CORRIGENDUM

Expression of Concern Regarding Grant, A. M., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 54(3), 528–550. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2011.61968043

Adam Grant and David Hofmann have expressed concerns about the integrity of the data in Study 2 for their 2011 *Academy of Management Journal* article, "Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity." The data collection and analyses for Study 2 were handled by Francesca Gino.

In an effort to verify the results, Grant and Hofmann contacted Data Colada and subsequently obtained an original data file from a research assistant involved in the experiment. Consistent with the published results, in Gino's file, the hypothesized interaction effect of the extraversion and proactivity manipulations on group performance is supported. In the research assistant's file, though, it is no longer statistically significant.

Group performance was measured by the number of T-shirts that participants folded, and the research assistant stated that the scores in this file may not be entirely reliable, as T-shirts were counted quickly between sessions. To corroborate the research assistant counts, participants also recorded their T-shirt counts in a Qualtrics survey.

Grant and Hofmann were unable to obtain the Qualtrics file, and it seemed possible that the Gino file used these Qualtrics scores instead of the research assistant counts. However, a closer inspection by Data Colada of the discrepancies between the research assistant and Gino files casts doubt on the integrity of the T-shirt scores in the Gino file.

In total, there were 163 participants in the experiments, and T-shirt scores for 159 of these participants appear in both files. Although the T-shirt scores are identical for 130 of the participants, they do not match for the remaining 29 participants. Over 96% of the T-shirt counts (28 of 29) differ from the research assistant's file to Gino's file in directions favoring the hypotheses. These discrepancies are unlikely to be the result of random measurement error, especially when considering that the majority of the T-shirt discrepancies differ by round numbers of 10, 20, 30, or 40. For example, one participant was recorded as having folded 91 T-shirts in the research assistant file but 61 in the Gino file, and another was recorded as having folded 21 T-shirts in the research assistant file but 61 T-shirts in the Gino file.

It is difficult to imagine how research assistants could have miscounted T-shirts so substantially or so evenly. Further, the majority of the discrepancies are multiple participants within the same team; 21 are all three members of one team, and 4 are two members of a team. (The T-shirt counts for the confederates were not utilized in the analyses, but there are also discrepancies between the two files for 10 confederates, all in the hypothesized directions.) It is important to note that the research assistant's file only contains scores for the dependent variable of group performance. It does not contain data on mediating mechanisms or the manipulation check, which were collected in Qualtrics along with the corroboratory measure of T-shirt counts from the participants.