Section 1 – Climate Scale Items and Climate and Personality Scale Reliabilities

<u>**Inclusion**</u>
<u>Samples 1 and 2</u>
- My team has treated me like an insider.
- My team has cared about me.
- My team has given me the feeling that i belong.
- My team has appreciated me.
- My team has allowed me to present myself the way that i am.
- My team has encouraged me to be who i am.

<u>Sample 3</u>
- My team gave me the feeling that I belong.
- My team appreciated me.
- My team allowed me to present myself the way that I am.
- My team encouraged me to be who I am.
- My team treated me like an insider.
- My team encouraged me to be authentic.
- My team liked me.
- My team allowed me to be who I am.

<u>**Psychological Safety**</u>
Note. Sample 3 used the full scale. Samples 1-2 used only the three items that seemed most essential to defining psychological safety.
<u>Samples 1 and 2</u>
- Members of this team were able to bring up problems and tough issues.
- It has been safe to take risks on this team.
- It has been difficult to ask other members of this team for help. **(Rev)**

<u>Sample 3</u>
- If you made a mistake on this team, it was often held against you. **(Rev)**
- Members of this team were able to bring up problems and tough issues.
- People on this team sometimes rejected others for being different. **(Rev)**
- It was safe to take risks on this team.
- It was difficult to ask other members of this team for help. **(Rev)**
- No one on this team would deliberately act in a way that undermined my efforts.
- Working with members of this team, my unique skills and talents were valued and utilized.

Justice

Samples 1 and 2

- Some people on the team failed to do their share of the work.
- We expressed our views and feelings about the way decisions are made in the team
- The way we made decisions is free from personal bias
- When discussing procedures, we did not always account for the views of different people in the team **(rev)**
- In general, we thoroughly explained our thinking to each other.
- When we needed to explain something to each other, we did so by providing reasons and arguments.
- Teammates treated each other with respect
- Teammates refrained from improper remarks and comments.

Sample 3

- Some people on the team failed to do their share of the work. **(Rev)**
- Duties and obligations were shared fairly among team members.
- We expressed our views and feelings about the way decisions were made in the team.
- When discussing procedures, we did not always take into account the views of the different people in the team. **(Rev)**
- When discussing procedures, we used accurate and precise information.
- The decisions we made as a team were coherent and always followed the same criteria.
- We debated the issues that affect us.
- We put each other down. **(Rev)**
- We helped each other out.
- We treated each other with respect.
- We refrained from improper remarks and comments.
- Within the team, we communicated with each other in a respectful manner.
- In general, we thoroughly explained the team procedures we use to each other.
- When we needed to explain something within the team, we did it in a timely manner and by providing details.
- Within the team, we tailored communications based on the specific needs of each member.

Supplemental Table 1
Climate and Personality Scale Reliabilities (McDonald's ωs)

Sample	Inclusion	Safety	Justice	Extraversion	Alienation
1	.97	.64	.86	.88	.83
2	.96	.62	.81	.86	.78
3	.95	.81	.90	.84	.76

Section 2 - Correlations between Teams' Average CTS and Average Personality or Climate Ratings

Supplemental Table 2

Correlations between Teams' CTS-16 and Personality or Climate Ratings

CTS Item	Inclusion	Safety	Justice	Extraversion	Alienation
A - Pushy	.29	.15	.29	.13	-.02
B - Competitive	-.24	-.36	-.23	-.06	.26
C - Combative	-.54	-.57	-.55	-.15	.27
D - Rude	-.54	-.62	-.62	-.09	.25
E - Guarded	-.65	-.64	-.73	-.11	.20
F - Evasive	-.43	-.50	-.56	-.20	.22
G - Hesitant	-.45	-.51	-.60	-.32	.16
H - Timid	-.50	-.50	-.60	-.29	.15
I - Cautious	-.05	-.08	-.10	-.15	.04
J - Yielding	-.06	-.09	-.03	-.22	.11
K - Modest	.27	.27	.31	-.08	.01
L - Respectful	.73	.69	.76	.18	-.15
M - Open	.71	.60	.68	.23	-.12
N - Engaged	.67	.72	.77	.23	-.22
O - Confident	.58	.56	.68	.24	-.12
P - Courageous	.37	.39	.46	.24	-.05

Note. N = 139 Teams. Correlations > .17 are significant at *p* < .05 (uncorrected).

Section 3 - Correlations between Individuals' Team-Centered CTS Personality or Climate Ratings

Supplemental Table 3

Correlations between Individuals' Team-Centered CTS-16 and Personality or Climate Ratings

CTS Item	Inclusion	Safety	Justice	Extraversion	Alienation
A - Pushy	.09	-.12	.04	.09	.07
B - Competitive	-.22	-.34	-.22	-.04	.09
C - Combative	-.22	-.37	-.27	-.04	.14
D - Rude	-.28	-.34	-.43	-.07	.19
E - Guarded	-.40	-.42	-.43	-.06	.20
F - Evasive	-.18	-.33	-.34	-.17	.14
G - Hesitant	-.23	-.40	-.48	-.08	.11
H - Timid	-.18	-.28	-.36	-.07	.14
I - Cautious	-.04	-.06	.01	-.14	.03
J - Yielding	.00	.02	.04	-.08	.06
K - Modest	.13	.15	.17	-.08	-.01
L - Respectful	.30	.35	.42	.02	-.13
M - Open	.48	.45	.48	-.01	-.07
N - Engaged	.40	.44	.52	.07	-.15
O - Confident	.34	.39	.48	.12	-.06
P - Courageous	.24	.21	.29	.12	-.01

*Note. N*s = 446 (for Inclusion, Safety, and Justice) or 442 (for Extraversion and Alienation). Correlations > .09 are significant at *p* < .05 (uncorrected).

Section 4 - Correlations between Individuals' CTS Ratings and their Teammates' Personality or Team Climate Ratings

Supplemental Table 4

Correlations between Individuals' CTS-16 and Teammates' Personality or Climate Ratings

CTS Item	Inclusion	Safety	Justice	Extraversion	Alienation
A - Pushy	.10	.13	.12	.01	-.02
B - Competitive	-.08	-.06	-.10	-.03	.10
C - Combative	-.22	-.17	-.24	-.08	.06
D - Rude	-.20	-.21	-.22	-.04	.01
E - Guarded	-.27	-.23	-.34	-.09	.03
F - Evasive	-.21	-.20	-.25	-.05	.05
G - Hesitant	-.26	-.21	-.28	-.18	.04
H - Timid	-.26	-.21	-.25	-.17	.01
I – Cautious	-.05	-.04	-.07	-.02	.01
J – Yielding	-.08	-.08	-.06	-.06	.05
K – Modest	.03	.03	.07	.02	.04
L – Respectful	.31	.26	.33	.10	.01
M – Open	.26	.23	.31	.14	-.02
N – Engaged	.32	.31	.37	.12	-.04
O – Confident	.25	.22	.30	.10	-.03
P – Courageous	.15	.18	.22	.08	-.01

*Note. N*s = 446 for Inclusion and Justice, 444 for Safety, and 441 for Extraversion and Alienation.
Correlations > .09 are significant at *p* < .05 (uncorrected).

Section 5 – Comparing Results for Samples 1-2 versus Sample 3

Whereas Samples 1-2 administered the same items to students from the same engineering course, Sample 3 administered somewhat different items to students from a different engineering course. To check if those differences affected the results, for each association reported in Table 3, Supplemental Table 5 compares that association in Sample 3 with the corresponding association in Samples 1-2. All *CI*s included zero, indicating no significant differences between samples.

Supplemental Table 5

Tests of Differences between Sample 3 and Samples 1-2 in Summary Parameters for Relations between CTS-16 and Personality or Climate Ratings

Measure	Communal Vector *[CI]*	Agentic Vector *[CI]*	Overall Vector Angle *[CI]*	Amplitude *[CI]*
teams' average CTS ↔ teams' personality or climate ratings				
Inclusion	0.06 [-0.12,0.25]	-0.07 [-0.25,0.13]	-7.4 [-21.7,9.1]	0.03 [-0.16,0.22]
Safety	-0.02 [-0.17,0.13]	-0.11 [-0.29,0.09]	-7.4 [-21.7,6.9]	-0.06 [-0.23,0.11]
Justice	0.06 [-0.07,0.19]	0.02 [-0.16,0.22]	-0.4 [-13.7,15.6]	0.06 [-0.06,0.22]
Extraversion	-0.20 [-0.47,0.07]	-0.08 [-0.30,0.14]	19.90 [-26.3,84.8]	-0.19 [-0.45,0.10]
Alienation	-0.08 [-0.36,0.21]	0.01 [-0.23,0.24]	-11.9 [-138.5,136.7]	0.08 [-0.23,0.29]
individuals' CTS ↔ individuals' personality or team climate ratings				
Inclusion	0.09 [-0.06,0.24]	0.02 [-0.11,0.18]	-2.2 [-15.8,14.5]	0.09 [-0.07,0.25]
Safety	0.10 [-0.02,0.22]	-0.02 [-0.14,0.10]	-5.6 [-16.5,6.8]	0.09 [-0.04,0.21]
Justice	0.10 [-0.00,0.20]	0.05 [-0.07,0.17]	0.2 [-9.8,11.0]	0.11 [0.00,0.22]
Extraversion	-0.11 [-0.25,0.04]	0.02 [-0.09,0.14]	31.70 [-4.5,74.8]	-0.05 [-0.18,0.10]
Alienation	-0.08 [-0.24,0.07]	-0.04 [-0.15,0.05]	7.3 [-48.2,76.9]	0.09 [-0.06,0.23]
individuals' CTS ↔ teammates' personality or climate ratings				
Inclusion	0.1 [-0.02,0.23]	-0.03 [-0.13,0.07]	-16.2 [-36.9,2.3]	0.07 [-0.06,0.20]
Safety	-0.02 [-0.16,0.11]	-0.08 [-0.19,0.02]	-12.2 [-35.6,9.2]	-0.06 [-0.20,0.07]
Justice	0.09 [-0.03,0.21]	0 [-0.11,0.09]	-8.6 [-24.7,7.7]	0.08 [-0.05,0.20]
Extraversion	-0.04 [-0.16,0.10]	-0.06 [-0.17,0.05]	-10.50 [-86.6,63.1]	-0.06 [-0.19,0.08]
Alienation	-0.02 [-0.15,0.12]	0 [-0.10,0.12]	-29.1 [-169.4,170.8]	0.01 [-0.10,0.09]

Note. CTS = Circumplex Team Scan. Values show how Sample 3 compares to Samples 1-2. *CI* = 95% confidence intervals for differences in structural summary parameters as computed by the *circumplex* package for R (Girard, Zimmerman, & Wright, 2018).

References

Girard, J. M., Zimmermann, J., & Wright, A. G. (2018, June). *New tools for circumplex data analysis and visualization in R*. Paper presented at the meeting of the *Society for Interpersonal Theory and Research,* Montreal, Canada.