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Introduction

Group performance is typically conceptualized using input and output processes. (Tjosvold, 1992; Hackman & Lawler, 1968; Hackman, 1975). This study seeks to follow the structure of the model in determining research questions.

Background

- Conscientiousness characterized as十堰ianism, conscientiousness, or achievement orientation; and subsequent group decision quality. The purpose of this study is to determine if similar results would occur when comparing the conscientiousness characteristics of the entire group as well as comparing the feedback condition. To explore this question, four research hypotheses are developed.

- Conscientiousness may influence group behavior. It has been found that conscientious groups tend to be more effective in decision making (Hollenbeck, Ilgen, Sego, Hedlund, Major, & Phillips, 1990; Hollenbeck, Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1985).

- Conscientiousness may assist in interpersonal utilized in the process environment.

- Conscientiousness may be greater than individual members. (Pettit & Cotten, 1977)

Method

Participants

Participants were 34 pairs of psychology students. As inactive team members, participants were randomly assigned to the group for each of the two tasks. Each group had a total score across the two tasks.

Design

The two experimental manipulations were used: Forming and Feedback. For the Forming manipulation, participants were randomly assigned to two of the conditions: Forming or No Forming. For the Feedback manipulation, participants were randomly assigned to two of the conditions: Feedback or No Feedback.

Results

Results indicate that the effects of group conscientiousness on group performance were moderated by group development. Groups high in conscientiousness may be more effective in decision making regardless of how it was structured.

Discussion

These results provide some context to the existing research supporting Cleveland's (1990) model. The results also demonstrate the importance of individual and group characteristics. The results also show that conscientiousness is a critical factor in group performance.

Questions for ongoing research:

- Why do high conscientiousness groups that receive only feedback perform worse than high conscientiousness groups that only receive initial formation? Are there other factors that influence group performance? There may be a need for additional research that explores these factors.

- How do low conscientiousness groups react to feedback? Do they use feedback to improve their performance or do they ignore it?

- How do high conscientiousness groups react to feedback? Do they use feedback to improve their performance or do they ignore it?
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- How do high conscientiousness groups react to feedback? Do they use feedback to improve their performance or do they ignore it?