



Better Together: Member Proactivity Is Better for Team Performance When Aligned with Conscientiousness

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Discoveries</i>
Manuscript ID	AMD-2021-0208.R2
Manuscript Type:	Revision
Keywords:	Team Composition < Interpersonal & Team Processes, Personality < Individual Differences, Proaction < Individual Differences, Team Development & Building < Interpersonal & Team Processes
Abstract:	<p>Proactivity, the tendency to create change in the work environment, typically improves team performance. This relationship is far from perfect, however. We explore inconsistencies in the team proactivity literature to shed light on an important question – when is member proactivity beneficial or dysfunctional for teams? First, we consider the composition of member proactivity at the team level and whether a simple ‘more is better’ heuristic neglects a more complex relationship linking member proactivity to team coordination and performance. Second, we explore whether proactivity is better when aligned with another individual difference focused on the propensity to plan and coordinate with others (i.e., conscientiousness). In two studies, we compare traditional additive and configurational compositional approaches to these two attributes with a new attribute alignment approach, allowing us to examine the co-occurrence of proactivity and conscientiousness within some team members relative to others. First, we find that team member proactivity-conscientiousness alignment (P-C alignment) predicts the performance of MBA consulting teams better than the other team composition models we considered. Then, we replicate this finding in a laboratory simulation, finding that it occurs because P-C alignment improves team coordination. Our results demonstrate that member proactivity is most effective for the team when it aligns with conscientiousness.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Better Together: Member Proactivity Is Better for Team Performance When Aligned with Conscientiousness

8
9
10
11
12

Kyle J. Emich*

University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
kemich@udel.edu

13
14
15
16
17

Li Lu

West Chester University
West Chester, PA 19383

18
19
20
21
22

Amanda Ferguson

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

23
24
25
26
27

Randall Peterson

London Business School
Marylebone, London, UK

28
29
30
31
32

Michael McCourt

Intel
2200 Mission College Blvd, Santa Clara, CA, 95054

33
34
35
36
37

Sean Martin

University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA, 22903

38
39
40
41
42

Elizabeth McClean

Cornell University
Ithaca, NY, 14853

43
44
45
46
47

Col. Todd Woodruff

United States Military Academy
West Point, NY, 10996

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

*Please direct all correspondence to Dr. Kyle J. Emich

BETTER TOGETHER: MEMBER PROACTIVITY IS BETTER FOR TEAM PERFORMANCE WHEN ALIGNED WITH CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

ABSTRACT

Proactivity, the tendency to create change in the work environment, typically improves team performance. This relationship is far from perfect, however. We explore inconsistencies in the team proactivity literature to shed light on an important question – when is member proactivity beneficial or dysfunctional for teams? First, we consider the composition of member proactivity at the team level and whether a simple ‘more is better’ heuristic neglects a more complex relationship linking member proactivity to team coordination and performance. Second, we explore whether proactivity is better when aligned with another individual difference focused on the propensity to plan and coordinate with others (i.e., conscientiousness). In two studies, we compare traditional additive and configurational compositional approaches to these two attributes with a new attribute alignment approach, allowing us to examine the co-occurrence of proactivity and conscientiousness within some team members relative to others. First, we find that team member proactivity-conscientiousness alignment (P-C alignment) predicts the performance of MBA consulting teams better than the other team composition models we considered. Then, we replicate this finding in a laboratory simulation, finding that it occurs because P-C alignment improves team coordination. Our results demonstrate that member proactivity is most effective for the team when it aligns with conscientiousness.

Teams in organizations perform their work in increasingly dynamic and uncertain contexts (Mathieu, Gallagher, Domingo, & Klock, 2019; Wageman, Gardner, & Mortensen, 2012). Particularly important for team effectiveness, therefore, is the question of how to create teams that are proactive in anticipating and solving problems, rather than simply being reactive or responsive only when directed (Harris & Kirkman, 2017). The construct of proactivity has emerged to explain this distinction, referring to teams and their members who have the tendency to bring about self-initiated and future-focused change in the work environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Parker, Bindl, & Strauss, 2010; Williams, Parker, & Turner, 2010).

In highly dynamic environments, however, the distinction of initiating versus responding to change is not enough. Teams must not only initiate change-focused activity, but also coordinate that activity with few process losses (e.g., Steiner, 1972). After all, simply adding more future-focused activity in a team is not helpful if it is not coordinated. As Williams et al.,

1
2
3 (2010) argue, “individuals within a team might behave proactively, such as by introducing new
4 methods, but unless this effort is coordinated, the team itself might not be proactive” (p. 302).
5
6

7
8 For that reason, we question the assumption supporting much of the existing literature:
9
10 that effective team proactivity is best understood as the simple total of individual members’
11 proactivity (cf. Zhang, Li, & Gong, 2021). In this paper, we explore alternatives to this ‘more is
12 better’ approach for considering how the composition of individual team members’ proactivity
13 affects team performance through the coordination of the team’s resources. Particularly, this
14 approach neglects the complex and multilevel nature of teams themselves (Mathieu et al., 2019),
15 resulting in mixed findings regarding the utility of member proactivity. While member
16 proactivity is generally beneficial for organizational teams (e.g., Lam, Lee, Taylor, & Zhao,
17 2018; Strauss, Griffin, & Rafferty, 2009; Williams et al., 2010), there are anomalies in that a
18 significant number of studies have found no relationship between member proactivity and team
19 performance (e.g., Chiu, Owens, & Tesluk, 2016), while others have found having too many
20 proactive members does not help team performance (e.g., Zhang et al., 2021).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Intriguingly, recent research considering this complexity finds that the positive effects of
36 member proactivity on team effectiveness depend on the diversity of proactivity within the team
37 rather than the mean level (Zhang et al., 2021). These scholars suggest that a complementarity
38 approach to member proactivity, where highly proactive members define strategy while less
39 proactive members follow that strategy, may help teams coordinate to enact constructive change.
40 However, there is a significant and unexplored assumption supporting this complementarity
41 argument; specifically, that the team members who are more proactive will also engage in the
42 planning and organization necessary to coordinate with others. This assumption may or may not
43 be true, and the degree to which it is or is not the case could help account for the differing
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 findings considering how proactivity relates to team performance. After all, careful planning
4 helps individuals to use their proactivity “wisely” in social contexts (Parker et al., 2019). For that
5
6 reason, if there is an absence of planning, proactive team members are likely to cause team
7
8 coordination failures by engaging in behaviors that are considered inappropriate, ill-timed, and
9
10 ineffective (Chan, 2006; Grant & Ashford, 2008).
11
12
13

14
15 We decided to explore this assumption considering team members’ tendencies to plan as
16
17 well as their proactivity to help us better understand when and why member proactivity benefits
18
19 teams. To capture team member tendencies for planning, we turn to conscientiousness, one of the
20
21 Big Five traits in the Five Factor Model of personality (Digman, 1990). Conscientiousness
22
23 describes individuals who are purposeful, prepared, organized, and deliberate in accomplishing
24
25 goals (McCrae & Costa, 2010). Conscientiousness positively predicts job performance and
26
27 leadership across a wide variety of contexts (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Bono, Ilies, &
28
29 Gerhardt, 2002), and is positively associated with situational judgment and contextual
30
31 performance in individual and team settings (Cabrera & Nguyen, 2001; Chan & Schmitt, 2002;
32
33 Morgeson, Reider, & Campion, 2005; Whetzel & McDaniel, 2009). As such, member
34
35 conscientiousness should help teams better engage in a comprehensive and coordinated process
36
37 of proactivity, which includes both anticipation of future change and planning to coordinate
38
39 efforts to implement actions that generate that change (Grant & Ashford, 2008).
40
41
42
43

44
45 The team composition literature contains several plausible conjectures as to how
46
47 proactivity and conscientiousness might best come together among team members (e.g., Chan,
48
49 1998; Emich, Lu, Ferguson, Peterson, & McCourt, 2022; Mathieu, Tannenbaum, Donsbach, &
50
51 Alliger, 2014). We explore the four most widely adopted team composition models here, where
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 each model contains distinct theoretical assumptions about the ideal configurations of proactivity
4 and conscientiousness.
5
6

7
8 First, we explore the most frequently used model of team composition, the additive
9 model (Chan, 1998), which assumes that having a large reserve of proactivity and
10 conscientiousness, usually in the form of respective mean levels, is enough to develop effective
11 team-level coordination and performance. Second, we explore whether simply having one highly
12 proactive and one highly conscientious member, in the form of respective maximum values, is
13 enough for a team to leverage their complementary benefits. Third, we ask whether having
14 dispersed proactivity and conscientiousness on a team, in the form of respective variances, is
15 enough for its proactive members to dictate strategy while others follow, improving coordination
16 and performance. Fourth, we ask if teams coordinate and perform better when proactivity and
17 conscientiousness coexist within some team members relative to others, creating attribute
18 alignment within members across the team (Emich et al., 2022). We examine these conjectures
19 abductively, using a combination of exploratory and confirmatory tests over multiple studies to
20 select the best explanation from several plausible but competing explanations (e.g., Mantere &
21 Ketokivi, 2013; Martin, Harrison, Hoopes, Schroeder, & Belmi, 2022; Mueller, 2018; Sætre &
22 Van de Ven, 2021).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Specifically, to examine the independent and simultaneous effects of proactivity and
43 conscientiousness on team coordination and performance, we conduct two studies: a field study
44 of MBA consulting teams and a controlled laboratory simulation. In both, we examine the
45 theoretical assumptions of each of the four team composition models suggesting how member
46 proactivity and conscientiousness combine to create effective team-level coordination and
47 performance. Our findings point to the value of considering proactivity in combination with
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conscientiousness, while recognizing that the configuration of these attributes matters.
4
5 Specifically, we find that teams perform better when their members who are more proactive are
6
7 also more conscientious, while their less conscientious members are also less proactive, and that
8
9 this alignment matters significantly more than the amount of proactivity or conscientiousness
10
11 present in a team.
12
13

14
15 Along the way, we explore different ‘patterns’ of alignment versus unalignment and map
16
17 them across team members, providing a new way of visualizing team composition. Additionally,
18
19 our second study demonstrates that P-C aligned teams outperform P-C unaligned teams because
20
21 they are better at team-level coordination, offering evidence for a key process criterion to
22
23 proactivity research (Lu et al., 2023; Williams et al., 2010; Wu, Parker, Wu, & Lee, 2018; Zhang
24
25 et al., 2021). Taken together, we discover that teams where proactivity and conscientiousness
26
27 align are more coordinated and perform better than teams where these attributes do not align. We
28
29 conclude by discussing how these emergent findings inform scholarly research on team
30
31 composition and processes, while also surfacing practically important implications for teams.
32
33

34 35 **PROACTIVITY AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS AMONG TEAM MEMBERS**

36
37 We focus on proactivity and conscientiousness as stable individual differences that affect
38
39 individual behavior and may vary across the individuals who comprise teams. Proactivity in this
40
41 sense, or proactive personality, is defined as “the relatively stable tendency to effect
42
43 environmental change” (Bateman & Crant, 1993, p. 103). People high in proactivity scan for
44
45 opportunities and show initiative in bringing about change (Bateman & Crant, 1993), which can
46
47 include behaviors such as feedback seeking (Ashford & Cummings, 1983), building social
48
49 networks (Morrison, 1993; Thompson, 2005), exchanging information (Gong, Cheung, Wang, &
50
51 Huang, 2012), innovating, gaining political knowledge, taking career initiative (Seibert, Kraimer,
52
53 & Crant, 2001) and championing issues (Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Dutton, Ashford, O’Neill, &
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lawrence, 2001). Proactivity also extends across multiple contexts, which can include efforts
4 directed toward an individual's work unit or team. For example, proactive individuals may
5 suggest new work methods for their teams, anticipate future problems rather than reacting to
6 them, or identify opportunities for the team (Williams et al., 2010).
7
8
9
10
11

12 Despite some evidence of a generally positive relationship between proactive personality
13 and effectiveness for both individuals (Fuller & Marler, 2009) and teams (Lam et al., 2018;
14 Williams et al., 2010), one concern with proactivity from a team composition standpoint is that
15 having too many proactive people on a team is likely to result in lack of coordination. This is a
16 logical outcome when every team member is proactive, as the actions of proactive teammates are
17 often directed towards implementing different changes (Harris & Kirkman, 2017; Williams et al.,
18 2010; Zhang et al., 2021). Moreover, proactive team members are likely to pursue these different
19 directions even in the face of teammate opposition (Bateman & Crant, 1993). As such, recent
20 work suggests that having some proactive team members and some team members who are not
21 proactive may constitute an ideal team proactivity composition (Zhang et al., 2021).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Although diversity in proactivity may help teams, coordination problems may persist if
36 those who are proactive are unable to effectively plan their change initiatives. For example,
37 proactive individuals are focused on "making things happen", but this may not always be
38 beneficial without carefully considering task and strategic elements of the situation (Parker et al.,
39 2019). When individuals do not consider these situational demands, their proactivity can be
40 ineffective because it is not pursued realistically (Chan, 2006; Sun & van Emmerik, 2015). As
41 such, the emphasis on order, dutifulness, and planning associated with conscientiousness
42 (McCrae & Costa, 2010) may help to orient proactivity to the situational context. It may also
43 enable the planning and organization necessary to coordinate any anticipated changes with
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 teammates, as coordinated action is positively associated with conscientiousness in teams
4
5 (Gevers & Peeters, 2009).
6

7
8 Although proactivity and conscientiousness tend to be modestly correlated, they are
9
10 conceptually distinct and predict different outcomes (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Crant, 1995;
11
12 Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006; Neal, Yeo, Koy, & Xiao, 2012). These attributes are similar in
13
14 that both proactivity and conscientiousness are characterized by self-directed activity towards
15
16 achieving goals (Barrick, Mount, & Strauss, 1993; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006). However,
17
18 proactivity centers on bringing about change, and involves envisioning possible future events
19
20 and outcomes (Grant & Ashford, 2008), whereas conscientiousness centers on bringing
21
22 organization and structure to situations generally, which may or may not involve change
23
24 (McCrae & Costa, 2010; Neuberg & Newsom, 1993). Indeed, conscientious members that are
25
26 not proactive may also limit their teams, especially in dynamic environments, for example if they
27
28 are inflexible or narrow-minded when it comes to adopting new team strategies (Bradley, Klotz,
29
30 Postlethwaite, & Brown, 2013). Proactivity and conscientiousness may thus complement one
31
32 another such that the emphasis on change and foreseeing future opportunities gained from
33
34 proactivity provides a compelling focus for the planning and preparation inherent in
35
36 conscientiousness.
37
38
39
40

41
42 At the team level, however, it is unclear how member proactivity and conscientiousness
43
44 should come together to allow the team to effectively coordinate and thus perform well, as
45
46 different theoretical and empirical approaches provide different recommendations. To explore
47
48 this, we describe conjectures from four different team composition approaches that could be used
49
50 to answer this question, outlining their unique theoretical assumptions and methodological
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 operationalizations. Then, we examine how these different configurations of member proactivity
4 and conscientiousness relate to team coordination and performance across two empirical studies.
5
6

7 **DIFFERENT THEORETICAL CONFIGURATIONS OF MEMBER PROACTIVITY** 8 **AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS** 9

10
11 Our arguments above articulate the theoretical idea that, to be effective, teams need
12 members who are both proactive and conscientious. Now, we consider conjectures from several
13 different team composition models to explore the most effective way to arrange these constructs
14 within teams – including traditional approaches, which comprise team-level assessments of
15 attributes, and a new attribute alignment approach to team composition, which integrates
16 individual-level and team-level assessments of attributes (Emich et al., 2022).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Traditional Team Composition Approaches** 25

26 Mathieu et al. (2014) explain that team composition models have traditionally focused on
27 either individual attributes that are aggregated to the team level (i.e., personnel models that
28 consider individual knowledge, skills, or abilities that would benefit teamwork) or on assessing
29 patterns or configurations of individual attributes (i.e., team profile models or relative
30 contribution models: e.g., team diversity or minimum/maximum scores on attributes). The first
31 approach commonly emphasizes additive models of attributes of interest (e.g., mean levels of
32 proactivity) whereas the second considers other configurations of attributes of interest (e.g.,
33 proactivity dispersion or the team maximum score). Both approaches, however, are inherently
34 variable-centered where each attribute is considered first as a team-level distribution in some
35 form (Emich et al., 2022).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The most widely applied composition approach is the additive approach suggesting
50 “more is better” when it comes to desirable knowledge, skills, and abilities, and thus it is more
51 valuable for a team to contain higher overall levels of desirable attributes (Mathieu et al., 2014).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 From this perspective, proactivity and conscientiousness are both considered desirable attributes
4 for teams (e.g., Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998; Chiu et al., 2016; Hyatt & Ruddy,
5 1997; Neuman & Wright, 1999; Williams et al., 2010). Thus, this approach assumes that teams
6 benefit from generally higher levels of proactivity and conscientiousness among team members
7 rather than low levels of these attributes. And, although magnitudes of these attributes
8 considered independently might benefit teams, their joint consideration may illuminate their
9 complementarity, i.e., this approach may theoretically assume that teams with higher amounts of
10 *both* conscientiousness and proactivity perform better than teams with high amounts of only one
11 or the other.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 A second well-established team composition approach involves considering patterns of
25 team member attributes at the team level, such as their variability or the impact of one very high
26 or very low scoring member, on team processes or outcomes (e.g., Barrick et al., 1998; Emich &
27 Lu, 2017; Ferguson & Peterson, 2015; Humphrey, Hollenbeck, Meyer, & Ilgen, 2007; Neuman,
28 Wagner, & Christiansen, 1999). For example, we could examine whether having at least one
29 person who is proactive will benefit the team because that person fulfills the need to initiate
30 constructive change and whether having at least one person who is conscientious will benefit the
31 team because that person fulfills the need to plan and organize activities related to implementing
32 that change. Alternatively, we could examine relative scores across team members by
33 considering the dispersion of these attributes. For example, in line with findings from previous
34 research, complementarity of member proactivity and similarity in conscientiousness may
35 positively influence team effectiveness (e.g., Barrick et al., 1998; Gevers & Peeters, 2009; Grant,
36 Gino, & Hofmann, 2011; Zhang et al., 2021). These approaches are consistent with relative
37 contribution models of team composition (Mathieu et al., 2014) and previous research
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 highlighting the tendency for personality traits to correspond to task and process-related roles in
4 group settings (Barry & Stewart, 1997; Stewart, Fulmer, & Barrick, 2005).
5
6

7
8 These traditional approaches to team composition carry certain assumptions. First, the
9 additive approach and the maximum configurational approach suggest that it does not matter
10 who is conscientious or proactive on the team (or how these attributes are distributed relative to
11 each other) as long as those attributes are present. Additionally, both assume that “more is
12 better”, whether all team members contribute to high attribute levels (e.g., via mean levels) or
13 specific individuals do (e.g., via maximum scores). Configurational approaches using dispersion
14 do acknowledge the importance of complementarity or similarity among members, and therefore
15 the potential value of low scores on these attributes. However, like other traditional approaches,
16 these only consider one attribute across team members at a time (e.g., a team-level dispersion
17 score on proactivity and a team-level dispersion score on conscientiousness).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Yet, there is reason to believe that it may matter whether multiple attributes occur *within*
32 team members in the context of their teammates (e.g., whether team members score high or low
33 on *both proactivity and conscientiousness*, relative to the rest of the team). To explore this
34 possibility, we turn to a new team composition approach that allows us to model multiple
35 attributes both within and across team members – the attribute alignment approach to team
36 composition (Emich et al., 2022).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Attribute Alignment Approach to Team Composition**

45
46 The alignment approach allows us to examine the possibility that the alignment of
47 proactivity and conscientiousness may be important, such that the members of the team who are
48 proactive are also conscientious (and the team members who are not conscientious are not
49 proactive). This approach generally assumes that the expression of individual team member
50 attributes changes as a function of other within-person attributes, and thus simultaneously
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 examining the configuration of member attributes before aggregating them to the team level may
4 offer additional insight into how multiple compositional attributes influence team processes
5
6 (Emich et al., 2022; in press). Specifically, when team members who are proactive are also
7
8 conscientious, they may be more likely to propose actions to bring about change and engage in
9
10 careful planning with respect to the actions they propose. Alternatively, members who score low
11
12 on these attributes may be flexible in accepting the proposed changes and planning initiated by
13
14 others, allowing for effective team coordination. Indeed, people who score low on both attributes
15
16 should be reliant on others to take initiative (Bateman & Crant, 1993) and be easy-going in
17
18 accepting direction from others (McCrae & Costa, 2010).
19
20
21
22
23

24 Instead, if some team members are proactive but not conscientious, while others are
25
26 conscientious but not proactive, there may be difficulties in coordinating anticipated changes.
27
28 For example, team members who are proactive but not conscientious may drive risk-taking to
29
30 bring about change, but a lack of planning and situational judgment may make their proposed
31
32 changes ill-advised, poorly timed, or ineffective (Chan, 2006; Grant & Ashford, 2008; Parker et
33
34 al., 2019). Similarly, team members who are conscientiousness but not proactive may use their
35
36 dutiful planning to improve and implement existing team processes, instead of seeing a different
37
38 future-oriented state which may include risk taking, innovating, or rule-breaking to create
39
40 necessary change (Miron-Spektor et al., 2022; Morrison, 2006; Robert & Cheung, 2010). Thus,
41
42 when high levels of conscientiousness and proactivity exist in different team members (i.e., there
43
44 is unalignment of these attributes), team members may work against each other as they focus on
45
46 different activities. Because of the potential for conscientiousness to influence the expression of
47
48 proactivity within individual team members, considering P-C alignment may help to explain
49
50 when team member proactivity is beneficial.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

We explored how these different team composition models of member proactivity and conscientiousness influence team coordination and performance in two studies. First, we conducted an exploratory study of MBA teams completing a consulting project in which they gathered and analyzed data, proposed recommendations, and presented their findings to client organizations. The ambiguity and uncertainty associated with consulting for real-world clients provided an ideal context in which to examine the proposed benefits of member proactivity and conscientiousness for team performance. Second, we conducted a confirmatory study of teams completing a decision-making simulation in which they exchanged information, balanced individual and collective goals, and adapted to changing task conditions in a laboratory setting. This study provided more situational control in terms of team tasks and greater opportunity to observe team behaviors including coordination as well as team performance.

STUDY 1: MBA CONSULTING TEAMS

Participants and Procedure

Our sample comes from an ongoing data collection effort to examine team composition and outcomes among MBA students at a graduate business school in the United Kingdom. Our sample includes 610 individuals assigned to 92 teams of between five and eight members ($M = 6.63$, $SD = .60$). Of these, 539 (88%) provided usable data on all measures. Individuals were assigned to teams by the MBA program office with the intent to maximize diversity in functional expertise and nationality. They represented 64 countries, led by the United States (103), India (68), and the United Kingdom (65), and 467 companies across 16 industries. Their average age was 28.41 years ($SD = 2.33$), 76% were male, and they had average work experience of 5.55 years ($SD = 2.07$). Teams were assigned at the start of the students' first academic term in the

1
2
3 MBA program and remained intact for one calendar year. Students completed all group project
4
5 work across courses in these assigned teams.
6

7
8 The first week of the academic term was devoted to leadership assessment and training,
9
10 where students received feedback on a personality inventory and 360-degree feedback ratings
11
12 that were collected prior to the start of the MBA program. During this week, they completed
13
14 several activities with their newly assigned teams (e.g., a team agreement exercise and a day-
15
16 long business simulation). They then completed the first term of academic courses, and in the
17
18 second academic term the teams sourced and completed major consulting projects for external
19
20 organizations. Team grades on this group project serve as team performance data and were
21
22 assigned by the professors of the course, neither of whom were a part of this study, nor were they
23
24 aware of our research questions.
25
26
27

28 **Measures**

29
30 ***Proactivity.*** Members of the students' former organizations provided ratings of
31
32 proactivity in the form of 360-degree feedback. In the summer prior to beginning the MBA
33
34 program, each student asks members of his or her former organization to provide structured
35
36 feedback via a 360-degree survey administered by an outside provider. Through this process,
37
38 former peers, supervisors, and subordinates provide feedback, of which four items were
39
40 identified as an appropriate measure for proactivity (described below). Although we were unable
41
42 to collect self-report ratings of proactivity, ratings of personality attributes by others who are
43
44 familiar with the person being rated (e.g., through observations and past experiences) tend to
45
46 have high agreement with self-ratings, both generally (Funder & Colvin, 1988) and for
47
48 proactivity in particular (Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999). Five hundred thirty-nine of the 610
49
50 team members had usable 360-degree feedback evaluations from 2,931 external raters (a rate of
51
52 88%), which represents an average of 5.44 raters per person.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Four items from the 360-degree feedback survey were used to measure proactivity: “Is
4 adaptable and responsive to new situations”, “Is able to motivate and energize others”, “Has a
5 high degree of personal energy”, “and “Enjoys change”. These items were rated on a 1 (*Very*
6 *ineffective, one of his/her least developed skills. A definite gap in his/her skill set*), to 5 (*Very*
7 *effective, one of his/her most successful skills. He/she acts as a role model for others*) scale ($\alpha =$
8 $.79$). These items are consistent with the definition of proactive individuals as those who “scan
9 for opportunities, show initiative, take action, and persevere until they reach closure by bringing
10 about change” (Bateman & Crant, 1993, p. 105). However, we further validated these items in
11 two ways. First, we followed other recent studies to establish content validity (e.g.,
12 Nurmohamed, 2020) by sharing these four items with six well-published personality scholars for
13 review. All rated these four items combined as embodying proactive personality more than other
14 plausibly-related personality constructs including openness, extraversion, self-monitoring, and
15 narcissism. We also followed procedures by Schaumberg and Flynn (2012) and Jones and Shah
16 (2016) to show convergent validity with Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer’s (1999) established
17 measure of proactive personality, which is a shortened version of Bateman and Crant’s (1993)
18 measure of proactive personality (example items: “Has been a powerful voice for constructive
19 change”, and “Is always looking for better ways to do things”). We surveyed 143 participants on
20 Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (73% Male; 60% White, 36% Asian, 4% Other Ethnicity).
21 Participants were asked to consider a current or recent team leader (e.g., at work, at a recreational
22 league, or another project) and answer questions about that person. They completed our 360-
23 feedback measure and Seibert and colleagues’ (1999) measure with their chosen leader in mind,
24 as well as a series of filler measures. Our four-item measure strongly and positively correlated
25 with Seibert, Crant and Kraimer’s (1999) proactivity items ($r = .80, p < .01$). This correlation is
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 comparable with those in other recent studies that follow this method to provide convergent
4 validity (Jones & Shah, 2016; Schaumberg & Flynn, 2012). These procedures gave us
5 confidence in using the 360-degree feedback ratings on these four items as a reasonable measure
6 of proactivity (Individual-level: $M = 3.95$, $SD = .37$; Team-level: $M = 3.93$, $SD = .15$).
7
8
9

10
11
12 ***Conscientiousness.*** Prior to beginning the MBA program, students completed the 240-
13 item NEO-PIR Inventory (McCrae & Costa, 2010), of which 48 items measured
14 conscientiousness ($\alpha = .89$) (Chan, 1998). Individual-level: $M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.37$; Team-level M
15 = 3.66, $SD = 0.16$.
16
17
18
19
20

21 ***Team performance.*** We assessed team performance as team grades on the major
22 consulting project for the core Organizational Behavior course, completed after nine months of
23 working together. In this project, teams worked with outside organizations to design and
24 implement a consulting project that would benefit the focal organization. This task required
25 teams to work interdependently to complete multiple activities associated with the consulting
26 engagement (e.g., meeting with the client, formulating plans, conducting research and analysis,
27 and presenting their results and recommendations). Examples of consulting projects include
28 assessing the performance of local bus service to the school, advising a local start-up how to
29 establish a culture of motivation in their employees, and working with a moderate-size division
30 of a large multinational company to understand why employee turnover was so high for mid-
31 level managers but not for others. The final deliverable was a presentation to the client
32 organization and a culminating project report, graded by the professor of the course with
33 feedback from the client organizations – none of whom were involved in or aware of this study.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

overall grades in the course ($M = 41.33$, $SD = 2.85$, Range = 34-48). A Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that these performance scores were normally distributed, $W(92) = .98$, $p = .21$.

Control variables. Because teams were not randomly assigned, we included two control variables that could potentially influence their grades on the consulting project: mean GMAT score, indicating additive collective cognitive ability, and class year (i.e., dummy coded) since different faculty members taught the course each year of our study¹.

Analytical Approaches

Additive and configurational approaches to conscientiousness-proactivity composition. Commensurate with the four plausible configurations of team proactivity and conscientiousness, we aggregated member proactivity and conscientiousness to the team level using team means, maximum scores, and standard deviations (Chan, 1998; Mathieu et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2021). We also consider the interaction terms between team means, standard deviations, and maximums in our analysis.

Alignment approach to proactivity-conscientiousness composition. We followed Emich et al. (2022) by calculating the Euclidian distance between proactivity and conscientiousness vectors (comprising attribute scores across all team members), accounting for team size. Specifically, we calculated P-C alignment using the equation below, where K indicates the alignment of two attributes x and z , and d indicates team size. This resultant term is referred to as a vector norm distance. For more details of this method, see Emich et al. (2022).

$$K(x, z) = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - z_i|^2 \right)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{d}}$$

¹ Note that our results are the same in terms of signs and significance levels with and without these control variables. In robustness checks, we also ran all models controlling for mean age, gender diversity, and ethnic diversity and our results were unchanged.

1
2
3 In this study, proactivity and conscientiousness had equivalent variances as measured, F
4 = .97, $p = .74$, so no transformation was needed prior to calculating alignment (Emich et al.,
5
6
7
8 2022).

9 10 **Results**

11 Descriptive statistics and correlations between individual and team-level proactivity,
12 conscientiousness, and performance can be seen in Table 1. We tested the different
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

---Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here---

First, in Model 1, we considered a traditional additive model by exploring whether a
team's mean level of proactivity and conscientiousness relate to its performance. Mean
proactivity negatively related to team performance ($B = -4.53$, $SE = 2.00$, $t = -2.27$, $p = .03$), and
there were no effects of mean conscientiousness ($B = 0.86$, $SE = 1.89$, $t = .45$, $p = .65$; Model 1).
This indicates that, in general, teams with members who had a greater tendency to make self-
initiated efforts to bring about change performed worse than teams whose members had less of
this tendency. Model 2 shows that the interaction between mean level proactivity and
conscientiousness did not impact team performance ($B = 18.24$, $SE = 11.23$, $t = 1.63$, $p = .11$),
however the negative effect of mean proactivity remained significant ($B = -4.15$, $SE = 2.00$, $t = -$
 2.08 , $p = .04$).

Next, we explored a configurational explanation of team composition by examining
whether having high member proactivity and conscientiousness within the team (but not
necessarily in the same team member), measured using maximum scores, related to team
performance. Model 3 reveals that neither maximum proactivity ($B = -1.88$, $SE = 1.27$, $t = -1.49$,
 $p = .14$) nor maximum conscientious ($B = 1.72$, $SE = 1.46$, $t = 1.18$, $p = .24$) related to team

1
2
3 performance. Their interaction also did not relate to team performance ($B = -3.58$, $SE = 5.79$, $t =$
4
5 -0.62 , $p = .54$; Model 4). Finally, exploring configurations using diversity in these attributes
6
7 shows that neither the standard deviation of proactivity (Model 5: $B = -1.04$, $SE = 2.54$, $t = -0.41$ p
8
9 $= .68$) nor conscientiousness (Model 5: $B = 1.97$, $SE = 2.43$, $t = .81$, $p = .42$) nor their interaction
10
11 (Model 6: $B = 6.85$, $SE = 19.70$, $t = .35$, $p = .73$) significantly accounted for team performance.
12
13 Models 1-6 also indicate that although the additive model did account for additional variance
14
15 over the control model ($\Delta R^2 = .09$, $p = .049$) standard deviations and maximums did not, as the
16
17 change in R^2 for these models was not significant. Finally, we explored the alignment of these
18
19 attributes (i.e., the distance between the vector norms of proactivity and conscientiousness in
20
21 each team: P-C alignment) in Model 7. We found that P-C alignment alone negatively relates to
22
23 team performance ($B = -12.52$, $SE = 3.98$, $t = -3.14$, $p < .01$), increasing the predictive capability
24
25 of the control model by 10%. The negative coefficient in this model indicates that P-C alignment
26
27 is positively related to team performance (where smaller distances indicate greater alignment).
28
29
30
31

32
33 ---Insert Table 3 about here---

34
35 Models 8-11, displayed in Table 3, test the relative influence of P-C alignment on team
36
37 performance over the other approaches tested. Model 8 indicates that the relationship between P-
38
39 C alignment and team performance held when controlling for mean proactivity and
40
41 conscientiousness and their interaction term – only P-C alignment significantly related to team
42
43 performance ($B = -10.92$, $SE = 5.44$, $t = -2.01$, $p = .048$). Model 9 reveals that P-C alignment
44
45 accounted for variance in team performance above maximum proactivity or conscientiousness
46
47 and their interaction ($B = -12.52$, $SE = 4.47$, $t = -2.80$, $p < .01$), while Model 10 shows that this
48
49 relationship held while controlling for the standard deviations of these attributes and their
50
51 interaction ($B = -17.92$, $SE = 4.57$, $t = -3.92$, $p < .01$). Finally, Model 11 demonstrates that the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationship between P-C alignment and team performance holds when all other team
4 composition models are considered ($B = -18.87$, $SE = 7.18$, $t = -2.63$, $p = .01$), explaining 7% of
5 the variance in team performance above the aggregate effects of these models.
6
7
8
9

10 These results reveal that P-C alignment best predicts team performance, and does so
11 beyond the other approaches considered. Teams in which proactive members are also high in
12 conscientiousness (and conversely, in which less conscientious members are also less proactive),
13 performed better than teams in which these attributes were unaligned. That said, an outstanding
14 question about the alignment of these attributes is how much the effects of alignment are
15 dependent upon overall magnitudes of proactivity and conscientiousness in teams and/or whether
16 these effects are being driven by specific individual(s).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 To address these questions, we further explored our data in three ways. First, we assessed
27 whether alignment interacts with mean or maximum levels of these attributes, or their standard
28 deviations, to influence team performance. Neither the interaction between P-C alignment and
29 mean proactivity ($t = -.48$, $p = .64$), nor the interaction between P-C alignment and maximum
30 proactivity ($t = -1.14$, $p = .26$) significantly influenced team performance. Similarly, neither the
31 interaction between P-C alignment and mean conscientiousness ($t = .70$, $p = .49$), nor the
32 interaction between P-C alignment and maximum conscientiousness ($t = -1.25$, $p = .14$)
33 significantly influenced team performance. Finally, we considered the interaction of the standard
34 deviations, finding no effects on performance (P-C alignment and proactivity SD: $t = .01$, $p =$
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 For example, Team 61 (blue line, left panel) exemplifies an ideal pattern of alignment:
4 the least proactive member (2.98) is also the least conscientious (3.21) and the most proactive
5 member (4.19) is the most conscientious (4.25), while those members in between these extremes
6 are moderately proactive and conscientious (team P-C alignment score = .14). This team scored a
7 43 on their consulting project, putting them above 75% of the teams in our sample. Team 2 (red
8 line) has a similar P-C alignment score (.15) and team performance score (42) and nearly follows
9 this ideal pattern, but has an obvious exception in that the least conscientious member has
10 relatively high proactivity (the second highest on the team). This indicates that, in this case, the
11 exception to P-C alignment within one team member did not negate the effects of the more
12 global P-C alignment observed across the team.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The right panel has a similar display of unaligned teams. Team 57's (blue line) two least
27 proactive members are the most conscientious, while the three most proactive members are the
28 least conscientious (team P-C alignment score = .43; 40th percentile for team performance).
29 Team 50 (red line) indicates a slightly different pattern of unalignment (team P-C alignment
30 score = .33). The four least conscientious members are reverse ordered in terms of their
31 proactivity (less conscientious members have higher proactivity), but there is one member who is
32 high in conscientiousness and proactivity. This team performed slightly better than Team 57
33 (57th percentile), although it seems the one high P-high C member was not able to overcome the
34 lack of alignment across the rest of her team. In short, these graphs and examples demonstrate
35 that our observed P-C alignment effect on performance comes from alignment across the whole
36 team, rather than the scores of any one or a few individual members.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Discussion

52
53 In summary, Study 1 discovers evidence that it is important to consider conscientiousness
54 in conjunction with proactivity to better understand how to create teams that perform well. It also
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Leadership and Team Simulation (V2) (Roberto & Edmondson, 2011) for lab credit (51% male,
4 84% White, $M_{\text{age}} = 20.12$ years). The Everest Simulation consists of a simulated six-day climb of
5 Mount Everest that takes approximately 90 minutes to complete. Team members are randomly
6 assigned to team roles (Environmentalist, Leader, Marathoner, Photographer, and Physician) that
7 include unique information which they can choose to share with their teammates. Each day (i.e.,
8 one simulation round), teams must share and analyze information on weather, health, supplies,
9 and hiking speed to decide whether to move to the next camp or stay at their current location.
10 They also complete three decision-making challenges: a medical challenge where participants
11 must discern that the Environmentalist needs an inhaler, a weather challenge where participants
12 must accurately predict the weather at their next camp, and an oxygen challenge where
13 participants must decide how many oxygen tanks each member needs for the summit ascent.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 After entering the behavioral research laboratory, each participant completed the
29 proactivity and conscientiousness measures described below. Then, participants were randomly
30 assigned to teams and simulation roles, and given detailed instructions about the task. Teams
31 were co-located in the same room, but communicated only through a computer-mediated chat,
32 which allowed us to track their interactions. Although participants generally find this task
33 intrinsically engaging (Roberto & Edmondson, 2011), we also awarded \$100 cash (\$20 per
34 member) to the two highest performing teams. This increased the importance of performing well
35 on the task beyond receiving course credit.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Measures

47 ***Proactivity.*** We measured proactivity using Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer's (1999)
48 proactive personality measure, which is a shortened version of Bateman and Crant's (1993)
49 measure. It has been used extensively in the organizational literature to measure proactive
50 personality and has shown good internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and discriminant,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 convergent, and criterion validity (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Seibert et al., 1999; Seibert et al.,
4
5 2001). To complete this measure, participants rate the extent to which they agree that ten
6
7 statements describe them from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*) (example items: “I
8
9 am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life” and “Wherever I have been, I
10
11 have been a powerful force for constructive change”) ($\alpha = .89$; Individual-level: $M = 3.74$, $SD =$
12
13 $.58$; Team-level: $M = 3.74$, $SD = .23$).

14
15
16
17 ***Conscientiousness.*** We measured conscientiousness using Goldberg’s (1992)
18
19 International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). The IPIP consists of 50 items, ten for each Big Five
20
21 personality trait. Subscales have been shown to have good internal consistency and appropriate
22
23 convergent and discriminant validity (Lim & Ployhart, 2006). Participants rated the extent to
24
25 which a series of statements described them compared to their peers from 1 (*Very Inaccurate*) to
26
27 5 (*Very Accurate*) (example items: “Am always prepared”, “Pay attention to details”) ($\alpha = .80$;
28
29 Individual-level: $M = 3.58$, $SD = .60$; Team-level: $M = 3.58$, $SD = .25$).

30
31
32
33 ***Team coordination.*** We used the team chat logs to unobtrusively measure team
34
35 coordination during the task. Teams communicated exclusively through the chat logs, so these
36
37 logs recorded the entirety of their task interactions. Two research assistants who were blind to
38
39 the study purpose read the team chat logs independently and rated each team on four team
40
41 coordination survey items taken from Lewis (2003) and Mathieu et al. (2020): “The team worked
42
43 together in a well-coordinated fashion”, “The team communicated well with each other”, “The
44
45 team smoothly integrated their work efforts” and “The team re-established coordination when
46
47 things went wrong” (rated on a 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*to a very great extent*) scale). The research
48
49 assistants assessed the first 20 teams independently, then met to resolve any discrepancies and
50
51 build a shared understanding of how to consistently assess task interactions in the chat logs
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 according to these items. Then, they rated the next 20 team transcripts independently. This
4
5 second set showed sufficient agreement (ICCs (2,1) = .75-.83; Shrout & Fleiss, 1979), so the
6
7 research assistants went on to rate the remainder of the transcripts independently. Their final
8
9 ratings of coordination for all transcripts also showed sufficient agreement: Item 1, ICC (2,1) =
10
11 .83, Item 2, ICC (2,1) = .80, Item 3, ICC (2,1) = .82, Item 4, ICC (2,1) = .76, full scale, ICC (2,1)
12
13 = .83, Cronbach's α = .94. For example, Team 63 was rated as having good coordination
14
15 (7.00/7.00) as they got input from each member before making team decisions, consistently
16
17 checked on each other's health, and gathered information on each team member after setbacks.
18
19 Alternatively, Team 117 was rated as having poor coordination (1.63/7.00) as they barely
20
21 communicated over the first two days of the simulation, did not ask for input from each other,
22
23 and did not incorporate others' information when responding back to the group.
24
25
26
27

28 ***Team performance.*** In the Everest Simulation, team performance is calculated by
29
30 considering the percentage of individual and team goals each team achieves. Each team member
31
32 has between two and six individual goals, which often overlap. For example, each team member
33
34 is tasked with surviving the climb, however only three members are tasked with staying an extra
35
36 day at a particular camp and only two of these members may overlap on the same day. In all,
37
38 individual goals account for 39 points. Collective goals, which include the team's ability to
39
40 complete each of the three decision-making challenges, count for 20 points plus an additional 15-
41
42 42 points depending on simulation-defined factors (e.g., team members' locations during the
43
44 weather decision-making challenge) (see Roberto & Edmondson, 2011). Overall, the percentage
45
46 of total possible points earned (0-100%) is a standard comparative measure of team performance
47
48 (Pearsall & Venkataramani, 2015; Tost, Gino, & Larrick, 2013). As in Study 1, a Shapiro-Wilk
49
50 test indicated that these performance scores were normally distributed, $W(135) = .99, p = .13$.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Analytical Approaches

Additive and configurational approaches to proactivity-conscientiousness composition.

As in Study 1, we used the team mean, maximum scores, and standard deviations of proactivity and conscientiousness, as well as their interaction terms, to examine additive and configurational team composition models in predicting team performance.

Alignment approach to proactivity-conscientiousness composition. We calculated P-C alignment as in Study 1. To account for the differences in response scales (5 vs. 7 points), we linearly transformed the proactivity scale to the conscientiousness scale by multiplying proactivity scores by $\frac{5}{7}$. This equated scale variances, $F = .93, p = .53$, confirming that both attributes contributed to the alignment score equally (Emich et al., 2022).

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations between individual and aggregated proactivity, conscientiousness, coordination, and performance are presented in Table 4. As in Study 1, we examined the different team composition models using a series of linear regressions. Results are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

---Insert Tables 4, 5, and 6 about here---

First, we considered a traditional additive model by exploring whether a team's mean level of proactivity and conscientiousness relate to its performance. Results revealed no effects for mean proactivity (Model 1: $B = -6.13, SE = 6.16, t = -.99, p = .32$), mean conscientiousness (Model 1: $B = 1.25, SE = 5.66, t = .22, p = .83$), or their interaction (Model 2: $B = -14.37, SE = 22.36, t = -.64, p = .52$). Next, Models 3 and 4 indicated no effects for maximum proactivity (Model 3: $B = 1.13, SE = 4.23, t = .27, p = .79$), maximum conscientiousness (Model 3: $B = 1.03, SE = 3.68, t = .28, p = .78$) or their interaction (Model 4: $B = 2.43, SE = 10.16, t = .24, p =$

1
2
3 .81). Finally, Models 5 and 6 show no effects of standard deviation in proactivity (Model 5: $B =$
4 7.11 , $SE = 6.47$, $t = 1.10$, $p = .27$), standard deviation in conscientiousness (Model 5: $B = 1.37$,
5 $SE = 6.76$, $t = .20$, $p = .84$), or their interaction (Model 6: $B = 23.65$, $SE = 32.86$, $t = .72$, $p =$
6 $.47$). Similar to the results of Study 1, these initial analyses indicate that traditional additive and
7 configurational models of team proactivity and conscientiousness did not directly explain much
8 variance in team performance.
9

10
11 We examine P-C alignment in Model 7. As in Study 1, P-C alignment across team
12 members negatively and significantly related to team performance ($B = -42.03$, $SE = 13.12$, $t = -$
13 3.20 , $p < .01$). Again, this indicates that having smaller distance between proactivity and
14 conscientiousness (i.e., greater alignment) positively influences team performance. Models 8-10
15 indicate that this relationship holds even when controlling for additive and configurational
16 explanations of how these attributes impact team performance. Finally, Model 11 shows that this
17 relationship holds when considering all composition models simultaneously ($B = -71.80$, $SE =$
18 16.75 , $t = -4.29$, $p < .01$). Further, it indicates that P-C alignment accounts for 13% of the
19 variance in team performance above these other explanations.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Next, we assessed whether team coordination, as rated from teams' communication logs,
39 helped to explain the relationship between P-C alignment and team performance. Since our
40 alignment measure exists at the team level, we tested this using Hayes's PROCESS macro to
41 conduct a bootstrapped mediation analysis with 5,000 resamples (Hayes, 2017). Results
42 indicated that P-C alignment led to greater team coordination ($B = -3.91$, $SE = 1.40$, $t = -2.79$, p
43 $< .01$), team coordination led to greater team performance ($B = 2.35$, $SE .86$, $t = 2.73$, $p < .01$),
44 and the indirect path from P-C alignment to team performance through team coordination was
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 significant (95% CI [-22,69, -.98]) ($R^2 = .15$). This indicates that a significant portion of P-C
4 alignment's impact on team performance occurs because it allows teams to coordinate better.
5

6
7
8 Because we used a different team task and measure of proactivity in Study 2, we also
9
10 wondered whether the patterns of alignment we discovered in Study 1 would be similar or
11
12 different in this sample. As in Study 1, we examined the influence of the interactions between P-
13
14 C alignment and mean or maximum proactivity and conscientiousness, or their standard
15
16 deviations, on team performance. None were significant. Similarly, the conscientiousness of the
17
18 most proactive and least proactive team members, and the P-C alignment of the high and low
19
20 proactivity subgroups (as determined by mean split) did not independently influence team
21
22 performance².
23
24

25
26 ---Insert Figure 2 about here---
27

28
29 Next, we graphed the top 10 aligned and unaligned teams in Figure 2. Figure 2 reveals
30
31 similar patterns of alignment and unalignment, relative to means and individual team members,
32
33 as we observed in Study 1. For example, Team 63 (blue line) has an 'ideal' pattern of alignment
34
35 – each team member with a higher proactivity also has higher conscientiousness (P-C alignment
36
37 score = .12). They scored a 67 in the simulation, which was the second highest score of any
38
39 team, and they were rated as a perfect seven out of seven on coordination. The team
40
41 communication log revealed consistent information seeking and input, primarily driven by the
42
43 second and third most proactive members (who were also the second and third most
44
45 conscientious). For example, one of these members consistently checked in regarding future-
46
47 oriented actions (e.g., “does everyone wanna go to camp 1 right now?”; “everyone wants to stay
48
49 for the day?”). In addition, the least proactive and conscientious member only provided
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ² Results are available from first author upon request.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information when asked (e.g., making only 9% of the comments over the first two days of the
4 climb, but providing important information after the weather equipment failed on Day 3). Team
5
6 20 (red line) shows similar metrics on alignment, performance, and coordination (P-C alignment
7
8 score = .12; team performance = 47; team coordination = 5.25); however, the most conscientious
9
10 member is less proactive than three others on the team. This again indicates the team nature of
11
12 attribute alignment. The two members with higher proactivity and slightly lower (but still high)
13
14 conscientiousness helped to coordinate the team by sharing information about team goals (e.g.,
15
16 “for my role, I have to stay in camp 1 and 2 an extra day to take photos”) and asking specific
17
18 questions about the team members’ health to assess readiness to move forward. Importantly,
19
20 during this process members lower in proactivity and conscientiousness did not interrupt, which
21
22 allowed the team to effectively coordinate their efforts.
23
24
25
26
27

28 We also see similar trends to Study 1 for the unaligned teams in Figure 2. Team 117 (blue
29
30 line) is highly unaligned except for their centrally conscientious member (P-C alignment = .58).
31
32 This team had the lowest score of any in our sample and scored in the 11th percentile of
33
34 coordination (1.63). The team communication log revealed that the team did not communicate
35
36 often, but when they did the conversation was dominated by the two members with high
37
38 proactivity and low conscientiousness. This pair dictated the team strategy without consulting
39
40 anyone other than each other. The most conscientious member, who was the least proactive,
41
42 almost never spoke up. Team 28 (red line) shows similar metrics but with a slightly different
43
44 pattern (P-C alignment = .52; team performance = 24th percentile; team coordination = 2.00, 16th
45
46 percentile). The team is relatively unaligned except the two most conscientious members are
47
48 moderately proactive. Still, the least conscientious member was one of the most proactive people
49
50 in our entire sample and the second least conscientious member was also highly proactive. The
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 team communication log indicated that proactivity on the part of these non-conscientious
4
5 members overwhelmed any effort by the team's more conscientious members to coordinate. For
6
7 example, these team members were eager to take action (e.g., "the weather looks good, so I think
8
9 we should go"; "G-O") without considering important information from others that required
10
11 coordination (e.g., that they needed to ration their oxygen canisters to attempt the summit).
12
13

14 **Discussion**

15
16 Study 2 replicates and extends the discovery that P-C alignment is the best predictor of
17
18 how member proactivity and conscientiousness can come together to improve team performance.
19
20 Teams perform best when they have some members who are proactive *and* conscientious and
21
22 some members who are not. Importantly, we also find that this happens because of the team's
23
24 ability to achieve effective coordination, offering evidence for a key process criterion to team
25
26 proactivity research (Lu et al., 2023; Williams et al., 2010; Wu, Parker, Wu, & Lee, 2018; Zhang
27
28 et al., 2021). We also note that this study provides initial evidence that highly proactive team
29
30 members who are not conscientious may also present a threat to team coordination by pushing
31
32 ahead without the information or skills that are needed to effectively do so. As such, we find that
33
34 the proactivity of less conscientious members can dampen the participation of other potentially
35
36 valuable team members.
37
38
39
40

41 **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

42
43 At the outset of this paper, we asked how organizations should create teams that are
44
45 proactive, but that also engage in the planning necessary to coordinate that proactivity and
46
47 perform well. Taken together, our studies reveal that teams in which member proactivity and
48
49 conscientiousness align within team members across the team are more coordinated and perform
50
51 better than teams in which these attributes are unaligned. Further, we find evidence that
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 considering P-C alignment is more useful in predicting how well a team will coordinate and
4 perform than other plausible team composition models of these attributes.
5
6

7 **Theoretical and Practical Implications of Proactivity-Conscientiousness Alignment Effects**

8
9 The discovery of the importance of P-C alignment in influencing team coordination and
10 performance is meaningful for several reasons. First, we provide further insight into the
11 anomalies in the literature concerning whether and when team member proactivity is beneficial,
12 detrimental, or does not matter for team performance. We confirm, for example, that it is not
13 necessary to have high mean levels of proactivity for team performance (e.g., Chiu et al., 2016),
14 and that a complementarity perspective is warranted (e.g., Zhang et al., 2021). Yet, we also find
15 that complementarity in proactivity alone is not sufficient. Instead, proactivity should be
16 considered in light of another individual difference that helps members plan and organize their
17 activities: conscientiousness. Considering the coexistence of these attributes allowed us to
18 address how organizations should compose teams that are proactive yet coordinate well, adding
19 coordination as a key process criterion in the team proactivity literature (Williams et al., 2010;
20 Wu et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2021).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Second, our study amplifies discussion of the complexity and multilevel nature of teams
38 and their members (Mathieu et al., 2019) by revealing the importance of the alignment of
39 multiple traits within individual team members, specifically proactivity and conscientiousness.
40 We not only explored several of the most widely used compositional models of these attributes
41 (e.g., means, maximum scores, standard deviations), but we also employed the alignment
42 approach to modeling teams as matrices of members and their attributes (Emich et al., 2022). We
43 discovered that the alignment approach provides the best path to understand how proactivity and
44 conscientiousness coexisting at the individual-level may be considered across the team, allowing
45 us to better understand how to create high performing teams. This answers calls to consider the
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 complexities of team composition in general (Bell, Brown, Colaneri, & Outland, 2018; Emich &
4 Lu, 2020; Emich et al., 2022) as well as to consider unique team composition models of
5
6 proactivity in particular (Harris & Kirkman, 2017). It also echoes previous literature that
7
8 considers the relative importance of team member attributes (e.g., social estimation schemes or
9
10 social decision modeling) (Bonner, Sillito, & Baumann, 2007; Davis, 1973; Yetton & Bottger,
11
12 1983), but extends it by relating the coexistence of multiple within-person attributes to team
13
14 processes and outcomes.
15
16
17
18

19 Practically, our findings can help managers appropriately staff teams and consider
20
21 interventions aimed at increasing their coordination. For example, Woolley et al. (2008) find that
22
23 teams that discuss collaborative planning for a few minutes before completing a task tend to
24
25 coordinate better during the task. However, these authors are careful to note that high
26
27 performance “requires both task-appropriate expertise and collaborative planning to identify
28
29 strategies for optimally using that expertise” (p. 352). We echo this integrative approach.
30
31 Interventions aimed to increase coordination should be considered in the context of team
32
33 composition. Having a P-C unaligned team meet to discuss strategy may not be effective because
34
35 proactive members who are not conscientious could still dominate that discussion with
36
37 deleterious effects (e.g., as we observed in our second study). As Bell et al. (2018) summarize:
38
39 “in teams, some combinations of people tend to work better together than others. Team
40
41 composition research provides insights into why as well as the optimal combinations of team
42
43 members. Importantly, the research allows for the evidence-based staffing and management of
44
45 teams” (p. 360).
46
47
48
49
50

51 That said, however, managers could also direct effort towards targeted interventions that
52
53 align these two facets of personality within individual team members. For example, it may be
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 possible to coach highly proactive but less conscientious team members to engage in more
4
5 coordination-related activities, or more duty-oriented versus achievement-oriented displays of
6
7 conscientiousness (Marinova, Moon, & Kamdar, 2013). Alternatively, highly proactive team
8
9 members with lower conscientiousness could be directed to training or other development in
10
11 project management or collaborative planning to ensure that, in the context of team and project-
12
13 based work, they are able to create systems that maximize the value of their proactivity.
14
15 Similarly, our findings suggest managers may do well to encourage and support highly
16
17 conscientious yet less proactive team members to engage in more proactive ways of contributing
18
19 to the team. For example, managers could actively solicit input from those team members, which
20
21 can increase their perceived influence and willingness to engage in prosocial behavior (Martin &
22
23 Harrison, 2022; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2012). In effect, our findings encourage managers to
24
25 consider both compositional and processual ways of aligning proactivity and conscientiousness
26
27 to enhance team performance.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Future Directions for Further Exploration**

34
35 Here we offer several other ideas for further exploration, regarding both P-C alignment
36
37 and alignment effects in general. First, although we find that P-C alignment improves team
38
39 coordination and performance, it may also result in some drawbacks, which we were unable to
40
41 observe in our samples. For example, P-C alignment may somehow undermine learning for the
42
43 low P-low C members who follow the lead of their high P-high C counterparts instead of
44
45 contributing to the team in a more active role. Over the long term, this might result in entrenched
46
47 social dynamics which paradoxically may lead to reduced team flexibility. We also wonder
48
49 whether P-C alignment might be particularly helpful for achieving coordination in teams acting
50
51 in even more dynamic environments than those we reported; for example, in virtual teams,
52
53 multiteam systems, or teams that experience frequent membership change (e.g., De Vries,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hollenbeck, Davison, Walter, & Van Der Vegt, 2016; Lanaj, Hollenbeck, Ilgen, Barnes, &
4
5 Harmon, 2013). P-C alignment may result in more efficient processing when teams face even
6
7 greater uncertainty from challenges in team design (e.g., shifting roles).
8
9

10 Additionally, one could combine work on social estimation schemes, specifically social
11 permutation models (Bonner, 2004; Bonner et al., 2007), with work on attribute alignment to ask
12 whether all members should contribute to alignment values equally. While we did not find that
13 the conscientiousness of the most or least proactive member predicted team performance above
14 global alignment, it is possible that attributes such as expertise, extraversion, and status may
15 affect whether other member attributes are considered by the group (Baumann & Bonner, 2004;
16 Bonner, 2004). For example, such attributes could be used to weight the importance of other
17 attributes to teams (e.g., the proactivity and conscientiousness of the leader is weighted more
18 than other members), or as separate vectors which may align with other attributes to predict team
19 behavior (e.g., extraversion is added as a third attribute in addition to proactivity and
20 conscientiousness. See Emich et al., in press).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Beyond examining future questions related to proactivity and conscientiousness, our
36 exploration uncovered a number of insights about the nature of attribute alignment more broadly.
37 First, a theoretically critical question is whether the attributes that align matter; or, can we simply
38 assume that any positively-valenced attributes that coexist within a subset of team members
39 relative to others will improve team coordination and performance? While the alignment
40 approach may be applied to any set of team member traits, thoughts, emotions, or behaviors
41 (Emich et al, 2022), we believe the attributes under consideration do matter because of the
42 specific team processes they would be expected to influence. For example, we observed initial
43 evidence that P-C aligned teams had more effective coordination because when some team
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 members had high proactivity and high conscientiousness they anticipated helpful changes and
4 planned and organized them with respect to their team context, while other team members who
5
6 were low on both traits let others initiate changes and were open to their direction. In contrast, P-
7
8 C unaligned teams had members who sometimes worked against each other, e.g., proactive
9
10 members who were not conscientious tried to direct changes that were ill-planned, and those who
11
12 were conscientious did not offer corrections because they let others take the initiative.
13
14
15

16
17 However, alignment of other positively-valenced traits may not affect coordination, or
18
19 may even affect it negatively. For example, if optimism and openness align such that some team
20
21 members are high on openness and optimism, and others are low on openness and optimism,
22
23 they may have difficulty coordinating their task strategies (e.g. highly open and optimistic
24
25 members may have confidence in adopting innovative task strategies whereas closed and
26
27 pessimistic members cling to more established strategies). Similarly, alignment that includes one
28
29 or more negatively-valenced traits could result in dysfunctional processes such as conflict (e.g.,
30
31 neuroticism-agreeableness alignment increased relationship conflict as reported by Emich et al.,
32
33 2022). As such, the theoretical properties of the attributes of interest should drive the cognitive,
34
35 affective, and behavioral manifestations of their alignments.
36
37
38

39
40 A second critical question is how attribute alignment generally relates to, and may
41
42 complement, more traditional ways of aggregating individual attributes to the team level. In our
43
44 study we did not find robust effects for traditional composition models using means, maximum
45
46 values, or standard deviations of proactivity and conscientiousness, and we did not find that these
47
48 traditional measures interacted with P-C alignment to influence team behavior. However, it is
49
50 important to consider why this occurred; and in doing so, consider situations in which traditional
51
52 approaches may better relate to team processes and outcomes than attribute alignment, or may
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interact with the alignment of team member attributes. To explore how attribute alignment
4 complements other team compositional models conceptually, we created Figure 3, which maps
5 theoretical patterns of P-C alignment, unalignment, and misalignment in nine hypothetical teams.
6
7 In these graphs, each line represents a team, and each point represents a team member. Teams 1,
8 2 and 3 are aligned; Teams 4, 5, and 6 are unaligned, and Teams 7, 8, and 9 are misaligned (i.e.,
9 there is no relationship between member proactivity and conscientiousness). These nine teams
10 also have different distributional properties of proactivity and conscientiousness in terms of their
11 respective means, maximum values, and variances.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 ---Insert Figure 3 about here---

23
24 The graphs of these nine hypothetical teams show that it is theoretically plausible for
25 alignment to explain team processes and outcomes that means, maximum values, or standard
26 deviations cannot explain (as we found). For instance, Teams 1 and 4, 2 and 5, and 3 and 6 have
27 the same mean levels and standard deviations of both proactivity and conscientiousness – only
28 their alignment differs. If alignment matters independently of other distribution properties of
29 these attributes we would expect the lower numbered teams (e.g., Team 1) to perform better than
30 their higher-numbered counterparts (e.g., Team 4). We would also expect this effect to become
31 particularly pronounced when considering teams with greater within-team variance (e.g., Team 2
32 and Team 5) as the conscientiousness associated with such teams proactive members varies
33 greatly. Thus, whenever there is moderate to high within-team variance (team lines slope
34 severely), we would expect C-P alignment to predict team coordination and performance above
35 mean levels of these attributes. This should also occur when there is little difference between
36 team means (i.e., low between-team variance – team lines overlap). Indeed, this is what we
37 observed in our samples (e.g., Figures 1 and 2, which show teams with similar means and
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 standard deviations of proactivity and conscientiousness, but different alignments of these
4 attributes). These comparisons illustrate why we found effects of P-C alignment on team
5 performance, but did not find effects for means or the interactions between P-C alignment and
6 means, maximum scores, and standard deviations.
7
8
9
10

11
12 However, the mean level of any given attribute may interact with alignment to predict
13 how a team behaves. For example, there may be a threshold that exists below which alignment
14 does not matter. Using P-C alignment as an illustration, if a team does not have any proactivity
15 and thereby is unable to identify opportunities for change or does not have any conscientiousness
16 and therefore is completely unable to plan, the fact that these attributes are aligned should not
17 matter to team performance. In Figure 3, Team 3 may represent such a ‘below threshold’ case,
18 where P-C alignment may not be relevant because the team has such low levels of proactivity
19 and conscientiousness overall. If we had observed a range of teams including those like Teams 1,
20 3, 4, and 6 in our sample, we likely would have found a significant interaction between mean
21 levels of these attributes and their alignment on team performance, or a simple additive mean
22 effect. In addition, there may also be cases in which, as the levels of a given attribute increase,
23 the importance of its concurrent attributes also increases. This may also pertain to variance – as
24 variances in particular attributes increase, their alignment becomes more important – or other
25 distribution properties such as minimum or maximum levels.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 These speculations raise a broader point regarding the role of alignment in curvilinear
45 team effects. Many sophisticated papers are tackling questions of curvilinearity (e.g. De Dreu,
46 2006), because too much of a good thing can turn into a bad thing (or a not as good thing) a lot
47 of the time. Alignment may be one way to approach these theoretical puzzles as it provides a
48 sense of closeness between attributes across the team, so it not only assesses whether attributes
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 exist at high levels within some team members, but also whether they exist at low levels within
4
5 others. As we found, considering teams as matrices of their members may provide more insight
6
7 into complex problems than simply recommending that teams have more “good things”.
8
9
10 Moreover, this can extend from team composition problems to literatures investigating team
11
12 member roles (Mathieu et al., 2015), leadership emergence in organizational contexts (Martin et
13
14 al., 2022), and strategic governance (Hambrick, Misangyi, & Park, 2015). In each of these
15
16 literatures, scholars have described the tradeoffs inherent in examples like sharing versus
17
18 specializing in roles or team leadership, or initiating change versus maintaining the status quo in
19
20 strategic decisions and governance. The attribute alignment framework could help explore how
21
22 such tradeoffs are made.
23
24
25

26 **Conclusion**

27
28 In closing, this paper presents a new way to think about the composition of team member
29
30 proactivity and how it relates to team coordination and performance. It also reminds us that
31
32 proactivity, in the absence of the planning and organization necessary for coordination, (i.e.,
33
34 conscientiousness), may not be the positive force it is often argued to be. Indeed, via both
35
36 exploratory and confirmatory studies in different contexts, we demonstrate the key role of
37
38 conscientiousness in unlocking the full potential of member proactivity in teams. We also
39
40 explore new ways of theorizing about the role of individual attributes in teams, particularly their
41
42 alignment, as well as how those attributes relate to collective outcomes. We believe this to be an
43
44 exciting new direction for the broader literature on team composition and performance.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5 Ashford, S. J., & Cummings, L. L. 1983. Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies
6 of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(3): 370-
7 398.
- 8 Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. 1991. The big five personality dimensions and job performance:
9 A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44: 1-26.
- 10 Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Strauss, J. P. 1993. Conscientiousness and performance of sales
11 representatives: Test of the mediating effects of goal setting. *Journal of Applied*
12 *Psychology*, 78(5): 715-722.
- 13 Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., Neubert, M. J., & Mount, M. K. 1998. Relating member ability
14 and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied*
15 *Psychology*, 83(3): 377-391.
- 16 Barry, B., & Stewart, G. L. 1997. Composition, process, and performance in self-managed
17 groups: The role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1): 62-78.
- 18 Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. 1993. The proactive component of organizational behavior: A
19 measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2): 103-118.
- 20 Baumann, M. R., & Bonner, B. L. 2004. The effects of variability and expectations on utilization
21 of member expertise and group performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
22 *Decision Processes*, 93(2): 89-101.
- 23 Bell, S. T., Brown, S. G., Colaneri, A., & Outland, N. 2018. Team composition and the ABCs of
24 teamwork. *American Psychologist*, 73(4): 349-362.
- 25 Bonner, B. L. 2004. Expertise in group problem solving: Recognition, social combination, and
26 performance. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 8(4): 277.
- 27 Bonner, B. L., Sillito, S. D., & Baumann, M. R. 2007. Collective estimation: Accuracy,
28 expertise, and extroversion as sources of intra-group influence. *Organizational Behavior*
29 *and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1): 121-133.
- 30 Cabrera, M. A. M., & Nguyen, N. T. 2001. Situational judgment tests: A review of practice and
31 constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2): 103-113.
- 32 Chan, D. 1998. Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different
33 levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
34 83(2): 234-246.
- 35 Chan, D. 2006. Interactive effects of situational judgment effectiveness and proactive personality
36 on work perceptions and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2): 475-481.
- 37 Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. 2002. Situational judgment and job performance. *Human Performance*,
38 15(3): 233-254.
- 39 Chiu, C.-Y. C., Owens, B. P., & Tesluk, P. E. 2016. Initiating and utilizing shared leadership in
40 teams: The role of leader humility, team proactive personality, and team performance
41 capability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(12): 1705-1720.
- 42 Crant, J. M. 1995. The Proactive Personality Scale and objective job performance among real
43 estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4): 532-537.
- 44 Davis, J. H. 1973. Group decision and social interaction: A theory of social decision schemes.
45 *Psychological Review*, 80: 97-125.
- 46 De Dreu, C. K. 2006. When too little or too much hurts: Evidence for a curvilinear relationship
47 between task conflict and innovation in teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 83-107.
- 48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 De Vries, T. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Davison, R. B., Walter, F., & Van Der Vegt, G. S. 2016.
4 Managing coordination in multiteam systems: Integrating micro and macro perspectives.
5 *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(5): 1823-1844.
- 6
7 Digman, J. M. 1990. Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review*
8 *of Psychology*, 41(1): 417-440.
- 9 Dutton, J. E., & Ashford, S. J. 1993. Selling issues to top management. *Academy of*
10 *Management Review*, 18(3): 397-428.
- 11 Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'Neill, R. M., & Lawrence, K. A. 2001. Moves that matter: Issue
12 selling and organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4): 716-736.
- 13 Emich, K. J., & Lu, L. 2017. He thought, she thought: The importance of subjective patterns to
14 understanding team processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(1): 152-156.
- 15 Emich, K.J., & Lu, L. 2020. How shared and unshared affect impact team creative success. In. A.
16 McKay, R. Reiter-Palmon, & J. Kaufman (Eds.) *Explorations in Creativity Research:*
17 *Creative Success in Teams* (pp.146-162). Academic Press.
- 18
19 **Emich, K. J., Lu, L., Ferguson, A. J., Peterson, R. S., & McCourt, M.** 2022. Team composition
20 revisited: A team member attribute alignment approach. *Organizational Research Methods*,
21 25, 642-672.
- 22
23 Emich, K.J., McCourt, M., Lu, L., Ferguson, A.J., & Peterson, R.S. (in press). Team
24 Composition Revisited: Expanding the Team Member Attribute Alignment Approach to
25 Consider Patterns of More than Two Attributes. *Organizational Research Methods*.
- 26 Ferguson, A. J., & Peterson, R. S. 2015. Sinking slowly: Diversity in propensity to trust predicts
27 downward trust spirals in small groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4): 1012-1024.
- 28 Fuller, B., Jr, & Marler, L. E. 2009. Change driven by nature: A meta-analytic review of the
29 proactive personality literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75(3): 329-345.
- 30 Funder, D. C., & Colvin, C. R. 1988. Friends and strangers: Acquaintanceship, agreement, and
31 the accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(1):
32 149-158.
- 33
34 Gevers, J. M., & Peeters, M. A. 2009. A pleasure working together? The effects of dissimilarity
35 in team member conscientiousness on team temporal processes and individual satisfaction.
36 *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(3): 379-400.
- 37
38 Goldberg, L. R. 1992. The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure.
39 *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1): 26-42.
- 40 Gong, Y., Cheung, S.-Y., Wang, M., & Huang, J.-C. 2012. Unfolding the proactive process for
41 creativity: Integration of the employee proactivity, information exchange, and psychological
42 safety perspectives. *Journal of Management*, 38(5): 1611-1633.
- 43 Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. 2008. The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in*
44 *Organizational Behavior*, 28: 3-34.
- 45
46 Grant, A. M., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D. A. 2011. Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage:
47 The role of employee proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3): 528-550.
- 48 Hambrick, D. C., Misangyi, V. F., & Park, C. A. 2015. The quad model for identifying a
49 corporate director's potential for effective monitoring: Toward a new theory of board
50 sufficiency. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(3), 323-344.
- 51 Harris, T. B., & Kirkman, B. L. 2017. Teams and proactivity. In M. C. Bolino, W. H. Turnley, &
52 H. J. Anderson (Eds.), *Proactivity at work*: 548-576. New York: Routledge.
- 53
54 Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. 2007. What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation,
55 variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1199-1228.
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Humphrey, S. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., Meyer, C. J., & Ilgen, D. R. 2007. Trait configurations in
4 self-managed teams: a conceptual examination of the use of seeding for maximizing and
5 minimizing trait variance in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3): 885.
- 6 Hyatt, D. E., & Ruddy, T. M. 1997. An examination of the relationship between work group
7 characteristics and performance: Once more into the breach. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(3):
8 553-585.
- 9
10 Jones, S. L., & Shah, P. 2016. Diagnosing the locus of trust: A temporal perspective for trustor,
11 trustee, and dyadic influences on perceived trustworthiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
12 101(3): 392-414.
- 13 Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. 2002. Personality and leadership: A
14 qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4): 765-780.
- 15 Lam, W., Lee, C., Taylor, M. S., & Zhao, H. H. 2018. Does proactive personality matter in
16 leadership transitions? Effects of proactive personality on new leader identification and
17 responses to new leaders and their change agendas. *Academy of Management Journal*,
18 61(1): 245-263.
- 19
20 Lanaj, K., Hollenbeck, J. R., Ilgen, D. R., Barnes, C. M., & Harmon, S. J. 2013. The double-
21 edged sword of decentralized planning in multiteam systems. *Academy of Management*
22 *Journal*, 56(3): 735-757.
- 23
24 Lewis, K. 2003. Measuring transactive memory systems in the field: Scale development and
25 validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4): 587-604.
- 26 Lim, B.-C., & Ployhart, R. E. 2006. Assessing the convergent and discriminant validity of
27 Goldberg's International Personality Item Pool: A multitrait-multimethod examination.
28 *Organizational Research Methods*, 9(1): 29-54.
- 29
30 Lu, L., Norder, K., Sawhney, A., & Emich, K.J. 2023. Setting the Programmatic Agenda: A
31 Comprehensive Bibliometric Overview of Team Mechanism Research. *Journal of Business*
32 *Research*, 154, 113297.
- 33
34 Major, D. A., Turner, J. E., & Fletcher, T. D. 2006. Linking proactive personality and the Big
35 Five to motivation to learn and development activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4):
36 927.
- 37
38 Mantere, S., & Ketokivi, M. 2013. Reasoning in organization science. *Academy of Management*
39 *Review*, 38(1): 70-89.
- 40
41 Martin, S.R., Emich, K.J., McClean, E., & Woodruff, T. 2022. Keeping teams together: How
42 ethical leadership moderates the effects of performance on team efficacy and social
43 integration. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 176, 127-139.
- 44
45 Martin, S. R., & Harrison, S. H. 2022. Upward mobility, the cleft habitus, and speaking up: How
46 class transitions relate to individual and organizational antecedents of voice. *Academy of*
47 *Management Journal*, 65(3), 813-841.
- 48
49 Martin, S. R., Harrison, S. H., Hoopes, C., Schroeder, J., & Belmi, P. R. 2022. Talking shop: An
50 exploration of how talking about work affects our initial interactions. *Organizational*
51 *Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 168: 104104.
- 52
53 Mathieu, J. E., Gallagher, P. T., Domingo, M. A., & Klock, E. A. 2019. Embracing complexity:
54 Reviewing the past decade of team effectiveness research. *Annual Review of*
55 *Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6: 17-46.
- 56
57 Mathieu, J. E., Luciano, M. M., D'Innocenzo, L., Klock, E. A., & LePine, J. A. 2020. The
58 development and construct validity of a team processes survey measure. *Organizational*
59 *Research Methods*, 23(3): 399-431.
- 60

- 1
2
3 Mathieu, J. E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Donsbach, J. S., & Alliger, G. M. 2014. A review and
4 integration of team composition models: Moving toward a dynamic and temporal
5 framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(1): 130-160.
- 6
7 Mathieu, J. E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Kukenberger, M. R., Donsbach, J. S., & Alliger, G. M. 2015.
8 Team role experience and orientation: A measure and tests of construct validity. **Group &**
9 **Organization Management**, 40(1), 6-34.
- 10 McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. 2010. *NEO inventories professional manual*. Lutz, FL:
11 Psychological Assessment Resources.
- 12 Miron-Spektor, E., Emich, K.J., Argote, L., & Smith, W. 2022. Conceiving Opposites Together:
13 How a Paradoxical Frame and Epistemic Motivation Affect Team Creativity.
14 *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 171, 104153.
- 15 Morgeson, F. P., Reider, M. H., & Campion, M. A. 2005. Selecting individuals in team settings:
16 The importance of social skills, personality characteristics, and teamwork knowledge.
17 *Personnel psychology*, 58(3): 583-611.
- 18 Morrison, E. W. 1993. Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and
19 outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3): 557-589.
- 20 Morrison, E. W. 2006. Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal*
21 *of Management*, 32(1): 5-28.
- 22 Mueller, J. 2018. Finding new kinds of needles in haystacks: Experimentation in the course of
23 abduction. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(2): 103-108.
- 24 Neal, A., Yeo, G., Koy, A., & Xiao, T. 2012. Predicting the form and direction of work role
25 performance from the Big 5 model of personality traits. *Journal of Organizational*
26 *Behavior*, 33(2): 175-192.
- 27 Neuberg, S. L., & Newsom, J. T. 1993. Personal need for structure: Individual differences in the
28 desire for simpler structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(1): 113-131.
- 29 Neuman, G. A., Wagner, S. H., & Christiansen, N. D. 1999. The relationship between work-team
30 personality composition and the job performance of teams. **Group & Organization**
31 **Management**, 24(1): 28-45.
- 32 Neuman, G. A., & Wright, J. 1999. Team effectiveness: Beyond skills and cognitive ability.
33 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3): 376-389.
- 34 Nurmohamed, S. 2020. The underdog effect: When low expectations increase performance.
35 *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(4): 1106-1133.
- 36 Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. 2010. Making things happen: A model of proactive
37 motivation. *Journal of Management*, 36(4): 827-856.
- 38 Parker, S. K., Wang, Y., & Liao, J. 2019. When is proactivity wise? A review of factors that
39 influence the individual outcomes of proactive behavior. *Annual Review of Organizational*
40 *Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6: 221-248.
- 41 Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. 2006. Modeling the antecedents of proactive
42 behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3): 636.
- 43 Pearsall, M. J., & Venkataramani, V. 2015. Overcoming asymmetric goals in teams: The
44 interactive roles of team learning orientation and team identification. *Journal of Applied*
45 *Psychology*, 100(3): 735-748.
- 46 Robert, C., & Cheung, Y. H. 2010. An examination of the relationship between
47 conscientiousness and group performance on a creative task. *Journal of Research in*
48 *Personality*, 44(2): 222-231.
- 49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Roberto, M., & Edmondson, A. 2011. *Leadership and team simulation: Everest (V2)*. Boston,
4 MA: Harvard Business Publishing.
- 5 Sætre, A. S., & Van de Ven, A. 2021. Generating theory by abduction. *Academy of*
6 *Management Review*, 46(4): 684-701.
- 7
8 Schaumburg, R. L., & Flynn, F. J. 2012. Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown: The link
9 between guilt proneness and leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
10 103(2): 327.
- 11 Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. 1999. Proactive personality and career success.
12 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3): 416-427.
- 13 Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. 2001. What do proactive people do? A longitudinal
14 model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4): 845-
15 874.
- 16 Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. 1979. Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability.
17 *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(2): 420-428.
- 18 Steiner, I. D. 1972. *Group process and productivity*. New York: Academic Press.
- 19 Stewart, G. L., Fulmer, I. S., & Barrick, M. R. 2005. An exploration of member roles as a
20 multilevel linking mechanism for individual traits and team outcomes. *Personnel*
21 *Psychology*, 58(2): 343-365.
- 22
23 Strauss, K., Griffin, M. A., & Rafferty, A. E. 2009. Proactivity directed toward the team and
24 organization: The role of leadership, commitment and role-breadth self-efficacy. *British*
25 *Journal of Management*, 20(3): 279-291.
- 26 Sun, S., & van Emmerik, H. I. 2015. Are proactive personalities always beneficial? Political skill
27 as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3): 966-975.
- 28 Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2012). Ask and you shall hear (but not always): Examining the
29 relationship between manager consultation and employee voice. *Personnel Psychology*,
30 65(2), 251-282.
- 31 Thompson, J. A. 2005. Proactive personality and job performance: a social capital perspective.
32 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5): 1011-1017.
- 33 Tost, L. P., Gino, F., & Larrick, R. P. 2013. When power makes others speechless: The negative
34 impact of leader power on team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(5):
35 1465-1486.
- 36
37 Wageman, R., Gardner, H., & Mortensen, M. 2012. The changing ecology of teams: New
38 directions for teams research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(3): 301-315.
- 39 Whetzel, D. L., & McDaniel, M. A. 2009. Situational judgment tests: An overview of current
40 research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(3): 188-202.
- 41 Williams, H. M., Parker, S. K., & Turner, N. 2010. Proactively performing teams: The role of
42 work design, transformational leadership, and team composition. *Journal of Occupational*
43 *and Organizational Psychology*, 83(2): 301-324.
- 44 Wu, C.-H., Parker, S. K., Wu, L.-Z., & Lee, C. 2018. When and why people engage in different
45 forms of proactive behavior: Interactive effects of self-construals and work characteristics.
46 *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1): 293-323.
- 47
48 Yetton, P., & Bottger, P. 1983. The relationships among group size, member ability, social
49 decision schemes, and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*,
50 32(2): 145-159.
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Zhang, R., Li, A., & Gong, Y. 2021. Too much of a good thing: Examining the curvilinear relationship between team-level proactive personality and team performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 74(2): 295-321.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and correlations among Study 1 variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Class Year Dummy	---	---	-----	.09	-.13	-.17	.11	-.21*	.30**	-.07	.16	.03
2. GMAT Score	677.66	42.76	.03	-----	-.13	.06	-.04	.07	.08	.06	-.09	.16
3. Proactivity	3.95	0.37	-.07	<.01	-----	-.02	.55**	-.10	-.22*	-.13	.34**	-.25*
4. Conscientiousness	3.66	0.37	-.06	-.11*		-----	-.06	.62**	-.10	-.24*	-.47**	.06
5. Max Proactivity	4.41	0.24					-----	-.13	.58**	-.18	.41**	-.17
6. Max Conscientiousness	4.11	0.21						-----	-.15	.49**	-.17	.14
7. SD Proactivity	0.36	0.12							-----	-.08	.24*	-.03
8. SD Conscientiousness	0.35	0.12								-----	.36**	.10
9. P-C Vector Norm Distance	0.24	0.07									-----	-.32**
10. Performance	41.30	2.85										-----

^aVariables below the diagonal are at the individual level; variables above the diagonal are at the group level. Descriptive statistics are at the individual level for variables 2-4 and the team level for variables 5-10. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

Table 2. Study 1: The Impact of the Alignment of Member Proactivity and Conscientiousness on Team Performance

Variables	Null Model	Model 1: Additive Model with Mean C,P	Model 2: Additive Model with Mean Interaction of C,P	Model 3: Max. Model of P,C	Model 4: Max. Model of P,C with Interaction	Model 5: Variance Model of P,C	Model 6: Variance Model of P,C with Interaction	Model 7: Alignment of P,C
Intercept	17.96 (15.91)	37.73 (19.46)	36.32 (19.30)	21.84 (17.73)	21.09 (17.84)	18.07 (16.02)	18.97 (16.30)	25.66 (15.37)
Data Year	.07 (.60)	-0.05 (.60)	0.01 (.59)	0.33 (.61)	0.37 (.61)	.18 (.63)	.20 (.63)	.38 (.58)
Mean GMAT Score	.03 (.02)	0.03 (.02)	0.03 (.02)	0.03 (.02)	0.03 (.02)	.03 (.02)	.03 (.02)	0.03 (.02)
Team Proactivity Mean		-4.53 (2.00)*	-4.15 (2.00)*					
Team Conscientiousness Mean		0.86 (1.89)	0.97 (1.88)					
Team Proactivity Mean x Team Conscientiousness Mean			18.24 (11.23)					
Team Proactivity Max				-1.88 (1.27)	-2.00 (1.28)			
Team Conscientiousness Max				1.72 (1.46)	1.91 (1.49)			
Team Proactivity Max x Team Conscientiousness Max					-3.58 (5.79)			
Team Proactivity SD						-1.04 (2.54)	-3.24 (6.82)	
Team Conscientiousness SD						1.97 (2.43)	-.43 (7.34)	
Team Proactivity SD x Team Conscientiousness SD							6.85 (19.70)	
Team P-C Alignment								-12.52 (3.98)**
<i>F</i>	1.10	1.93	2.10	1.57	1.32	0.76	0.63	4.10**
<i>R</i> ²	0.02	0.08	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.04	0.12
ΔR^2	0.02	0.06	0.08*	0.04	0.06	0.01	0.02	.10**

*p < .05 ** p < .01. DV = Team Performance. P = Proactivity. C = Conscientiousness.

Table 3. Study 1: Comparison of P-C Alignment to Other Team Composition Approaches

Variables	Null Model	Model 8: Comparison to Additive Approach	Model 9: Comparison to Max Approach	Model 10: Comparison to Variance Approach	Model 11: Full Model with All Predictors
Intercept	17.96 (15.91)	41.69 (19.16)*	22.10 (17.17)	27.57 (15.25)	36.89 (19.46)
Data Year	.07 (.60)	0.19 (.59)	0.61 (.60)	.49 (.59)	.56 (.63)
Mean GMAT Score	.03 (.02)	0.03 (.02)	0.03 (.02)	.02 (.02)	.02 (.02)
Team Proactivity Mean		-2.57 (2.11)			-3.18 (3.88)
Team Conscientiousness Mean		-1.31 (2.17)			-2.76 (4.13)
Team Proactivity Mean x Team Conscientiousness Mean		6.83 (12.41)			1.95 (13.86)
Team Proactivity Max			-0.65 (1.33)		2.17 (2.86)
Team Conscientiousness Max			1.68 (1.44)		1.33 (3.50)
Team Proactivity Max x Team Conscientiousness Max			-7.15 (5.72)		-7.56 (6.38)
Team Proactivity SD				6.12 (6.75)	-.73 (8.87)
Team Conscientiousness SD				11.20 (7.41)	6.15 (9.51)
Team Proactivity SD x Team Conscientiousness SD				-14.47 (19.03)	-4.99 (21.26)
Team P-C Alignment		-10.92 (5.44)*	-12.52 (4.47)**	-17.92 (4.57)**	-18.87 (7.18)**
<i>F</i>	1.10	2.48	2.49	3.17**	1.77
<i>R</i> ²	0.02	0.15	0.15	0.18	0.21
ΔR^2	0.02	.04*	.08**	.14**	.07**

**p* < .05 ** *p* < .01. DV = Team Performance. P = Proactivity. C = Conscientiousness.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and correlations among Study 2 variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Proactivity	3.74	0.58	-----	.30**	.58**	.33**	-.10	.12	.24**	-0.08
2. Conscientiousness	3.58	0.60	.29**	-----	.10	.56**	-.15	-.07	-.22*	-.01
3. Max Proactivity	4.40	0.33			-----	0.24**	.63**	.25**	0.38**	0.03
4. Max Conscientiousness	4.28	0.38				-----	-.02	.67**	.19*	0.03
5. SD Proactivity	0.56	0.21					-----	.16	.29**	.10
6. SD Conscientiousness	0.57	0.20						-----	.45**	.03
7. P-C Vector Norm Distance	0.31	0.10							-----	-.27**
8. Performance	37.81	15.73								-----

Note. Variables below the diagonal are at the individual level; variables above the diagonal are at the group level. Descriptive statistics are at the individual level for variables 1-2 and the team level for variables 3-8. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

Table 5. Study 2: The Impact of the Alignment of Member Proactivity and Conscientiousness on Team Performance

Variables	Model 1: Additive Model with Mean P,C	Model 2: Additive Model with Mean Interaction of P,C	Model 3: Max. Model of P,C	Model 4: Max. Model of P,C with Interaction	Model 5: Variance Model of P,C	Model 6: Variance Model of P,C with Interaction	Model 7: Alignment of P,C
Intercept	56.29 (25.76)*	-135.58 (299.62)	28.45 (21.30)	73.68 (190.39)	33.07 (5.02)**	41.09 (12.22)	50.77 (4.25)**
Team Proactivity Mean	-6.13 (6.16)	45.03 (79.83)					
Team Conscientiousness Mean	1.25 (5.66)	55.22 (84.16)					
Team Proactivity Mean x Team Conscientiousness Mean		-14.37 (22.36)					
Team Proactivity Max			1.13 (4.23)	-9.25 (43.60)			
Team Conscientiousness Max			1.03 (3.68)	-9.58 (44.53)			
Team Proactivity Max x Team Conscientiousness Max				2.43 (10.16)			
Team Proactivity SD					7.11 (6.47)	-7.30 (21.04)	
Team Conscientiousness SD					1.37 (6.76)	-12.08 (19.87)	
Team Proactivity SD x Team Conscientiousness SD						23.65 (32.86)	
Team P-C Alignment							-42.03 (13.12)**
<i>F</i>	0.50	0.47	0.10	0.08	0.68	0.62	10.26**
<i>R</i> ²	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.07


* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$. DV = Team Performance. P = Proactivity. C = Conscientiousness

Table 6. Study 1: Comparison of P-C Alignment to Other Team Composition Approaches


Variables	Model 8: Comparison to Additive Approach	Model 9: Comparison to Team Max Approach	Model 10: Comparison to Variance Approach	Model 11: Full Model with All Predictors
Intercept	-293.07 (292.92)	-22.53 (183.84)	40.08 (11.51)**	-361.37 (301.80)
Team Proactivity Mean	96.63 (78.58)			133.15 (88.38)
Team Conscientiousness Mean	96.42 (82.14)			131.65 (91.76)
Team Proactivity Mean x Team Conscientiousness Mean	-26.93 (21.90)			-37.54 (24.42)
Team Proactivity Max		15.03 (42.19)		-18.33 (49.77)
Team Conscientiousness Max		11.08 (42.93)		-17.45 (49.87)
Team Proactivity Max x Team Conscientiousness Max		-1.96 (9.79)		5.14 (11.22)
Team Proactivity SD			16.66 (20.61)	18.24 (24.49)
Team Conscientiousness SD			17.05 (19.94)	11.73 (23.97)
Team Proactivity SD x Team Conscientiousness SD			-4.78 (31.67)	-9.82 (33.59)
Team P-C Alignment	-47.66 (14.49)**	-52.53 (14.34)**	-63.86 (15.15)**	-71.80 (16.75)**
<i>F</i>	3.08*	3.42**	4.97**	2.30*
<i>R</i> ²	0.09	0.10	0.13	0.16
ΔR^2	.08**	.09**	.12**	.13**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$. DV = Team Performance. P = Proactivity. C = Conscientiousness

Figure 1. Top 10 Aligned and Unaligned Teams in Study 1.




Top 10 Aligned Teams



Top 10 Unaligned Teams

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Figure 2. Top 10 Aligned and Unaligned Teams in Study 2.




Top 10 Aligned Teams

Top 10 Unaligned Teams

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Figure 3. Theoretical alignment types at different mean levels of proactivity and conscientiousness.



1
2
3 **Kyle Emich** (Ph.D., Cornell University; kemich@udel.edu) is a Professor of Business
4 Administration at the University of Delaware's Alfred Lerner College of Business and
5 Economics. His research explores the role of individual attributes, particularly perceptions and
6 emotions, in team dynamics. It appears in journals including *Academy of Management Journal*
7 and *Psychological Science* and media outlets such as *TIME* and the *New York Times*.
8
9

10 **Li Lu** (Ph.D. University of Southern California; llu@wcupa.edu) is an Associate Professor of
11 Management at West Chester University. Her research focuses on team decision-making and
12 performance. Her research has appeared in outlets including *MIS Quarterly*, *Personality and*
13 *Social Psychology Review*, and *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
14
15

16 **Amanda J. Ferguson** (Ph.D. London Business School; amanda.j.ferguson@niu.edu) is an
17 Associate Professor of Management at Northern Illinois University. Her research focuses on
18 team composition, team conflict, and intergroup relationships and appears in outlets including
19 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Academy of Management Journal*, and *Journal of Applied*
20 *Psychology*.
21
22

23 **Randall S. Peterson** (Ph.D. University of California, Berkeley; rpeterson@london.edu) is
24 Professor of Organisational Behaviour and Director of the Leadership Institute at London
25 Business School. His research focuses on boards, top management teams, team conflict, and
26 team leadership and appears in outlets including *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Journal of*
27 *Applied Psychology*, and *Harvard Business Review*.
28
29

30 **Michael McCourt** (Ph.D., Cornell University) is the General Manager of SigOpt. His research
31 involves computational statistics and Bayesian machine learning for efficient decision making in
32 optimization, search, and learning. His work has appeared in SIAM journals, *Optica*, and
33 *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*. He also cowrote a text on kernel-based
34 approximation methods for World Scientific Press.
35
36

37 **Sean R. Martin** (Ph.D., Cornell University; martins@arden.virginia.edu) is the Don & Lauren
38 Morel Associate Professor at the Darden School of Business at the University of Virginia. His
39 research interests include leadership, social class, values, and communication.
40

41 **Elizabeth J McClean** (Ph.D Cornell University; ejm45@cornell.edu) is an Associate Professor
42 at the S.C. Johnson Graduate School of Management at Cornell University. Her research focuses
43 on voice, gender, leadership, and strategic human resource management.
44
45

46 **Col. Todd Woodruff** (Ph.D. University of North Carolina; todd.woodruff@westpoint.edu) is a
47 Professor of Management at the United States Military Academy, West Point, and the Director of
48 the West Point Leadership Center, developing the world's preeminent leaders of character. He
49 also directs the Eisenhower (graduate) and Benavidez (executive) Leader Development Programs
50 cooperatively with Columbia University.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60