Introduction
Group performance is typically conceptualized and assessed using two primary group processes: task and maintenance (Rohrbaugh, Gagné, Hutchings, & Smith, 1975). The current study follows the structure of this model by examining the characteristics of group interaction and subsequent group decision quality.

Method
Participants were randomly assigned to 20 groups. Each group consisted of 20 participants who completed two survival decision making tasks. For each task, the group was asked to vote on a decision and then to experience feedback aimed at increasing relational development, quality of the decisions and speed of decision making. The goal of this specific project is to determine how inputs of minority opinion member, personal need for structure, and feedback did not jointly moderate the relationship between the group’s process and decision quality.

Results
Effects of Need for Structure of Minority Opinion Member on Group Decisions

Table 1: Summary of Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) for Group Decision Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Need for Structure</td>
<td>48.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback * Group Composition Minority Opinion Member * Forming * Feedback * Distribution of Personal Need for Structure</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Personal Need for Structure</td>
<td>104.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104.79</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Composition Minority Opinion Member</td>
<td>335.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>335.35</td>
<td>11.138</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>194.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97.08</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming</td>
<td>48.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Personal Need for Structure</td>
<td>48.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
These results suggest there is no single best way to create a successful group. These effects are moderated by group development experiences such as forming and feedback. The key outcome under these conditions.

Summary
When analyzing the results, it is important to examine specifically the differences among the three levels of feedback. Asking the most expert member in the minority, has a high personal need for structure and experiences maintenance forming, group added value is higher. The effects on the group’s process and decision quality were most significant.
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