
| Standard deviation  | .84 | .86 | .67 | .76 | .99 | .82 | .86 | .96 | .71 | .71 | .74 | .77 |
| Independent t-test | 2.78\*\* | 1.57 | 2.57\* | 2.24\* | -1.06 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 1.24 | 11.46\*\*\* | 2.84\*\* | -0.86 | 3.15\*\* |

*Note*. Outstanding employees and their supervisors, N = 288; common employees and their supervisors, N = 202. \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001. Correlations above the diagonal refer to common employees, and correlations below the diagonal refer to outstanding employees. The answer responses range from 1 to 7.

**Table 3**

*Paired Samples T-test Results for Political Skills of Employees and Supervisors*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Employee type | Employees | Supervisors | Correlation | T-test |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |  |  |
| Social astuteness | Outstanding | 5.57 | 0.93 | 5.35 | 1.07 | 0.145\* | 2.89\*\* |
| Common | 5.54 | 0.82 | 5.58 | 0.81 | 0.342\*\*\* | -0.51 |
| Interpersonal influence | Outstanding | 5.95 | 0.93 | 5.98 | 1.06 | 0.225\*\*\* | -0.31 |
| Common | 5.94 | 0.86 | 6.15 | 0.78 | 0.303\*\*\* | -3.13\*\* |
| Networking ability | Outstanding | 5.46 | 1.06 | 5.50 | 0.91 | 0.179\*\* | -0.48 |
| Common | 4.54 | 0.71 | 4.68 | 0.66 | 0.342\*\*\* | -2.43\* |
| Apparent sincerity | Outstanding | 5.33 | 1.12 | 5.52 | 1.12 | 0.249\*\*\* | -2.53\* |
| Common | 5.20 | 0.96 | 5.57 | 0.81 | 0.428\*\*\* | -5.53\*\*\* |

*Note.* \* *p*< 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001.

**Figure 1**

*Research Model*

**Figure 2**

*Structural Model for Determinants of Outstanding Employee Performance*

