ONLINE APPENDICES FOR "REAL-TIME PEER FEEDBACK AND ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS IN THE DIGITAL AGE: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION"

In Online Appendix A, we first present Pearson's correlation matrix for our main variables in the paper.

In Online Appendix B, we present our robustness check results for the additional analyses discussed in the paper.

ONLINE APPENDIX A

Table A1. Pair-wise Pearson Correlation Matrix of Major Feedback Variables Variable Rating 1.00 Sentiment 0.16 1.00 Rating_Given 0.01*** -0.09 1.00 0.14** Team Size 0.23* 1.00 0.03*** Function Size -0.02* 0.17 1.00 0.08 0.26 Same_Team 0.01* 0.01* 0.04** 0.00 0.05 1.00 0.05** 0.09** Same Location 0.09** 0.08*** 1.00 0.02*** 0.14*** 0.04** Same_Function -0.01 0.33** 0.35** 0.14*** 0.58** 1.00 0.08*** *TitForTat* 0.03*** 0.18*** 0.08* 0.11** 0.00 0.06** 0.00 1.00 0.17**

Standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

ONLINE APPENDIX B

Table B1. Impact of Organizational Size & Work Proximity on Rating Scores & Sentiment, Using Instrumental Variable Approach

Variables	Same Team	Rating	Sentiment
	First Stage of 2SLS	Second Stage	of 2SLS
CEO_Change	0.937*** [0.008]		
Team_Size	0.013*** [0.000]	-0.015*** [0.001]	0.004*** [0.001]
Function_Size	0.008*	-0.003 [0.001]	0.006 [0.069]
Same_Team (Instrumented)		0.005* [0.083]	0.0002** [0.006]
Same_Function	0.154*** [0.009]	-0.150*** [0.029]	-0.016*** [0.004]
Same_Location	0.788*** [0.009]	-0.834*** [0.090]	0.008** [0.011]
Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B2. Impact of Organizational Size & Work Proximity on Rating Scores & Sentiment, with Additional Control Variables

0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		
Variables	Rating	Sentiment
Team_Size	-0.002***	0.003***
	[0.001]	[0.001]
Function_Size	-0.001	0.002
	[0.001]	[0.0006]
Same_Team	0.008	-0.0002
	[0.020]	[0.006]
Same_Function	-0.112***	-0.042***
	[0.017]	[0.004]
Same_Location	-0.314***	0.005***
	[0.042]	[0.011]
Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B3. Impact of Culture Profile Scores on Rating Scores using O'Reilly's Original OCP

OCP Variable	Rater	Ratee
Aggressiveness	0.098***	0.060*
(Competitiveness)	[0.017]	[0.009]
Respect for People	0.032***	0.108
(Social Responsibility)	[0.009]	[0.012]
Supportiveness	0.087***	0.047**
(Supportiveness)	[0.019]	[0.008]
Innovation	-0.130***	-0.033
(Innovation)	[0.022]	[0.008]
Team Orientation	0.027**	0.0005
(People and Equity)	[0.013]	[0.011]
Emphasis on Reward	-0.058***	0.070*
(Performance Oriented)	[0.012]	[0.014]
Stability	0.125**	0.133***
(Stability)	[0.015]	[0.018]
Weekly-Level Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Employee-Level Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B4. Random Trend Model for External Factors

Variables	Rating	Sentiment
Town Ciro	-0.004***	0.003***
Team_Size	[0.001]	[0.001]
Enmation Size	-0.007*	0.001
Function_Size	[0.001]	[0.0006]
Cama Tagm	0.007	0.0003
Same_Team	[0.025]	[0.007]
Same_Function	-0.043***	-0.027***
	[0.016]	[0.005]
Same_Location	-0.113***	0.033***
	[0.002]	[0.007]
Employee-Level	Yes	Yes
Fixed Effects	i es	Y es
Controls	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B5. Random Trend Model for Internal OCP Factors

Tuble B3: Rundom 11 end Wioder for Internal Get 1 actors			
Rater	Ratee		
0. 097***	0.063*		
[0.017]	[0.009]		
0.032***	0.108		
[0.009]	[0.012]		
0.087***	0.047**		
[0.019]	[0.008]		
-0.128***	-0.048		
[0.022]	[0.009]		
0.025**	0.008		
[0.013]	[0.012]		
-0.058***	0.070*		
[0.012]	[0.014]		
0.125**	0.133***		
[0.015]	[0.018]		
Yes	Yes		
Yes	Yes		
	0. 097*** [0.017] 0.032*** [0.009] 0.087*** [0.019] -0.128*** [0.022] 0.025** [0.013] -0.058*** [0.012] 0.125** [0.015] Yes		

Robust standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B6. Random Trend Model for Internal WC Factors

WC Variables	Rater	Ratee
Communication Skills	-0.143*	-0.005
Communication Skins	[0.015]	[0.017]
Financial Influence	-0.758***	0.659**
r manciai influence	[0.106]	[0.112]
Landarahin Strilla	0.175***	0.122***
Leadership Skills	[0.016]	[0.015]
Landing Change	-0.072***	0.109**
Leading Change	[0.005]	[0.017]
Training & Davidanment	0.134***	0.101***
Training & Development	[0.018]	[0.022]
Employee-Level Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes

Robust standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B7. Impact of Organizational Size & Work Proximity on Rating Scores & Sentiment, with Comments

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	with comments		
Variables	Rating	Sentiment		
T C:	-0.003***	0.002***		
Team_Size	[0.001]	[0.001]		
Expedien Size	0.002	0.001		
Function_Size	[0.001]	[0.0004]		
Cama Tagm	0.005	0.0001		
Same_Team	[0.023]	[0.003]		
Com a Francisco	-0.052***	-0.010***		
Same_Function	[0.014]	[0.004]		
Carre I a satissa	-0.061***	0.023***		
Same_Location	[0.023]	[0.006]		
Weekly-Level Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes		
Employee-Level				
Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes		
Controls	Yes	Yes		

Robust standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B8. Impact of Organizational Size and Work Proximity on Rating Scores and Sentiment from Advance Reviewer

-0.033*** [0.001] -0.002 [0.001]	0.003*** [0.001] 0.001 [0.0006]
-0.002	0.001
[0.001]	[0.0006]
0.006	-0.0006
[0.013]	[0.003]
-0.029**	-0.005**
[0.014]	[0.004]
-0.054***	0.023***
[0.027]	[0.006]
Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes
Yes	Yes
	[0.013] -0.029** [0.014] -0.054*** [0.027] Yes Yes

Robust Standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table B9. Impact of Organizational Size and Work Proximity on Rating Scores with Lag Values

Variables	Rating	Rating with 7-day Lag
Team Size	-0.003***	-0.001***
	[0.001]	[0.001]
Function Size	0.002	0.004
_	[0.001]	[0.003]
Same Team	0.005	0.007
_	[0.023]	[0.003]
Same Function	-0.052***	-0.031***
_	[0.014]	[0.009]
Same Location	-0.061***	-0.088***
_	[0.023]	[0.001]
Weekly-Level Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Employee-Level Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes
Controls	Yes	Yes

Robust Standard errors in brackets; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1