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Affect and Proactivity in Teams

Hector P. Madrid and Malcolm Patterson

The relationship between affect and proactivity is established at the employee level of analysis. Individuals’ positive and negative moods have the potential to drive proactive problem prevention, voice behaviour, and taking charge due to information processing and motivational processes (Cangiano, Bindl, and Parker, 2017). In addition, the relationship between affect and proactivity can also operate at the team level of analysis through interpersonal mechanisms and social integration processes; however, theory and empirical research about how team affect is related to team proactivity is still underdeveloped. This is a sensitive limitation in the proactivity literature because in today’s organizations teamwork is an essential form of organizing work, due to the complexities of tasks that cannot be executed by individual employees. Also, teamwork helps ensure rapid responses to environmental demands, facilitates creativity and innovation and increases the likelihood of achieving high quality outcomes. Therefore, teamwork contributes to the effectiveness of organizations and even their survival. Thus, to further develop the affect and proactivity literature, in this chapter we survey and discuss emergent research on affect at the group level of analysis and how and when the effects of group affect on proactivity are likely to happen. Accordingly, in the first section, we present the team effectiveness model in which team level affect and proactivity occur, together with describing the psychological processes that explain their reciprocal relationships. Then, we present and discuss the theory and evidence about the etiology of affect and proactivity in the context of teamwork.
Team effectiveness model

Research on teamwork has proposed and largely validated that team effectiveness is described by a process model in which teams’ achievement of their goals is given by their inputs, mediators, and outputs (Gladstein, 1984; Ilgen et al, 2005; Mathieu et al, 2019; McGrath, 1964). Team inputs refer to the set of individual and organizational resources available for the operation of the team. Examples of those resources are the skills, knowledge, and dispositions of team members, together with the financial, material, and technological means to perform the relevant tasks (Mathieu et al, 2008). Team mediators, categorized in terms of behavioural processes and emergent states, are the means by which resources are translated into results in the team (Ilgen et al, 2005). Behavioural processes are the collection of interpersonal behaviours performed among team members to use the resources available in the execution of tasks, such as goal specification, coordination, monitoring, collaboration, and conflict management (Marks, Mathieu, and Zaccaro, 2001). In turn, emergent properties are team-level psychological states resulting from social interaction among team members, expressed in, for example, cohesion, trust, psychological safety, or, on the negative side, interpersonal conflict (Mathieu et al, 2019). Team emergent states also influence, or feedback, behavioural processes, such that, for instance, trust facilitates collaboration, while conflict reduces coordination (compare, Ilgen et al, 2005). Regarding team outputs, they are the results of the use of the team inputs, through team mediators, manifested in the quantity and quality of work done, adaptation, innovation, and team members’ attitudes, such as job satisfaction and commitment (Burke et al, 2006; Campion, Medsker, and Higgs, 1993; West, 2002).

In this structural representation, proactive behaviour with interpersonal meaning and implications, such as voice and innovation behaviour, is a type of team behavioural process (Figure 9.1) (Harris and Kirkman, 2017; Williams, Parker, and Turner, 2010). Voice behaviour is the active proposal of ideas to solve problems, improve procedures, and take advantage of new opportunities in the work environment, which is only possible in an interpersonal forum where these ideas are communicated (Morrison, 2014). Teams are an example of this interpersonal context, in which team member voice behaviour is the active exchange of ideas among team members to foster team effectiveness (Lepine and Dyne Van, 1998; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, and Kamdar, 2011). Innovation behaviour corresponds to the exploration, experimentation, testing, and implementation of new
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Figure 9.1: Team effectiveness model applied to team proactivity and affect

and useful ideas (Kanter, 1988). Translated into the team context, innovation emerges as a collective behavioural process directed to solve problems and make changes based on the development of new strategies and solutions (De Dreu and West, 2001).

Affect is also part of the team mediators and represents a form of emergent states (Figure 9.1). In this context, team members’ affective experience has been conceptualized as team affective tones, which are shared and consistent affective states experienced by team members as a whole (George, 1996). Mirroring conceptualizations of affect at the individual level, examples of positive and negative team affective tones are the collective states of enthusiasm, comfort, anxiety, and disappointment, respectively, which represent the mood of teams (Warr et al, 2014).

Applying the model of team effectiveness to team-level proactivity and affect, conceptualizes both constructs as derived from the input resources of the team (Collins et al, 2013; Harris and Kirkman, 2017). For instance, team composition in terms of personality traits of team members should play a role here, such that, for example, the proactive and openness to experience dispositions of team members may explain the extent to which voice and innovation behaviour unfold within the team (Hammond et al, 2011; Thomas, Whitman, and Viswesvaran, 2010; Zare and Flinchbaugh, 2019). In parallel, affective dispositions embedded in team members’ extraversion and neuroticism traits may
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be one of the sources of positive and negative affective tones (Collins et al., 2013).

Continuing the process model of team effectiveness, team-level proactivity and team affective tones influence each other (compare, Ilgen et al., 2005). The first intuitive causality effect stems from affective tones towards behavioural processes. In this case, shared positive and negative feelings infuse and motivate, for example, the suggestion and experimentation of (novel) ideas (Madrid, Niven, and Vasquez, 2019). In contrast, these behavioural processes should also have an effect on team affective tones because voice and innovation behaviour may result in team member feelings of shared enthusiasm or worry.

Finally, team member voice, innovation behaviour and team affective tones contribute to team outputs. The proposal and exchange of new ideas, as well as their experimentation, promises to improve the quality of the work carried out by the team (King and Anderson, 1990). Also, these forms of proactivity may benefit better adaptation to changes unfolding in the environment, the production of novel procedures, products, and services, and also a better sense of team member satisfaction when voice and innovation behaviour deliver positive results (Morrison, 2014; Shipton et al., 2006). Affective tones should facilitate, or inhibit, these behavioural processes, influencing also team performance.

Hence, team proactivity and affect are central components of team effectiveness. Thus, the understanding of their etiology and how they operate and influence each other is highly valuable for teamwork management.

Affective tones and proactivity

The effects of team affective tones on team proactivity

At the employee level of analysis, affective states are well-known for influencing individual proactivity (Cangiano, Bindl, and Parker, 2017). Positive moods expressed in enthusiasm, joy, and inspiration drive proactive problem identification, voice, and taking charge, together with the generation, promotion, and implementation of novel ideas (Bindl et al., 2012; Madrid and Patterson, 2019; Madrid et al., 2014; Warr et al., 2014). On the other hand, employees’ negative affect has mixed effects on proactivity and innovation. In general, states composed of anxiety, worry, and nervousness are not directly related to proactive and innovation behaviour because those effects seem to be context-dependent (Madrid and Patterson, 2018; Madrid et al., 2014). In the
case of voice behaviour, negative moods have the potential of increasing the likelihood of suggesting ideas to make changes in the work environment when the tasks to be executed imply high complexity, expressed in the need to solve difficult problems, manage uncertainty, and use expert knowledge (Madrid, Patterson, and Leiva, 2015). In the case of innovation, indirect evidence, observed in research on the related construct of employee creativity, indicates that negative moods could increase the generation and use of novel ideas when the work environment provides social support (George and Zhou, 2007).

One set of psychological mechanisms explaining the influences of affect on proactive and innovation behaviour focuses on information processing (Bindl et al, 2012; Madrid and Patterson, 2018). The latter denotes the function played by perception, memory, and attention, together with how information gathered from the environment is processed.

Positive moods lead to positive priming of perception and memory, such that perception is directed to positive conditions in the environment when individuals experience positive feelings, while recalled memories are about satisfactory and rewarding past experiences related to the tasks being performed (Isen, 1984; Isen et al, 1978). The same feelings expand attentional focus; therefore, more information to solve the problems is available, and this information is processed using flexible and divergent thinking, such that, for example, multiple possible ideas are explored in order to solve problems (Fredrickson, 2001). On the other hand, negative moods prime perception and memory by directing cognition to negative and unsatisfactory conditions in the environment and past experiences (Fredrickson, 2004; Schwarz and Skurnik, 2003). As part of the same affective experience, attention is narrow, and information processing is convergent and analytic, leading to the exploitation of well-established knowledge available in the environment (George and Zhou, 2007; Nijstad et al, 2010).

Motivation is the other mechanism that has been proposed as mediating the effects of employee affect on proactivity (Seo, Barrett, and Bartunek, 2004). Moods involve not only differences in pleasure, but also degrees of activation and energy expenditure (Russell, 1980). As such, high-activated positive feelings, such as enthusiasm and joy, but not those low in arousal, like comfort and calm, drive proactive and innovative behaviour, because they provide the willingness to engage in problem-solving (Madrid and Patterson, 2019; Madrid et al, 2014).

The same rationale applies to high-activated negative versus low-activated negative moods (for example, anxiety versus disappointment)
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because the former provides the energy to approach and engage in social exchange, such as coordination and collaboration, whereas the latter leads to withdrawal behavioural tendencies (Warr et al., 2014).

Information processing and motivational mechanisms are intrapersonal psychological processes; thereby, they are primarily suitable for explaining affect, cognition, and behaviour at the individual level of analysis. In contrast, the psychological processes involved in the effects of team-level affect on proactivity should be those with interpersonal meaning.

Accordingly, the influences of team affective tones on social cognition and behaviour in groups occur through processes of social integration. The latter is an umbrella construct, which contains emergent states and behavioural processes with interpersonal meaning, such as cohesion, trust, psychological safety, collaboration, and conflict (Knight and Eisenkraft, 2014).

Cohesion, trust, and psychological safety are team emergent states. Cohesion is the sense of collective identity among team members. When cohesion is strong, team members are more likely keen to work together, enhancing continuity and viability of the team over time (Beal et al., 2003). Trust is the state built among team members denoting attributions of good intentions in the social exchange. Team members are willing to take risks, such as sharing information and delegating responsibilities to others, in teams where trust is present (Costa, 2003; De Jong and Elfring, 2010; De Jong, Dirks, and Gillespie, 2015; Sheppard and Sherman, 1998). Psychological safety is a similar construct to trust, but whereas trust describes the extent to which the benefit of the doubt is given to others, psychological safety describes the extent that others give the benefit of the doubt to you (Edmondson and Lei, 2014). Accordingly, psychological safety is the collective sense that makes team members feel they can be themselves; their capabilities are acknowledged and respected, and their voice is heard (Edmondson, 1999). Therefore, strong team psychological safety leads to active participation and engagement in teamwork (Frazier et al., 2017).

In turn, collaboration and conflict are behavioural processes. Collaboration involves the collective execution of tasks and mutual social support among team members (Beersma et al., 2003; Tjosvold, 1984). Social support is expressed in instrumental and emotional assistance (Drach-Zahavy, 2004; Ganster, Fusilier, and Mayes, 1986). In the first case, team members share knowledge and experiences with each other to solve problems and improve performance. Whereas, emotional support is expressed in concern about the emotional needs of the other team members and the provision of advice when it is
appropriate. In contrast, conflict is the team members’ perception of incompatibility about their interests, viewpoints, and way of interacting (Jehn and Bendersky, 2003). More specifically, task conflict is disagreement about the content of the work to be carried out within the team; process conflict refers to discrepancies about the procedures and methods utilized to perform the team’s tasks, while relationship conflict involves disagreements among team members based on their work-related values, interests, and motivations (Behfar et al., 2011; Beitler, Scherer, and Zapf, 2018; DeChurch, Mesmer-Magnus, and Doty, 2013; Guenter et al, 2016). As might be expected, in general, all forms of conflict exert negative effects on teamwork (De Dreu and Weingart, 2003; De Wit, Greer, and Jehn, 2012), except task conflict that might increase team performance under certain contextual conditions, such as when psychological safety is strong within the team (Bradley et al, 2012).

Team affective tones exert influences on social integration, which in turn should shape team proactivity (compare, Knight and Eisenkraft, 2015). When the tone of the team is positive, expressed in the experience of enthusiasm, joy, excitement and inspiration, trust and psychological safety increase, while collaboration ripples throughout the team (Barsade, 2002; Frazier et al, 2017). These effects are likely because the expansive cognition embedded in positive feelings may open perspectives about the problems teams need to manage and enhance team members flexibility in seeing the viewpoints of others. As a result, social integration, stemming from the positive affective tone, should be conducive to greater performance of voice and innovation behaviour. Both voice and innovation are risky behaviours because they promote change, challenge the status quo, and often face resistance; thus, social integration contributes to these behaviours because trust and psychological safety relieve the sense of risk (Costa, 2003; Edmondson and Lei, 2014). Furthermore, suggesting, and experimenting with, ideas only makes sense in a forum of collaboration, which, as described above, emanates from team positive affective tones.

The relationship between negative affective tone entails more complexity. Shared negative feelings only dampen social integration when the source of them pertain to the internal, but not external, team environment (Knight and Eisenkraft, 2015). As such, if negative affective tones emerge due to adverse internal events, such as the experience of errors or failures, or poor previous performance, these affective tones could stifle the sense of cohesion, trust, and safety, limiting collaboration and even increasing the chance of
conflict. These effects may emerge because negative feelings narrow cognition, reducing perspective-taking of others’ viewpoints, together with boosting irritability and impulsivity, leading to higher levels of emotional conflict (Greer and Jehn, 2007). These states and actions are dysfunctional to team voice and innovation behaviour, because lack of social integration may invoke withdrawal behavioural tendencies, suppressing the suggestion and examination of novel ideas.

*The effects of team behavioral processes on team affective tones*

According to the model of team effectiveness, affect is thought to have a reciprocal relationship with behavioural processes and other emergent states, where affects not only effect behavioural processes and states, but the latter may also be the reciprocal cause of shared affect among team members (Ilgen et al., 2005; Mathieu et al., 2019).

The states of cohesion, trust, and psychological safety are likely to shape team affective tones. The rationale for this relationship derives from the affect-as-information hypothesis, which proposes that affective states are built from information about the characteristics of the environment (Clore, Gaspar, and Garvin, 2001; Martin and Stoner, 1996; Schwarz and Clore, 1983). As such, for example, positive moods are constructed due to the presence of rewarding conditions in the immediate environment, whereas negative moods emerge from the presence of threats (Watson, 2000; Watson et al., 1999). The extrapolation of these principles to the interpersonal realm has led to the theory of emotion-as-social information (van Kleef, 2009; van Kleef, Homan, and Cheshin, 2012). According to this framework, in the social domain, affect conveys information about the interpersonal attitudes, motivations, and intentions of individuals participating in the social interaction. Thus, positive feelings emerge when there are perceptions that the others are concerned with the quality of social exchange and well-being of others (Madrid, Niven, and Vasquez, 2019). In contrast, negative feelings arise from perceptions signalling that interaction partners are not interested in the quality of the relationship or if they are perceived as having negative attitudes toward the social exchange. As a result, it may be the case that the states of cohesion, trust, and psychological safety, together with collaboration expressed in interpersonal facilitation and social support, would increase the construction of positive affective tones because they involve affiliation meaning. In contrast, the lack of social integration exhibited in task, process, and relationship conflict should participate in the emergence of team negative affective tones due to the experience of weak bonding.
A Note on Affect Dispersion and Diversity

Thus far, we have based our review on the assumption that affective tones are homogenous states that represent the emotional experience of each team member. However, not all teams are defined by strong shared affective states because, inevitably, team members will differ in the level of the feeling they experience. For example, while in some teams all team members could tend towards feeling the same level of enthusiasm, in others there may be considerably more variation in the strength of enthusiasm experienced by team members. The construct of team affect dispersion (or diversity) has been coined to capture this phenomenon (Barsade and Gibson, 2012; Barsade and Knight, 2015; Collins et al, 2013). In teams, when affective tones are low in dispersion, all team members are prone to feel the shared feelings with the same intensity, which informs about a ‘strong’ affective tone. In contrast, team affective tones are ‘weak’ when the level of feelings experienced is high in dispersion, which implies that team members differ in the level of feelings experienced, such that in some cases, the affective state is weak, in others moderate, and in others strong.

The implications of affective tones’ dispersion remain relatively unexplored; however, initial insights propose two possible alternatives. Based on the categorization–elaboration model of group diversity (Van Knippenberg, De Dreu, and Homan, 2004), affective dispersion could be understood as a form of diversity within teams, namely, the presence of diverse degrees of affective experience among team members. The elaboration hypothesis indicates that high dispersion might have benefits for team effectiveness because affective dispersion would lead to a broader array of cognitive processes that increases intra and interpersonal flexibility and, thereby, better performance, expressed in, for example, creativity and innovation (George and King, 2007). However, the categorization hypothesis stresses that diversity is an expression of existing sub-groups within the group, which increases the likelihood of tension and conflict due to incompatibilities in viewpoints (Van Knippenberg, De Dreu, and Homan, 2004). Thus, dispersed affective tones, either positive or negative, may have negative consequences for behavioural processes such as team voice and innovation behaviour, due to the possible underlying conflict in this affective configuration.

The etiology of team affective tones

The construction of group-level affect is associated with an array of etiological factors and processes (Kelly and Barsade, 2001). The
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essential variable participating in the emergence of team affective tones is the composition of the team in terms of the individual differences of its members; thus, affective-laden team members’ personality traits influence the likelihood of building positive or negative shared affective states (Barsade and Gibson, 1998; Collins et al, 2013). For example, the mean-level of team members’ extroversion is linked to the mean-level of positive affective tones, due to the temperamental and affective components of this personality trait (for example, enthusiasm, joy, inspiration) (Eysenck, 1974; Lucas and Baird, 2004; Wilt and Revelle, 2009). In contrast, the composition based on the mean-level of neuroticism among team members, which is a trait conveying negative affective tendencies (for example, anxiety, tension, worry) (Watson and Clark, 1992; Widiger, 2009), contributes to the emergence of the mean-level of negative affective tones. The same applies to trait affect, which refers to the stable tendencies to experience positive or negative feelings over time, such as activation and excitement or anger and fear, respectively (Watson, 2000; Watson et al, 1999). In this case, team composition based on team members’ positive or negative trait affect explains why the team is characterized by positive or negative affective tones, respectively (Collins et al, 2013). Therefore, the extent of team members’ extraversion and neuroticism or positive and negative traits affect determines, in part, the kind of group affective states experienced within the team.

The translation of compositional team conditions into group-level states occurs through processes of affect convergence (Kelly and Barsade, 2001). Emotional contagion is one of these mechanisms, which is the transference to interaction partners of an individual’s feelings, who catch this affective experience (Elfenbein, 2014). Thus, a team member who is feeling excited may spread this mood among the other team members, whereas another team member experiencing nervousness may propagate this feeling, making other team members feel nervous. Emotional contagion is mostly unconscious, occurring due to the mimicry of facial expression and non-verbal communication that human beings tend to perform from the behaviour of others (Hatfield, Cacioppo, and Rapson, 1992). Adopting a facial expression that reflects the facial expression of another leads to catching the mood of the latter. Emotional contagion is particularly likely from individuals with salience within teams, as is the case of team leaders, formally defined as influential individuals who concentrate power and resources. Supporting this assertion, leaders’ affective dispositions embedded in affective laden personality traits (for example, extraversion and neuroticism), together with their concomitant moods, are often
caught by their followers, which might unfold in affective tones if the followers work together (Sy and Choi, 2013).

Recently, another psychological process, called affective presence, has been proposed as an etiological factor of shared affect in groups. Affective presence is an individual’s tendency to consistently elicit the same feelings among interaction partners, independent of affective personality traits and contagion (Eisenkraft and Elfenbein, 2010). Thus, an individual could tend to provoke enthusiasm among interaction partners (positive affective presence), although s/he is feeling tense in his/her interpersonal realm, while another individual could tend to produce nervousness in others (negative affective presence), even when he or she is feeling enthusiastic. Although the roots of affective presence are not still well understood, the application of this construct to the teamwork setting has shown that team members reliably describe their team leaders in terms of positive or negative affective presence (Madrid et al, 2016). Furthermore, this research has also established that affective presence is correlated to team affective tones and concomitant interpersonal processes such as team information sharing, interpersonal facilitation, innovation, and service performance (Jiang et al, 2018; Madrid, Totterdell, and Niven, 2016; Madrid et al, 2018). Thus, affective presence is emerging as a complementary process to emotional contagion for explaining why and how group affect is formed in teams.

Team affect also is derived from deliberate and intentional influences of team members. In this context, emotion has a social and communicative component, such that individuals may enact emotion expression behaviour to demonstrate their feelings and communicate their attitudes, motivations and intentions towards the social exchange with other team members, influencing, therefore, the others’ affect, cognition and behaviour (van Kleef, 2009). For example, the expression of enthusiasm communicates positive attitudes toward the relationship with others and also affiliative intentions, which leads to positive affective reactions among interaction partners (van Kleef, Homan, and Cheshin, 2012). In contrast, the expression of anger demonstrates indifference towards the affiliation processes, which is often conducive to negative affective experiences among group members (van Knippenberg and van Kleef, 2016). Another form of intentional affective influence occurs due to deliberate interpersonal emotion regulation (Troth et al, 2018). This refers to active behaviours oriented to change, provoke, or modulate affective states in others, in order to improve or worsen the affective experience of interaction partners (Niven, Totterdell, and Holman, 2009; Zaki and Williams, 2013). In the first case, individuals, for example, behave to reduce
negative feelings in others, such as those associated with distress like anxiety, tension, and worry. This effect is achieved by modifying the situations that provoke negative affect, helping to deploy attention and cognitively reappraise affect-eliciting events, and supporting the expression of negative feelings (Gross and Thompson, 2007). On the other hand, individuals also enact behaviours to worsen the affect of the other, such as using destructive criticizing, being unresponsive or giving the cold-shoulder (Niven et al, 2011). Both emotion expression and interpersonal emotion regulation behaviours can be enacted by any member of the group; however, as discussed above, these behaviours are particularly influential when performed by salient individuals. Supporting this assumption, studies have shown that leaders’ emotional expression and emotion regulation contribute to building affective experiences of group members in the context of teams (Little, Gooty, and Williams, 2016; Madrid, Niven, and Vasquez, 2019; van Knippenberg and van Kleef, 2016).

At the contextual level, team task characteristics also influence the group affective states shared among its members (Collins et al, 2013). Thus, mirroring the effects of task characteristics at the job level, when team members have to collectively manage tasks involving skill variety, complexity, challenges, and social meaning, an enthusiastic shared affective tone is likely to emerge (compare, Christian, Garza, and Slaughter, 2011; Hackman and Oldham, 1976). In contrast, shared stressful conditions, such as ambiguity, heavy workloads, and tight deadlines, increase the likelihood of an anxious affective tone (compare, Karasek, 1979; Wall et al, 1996). Furthermore, events derived from environmental characteristics and social behaviour in the teamwork setting are linked to the emergence of affective tones as well. Accordingly, collective events influencing all team members, for example, goal attainment, performance recognition, and positive feedback, spark the collective sense of pride, whereas events involving, for instance, errors, communication problems, and interpersonal conflict, elicit the shared experience of frustration (Basch and Fisher, 1998; Ohly and Schmitt, 2015). All the above contextual conditions are particularly influential when teamwork involves greater interdependency, which is the extent to which team members depend on the work of each other, so that task performance requires tight coordination to implement working procedures and attain the team's common goals (Courtright et al, 2015). As such, the greater the interdependence, the stronger should be the effects of task characteristics and affective events on the shared affective experiences of team members.
Finally, organizational culture also operates in the construction of group affect. In this scenario, affective culture is defined as group norms that dictate the appropriateness of experiencing and expressing positive or negative feelings (Barsade and Gibson, 2012; Barsade and Knight, 2015). Thus, some cultures reward the expression of positive feelings, such as enthusiasm, joy, and happiness, which should unfold into positive affective tones, whereas in other cultural settings, like those characterized by aggressive assertiveness, the expression of negative feelings is not curbed, it is accepted and even encouraged (Javidan et al, 2006), which should increase the emergence of negative affective tones. In general, the construct of affective culture has been defined at the organizational level of analysis; however, displays rules could also operate at closer environments, such as those described by the social context within teams.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we argued and discussed the possible relationships between affect and proactivity in teams. Accordingly, based on the proposals of the process models of teamwork, affective tones and team proactive behaviours are emergent states and behavioural processes respectively, that facilitate and contribute to team performance and building job attitudes of their members. Given their relevance, we surveyed and discussed theory and evidence about how affective tones, conductive to proactivity, emerge within teams. This review revealed that etiological factors participating in the construction of team-level affect are those associated with the composition of individual differences, task characteristics, affective-laden events, and the intentional influence of team members. Ultimately, understanding the relationship between affect and proactivity at the team level is valuable for promoting intervention of teamwork processes in organizations and increasing the possibility of functional team outcomes.
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