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ABSTRACT

Previous research has linked group satisfaction with increased productivity and better overall product outcomes. It is important then to determine the variables that affect the satisfaction of group members. Three possible variables are the gender composition of the group, the individualism/collectivism level of the group members, as well as the socio-political orientation of the members. Three hypotheses were proposed in this study: (1) Both men and women would experience less satisfaction when placed in a gender-balanced group than when placed in a group that is uniform; (2) Collectivists would have a higher satisfaction level with their group in comparison to individualists; and (3) Group members would be more satisfied with the group if the outcome of the group activity is congruent with their political orientation than if the outcome is not congruent with their political orientation.

Undergraduate and graduate students were randomly placed into one of three groups, each with a different gender composition (four females, four males, or two females and two males). Subjects filled out a survey that measured their socio-political orientation and their individualism/collectivism levels and then participated in solving a socio-political dilemma. Once group consensus was reached, the subjects took the Group Satisfaction Survey which measured their level of group satisfaction. The first hypothesis
was not supported by this research and only partial support was found for the second hypothesis. The third hypothesis reached significance, but the variables only accounted for four percent of the variance.

Many variables may play a part in enhancing or detracting from the members' satisfaction with the group. Establishing these variables will be of great value to organizations as they continue to strive for an increase in production and improvement in their final products.
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INTRODUCTION

Definition

Groups are an integral part of everyday life. They are the structure in which we work, play, learn, and even pray. However, even though groups are so vital to our existence, there is some discrepancy over the actual definition of the concept. As Wheelan (1994) points out in her book, *Group Processes: A Developmental Perspective*, the definition for group ranges in degree from a collection of individuals and/or individuals sharing a common relationship (Webster's Dictionary, 1989) to Luft's (1984) definition that a group is a living, breathing entity, unique from the individual members that form it. The range between these two definitions is more than extreme. It seems like the two theorists are defining two different worlds. Webster's definition is focused at the individual level in which a group is simply a gathering of people. Luft, on the other hand, appears to ignore the individual members defining a group as a separate entity all its own (Wheelan, 1994). Canaan (1985) finds a middle ground for his definition of a group. He concluded that groups are a "collection of individuals" who are "interdependent" in nature.

As Johnson and Johnson (1994) point out, definitions of groups often focus on one aspect of a group and not the term in its entirety. Their solution to this is to combine all of the definitions into one. They define a small group as:

...two or more individuals in face-to-face interaction, each aware of his
or her membership in the group, each aware of the others who belong
to the group, and each aware of their positive interdependence as they
strive to achieve mutual goals (13).

Johnson and Johnson (1994) acknowledge that a group may not always meet the criteria
of this definition but, in most cases, it will. For the purposes of this study, the definition
of a group will be the one proposed by Johnson and Johnson.

Group Dynamics

Throughout the centuries, scientists have been interested in groups and their
effects on the members, other groups, and society in general. However, it was not until
the twentieth century when social scientists began to focus their attention toward groups,
developing the area of group dynamics (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). In 1985, Conye
defined group dynamics as the "scientific study of groups and of what occurs in them." 
Johnson and Johnson (1994) expanded this definition, in which they describe group
dynamics as the "...scientific study of behavior in groups to advance our knowledge about
the nature of groups, group development, and the interrelations between groups and
individuals, other groups, and larger entities" (14 & 15). It should be recalled that during
World War II Lewin began to scientifically study and apply the effects of group dynamics
as a change effort. He studied the differences between two approaches, group discussion
and decision versus a lecture, on the effects of altering food preferences. Consistently,
significant positive results were found when the group discussion and decision approach
was used among the food preferences of homemakers when deciding what to feed their
families (Conye, 1985). This research by Lewin, as described by Canaan (1985), spurred
researchers into considering the effects of group dynamics on various organizational change strategies. One such study was conducted by Seashore and Bowers in 1970 in which they found group dynamics to positively affect organizational change in such ways as improved organizational productivity, a decrease in turnover, and an increase in employee satisfaction.

**Group Satisfaction**

Group dynamics is becoming of even greater importance today as organizations begin to and continue to utilize work groups and teams in order to improve efficiency and increase productivity. In this vein, group dynamics research has been conducted to find links between group productivity and a variety of possible group moderators. One such moderator is group satisfaction. Although the research is limited, Yalom (1987) conducted a study that found evidence supporting the link between group satisfaction and overall group productivity. He found that satisfaction with the group leads to greater productivity and a higher degree of creativity, which in turn leads to better outcomes. This means that not only were satisfied group members more productive, but their final product was qualitatively better than those unsatisfied with their group. Yalom (1987) also found that those who were more satisfied with their group tended to remain with the organization longer than if they were less satisfied.

Acknowledging that group satisfaction is important to group productivity and the quality of an outcome, leads social scientists to the question, "What variables affect group members' satisfaction level?" Caple and Cox (1989) conducted a study in which they observed a number of variables including members' satisfaction with the group
experience. They found that subjects' level of expectations (high, moderate, or low) regarding the group experience did not significantly affect the subjects' satisfaction. Nor did they find statistical significance supporting the idea that by establishing structure early on in the group, the members would be more satisfied with the experience than those groups without predetermined structure. Wall and Nolan (1986 and 1987) found that group conflict was negatively related to group satisfaction, and they found equity to be positively related to group satisfaction.

Other variables may play a part in the satisfaction of group members', as well. Three of the more significant variables found in the literature to affect group satisfaction are the group's gender composition, the group members' individualism/collectivism levels and the members' socio-political orientation.

Gender Composition

Gender composition has been found to be an influential variable in many group settings. Martin and Shanahan (1983) stated in their literature review on group gender composition, that almost no studies found gender composition to be unimportant. More specifically, Martin and Shanahan stated that task outcomes and the functioning of small groups can be dramatically affected by gender composition.

Many studies have varied the gender composition of groups from uniform (e.g., all female) to skewed (e.g., more males than females) to gender-balanced (i.e., equal number of males and females). LaNoue and Curtis (1985) found women who were in gender-mixed groups gave themselves less rewards, had poorer performance, and actually felt this poor performance was due to lack of ability more often than men. However,
when the women were placed in uniform groups or worked alone, they did not differ from men on amount of rewards given to self or their level of performance. Wharton and Baron (1987), on the other hand, found that men experience lower self-esteem, lower job satisfaction, and higher job-related depression when they are in gender balanced work settings than when they are in male skewed work settings. This is not surprising because men have traditionally been found to be the influential sex in most work-group settings (Doyle and Paludi, 1991). So, when they are placed into a setting in which women exert more influence than usual, it can be difficult for them to accept. It is not surprising, then, that South et al. (1987) found both males and females receive less achievement oriented social support from individuals of the opposite sex when placed in a gender-balanced group.

In contrast to the findings of these studies, Martin (1985) believes balanced mixed-gender task groups, for both males and females are "advantageous" over skewed and uniform groups. Martin's basis for this proposition is that "men benefit because the presence of women gives them more opportunities to participate and makes interaction less dominance oriented, and women benefit because the presence of men adds legitimacy to task-oriented goals and pursuits" (Taps and Martin, 1990, 474). Taps and Martin (1990) studied this by looking at the amount of influence women have in the three different group compositions and specifically wanted to assess if gender-balanced task groups were actually more advantageous for women than uniform and skewed groups. They found that women in balanced and uniform groups have significantly more influence than women in male-skewed groups. A non-significant difference was also
detected between balanced and uniform groups, in which women in balanced groups have slightly more influence than women in uniform groups. These results indicate that gender-balanced groups are superior to gender skewed groups; however, as stated above, the difference between gender-balanced and uniform groups was non-significant in relation to women's influential power over the group.

Individualism/Collectivism

The level of individualism/collectivism felt by a member of a group has been found to moderate individual cooperation (Wagner, 1995) and performance within that group (Earley, 1993). In order to better understand why individualism/collectivism level impacts a group's performance, the terms should be defined. Wagner and Moch (1986) define individualism as the interests of self are more important than the needs or goals of the group. Therefore, if group goals differ from the personal goals of an individualist, the group goals will be ignored. On the other hand, a collectivist places the goals and needs of the group before their own personal needs (Wagner, 1995). Personal desires will be sacrificed for the sake of the group by a collectivist. As stated above, Wagner (1995) found group members' level of individualism/collectivism moderates cooperation. More specifically, less cooperative behavior was found to occur among individualists who are self-reliant and independent, and more cooperative behavior was found among the reliant and interdependent collectivists.

Socio-Political Orientation

Another variable that may affect group satisfaction is the socio-political viewpoints of the individual members. In the United States, two major socio-political
orientations have surfaced, conservatism and liberalism. Linder (1977) studied the differences in the value systems between these two groups. The author used Laing et. al.'s (1966) Interpersonal Perception Method in which subjects were instructed to rank order a list of values, as well as indicate whether they accepted or rejected the value according to their own personal value system. It was found that although both conservatives and liberals similarly rank ordered the values, they disagreed about the actual acceptance or rejection of particular values. This may indicate that the two groups follow a different value system.

Not only are there distinct differences between the value systems of the conservatives and liberals, there may also be differences within each socio-political group over a period of time. Although McBroom and Reed (1990) found that conservatism was on the rise during the 1980s, certain indicators did not remain consistent during that time period. It was found that although the trends of political-economic conservatism and opposition to abortion remained consistent with measures of conservatism, sex-role traditionalism was not accurately reflected by these measures. This points to the fact that this indicator changed over time in a different direction than the other indicators.

Although there may be differences within the socio-political groups themselves, of importance to this study are the differences between the two groups. More specifically, the current study is interested in the difference between conservatives' and liberals' level of group satisfaction.
Summary and Hypotheses

The reviewed research has provided evidence that gender composition is an important variable when considering groups and group members. It is not unlikely then that gender composition influences the satisfaction of a group. However, the research is somewhat mixed as to whether certain combinations of males and females in a group affects the group, as a whole, positively or negatively. One purpose of this study is to investigate if gender composition, using gender-balanced and uniform groups, moderates group satisfaction. As previously cited, researchers have found (LaNoue & Curtis 1985; Wharton & Baron 1987; South et al. 1987), members' experiences are more negative when placed in gender-balanced groups. Although Taps and Martin (1990) found significant differences between gender-balanced groups and those groups that are highly skewed for women's experiences within the group, they did not find a significant difference between gender-balanced and uniform groups. One purpose of this study is to investigate if gender composition, using only gender-balanced and uniform groups, moderates group satisfaction. Thus:

Hypothesis 1: Both men and women will experience less satisfaction when placed in a gender-balanced group than when placed in a group that is uniform.

A second possible moderator of group satisfaction is the members' level of individualism/collectivism. As previously stated, cooperation has been found to be moderated by this trait, in which individualists are less cooperative than collectivists. This leads one to believe that if an individualist is less cooperative in the group because
they prefer to work alone, they would also have a lower satisfaction level with the group, in comparison to the collectivists. Additionally, because collectivists were found to be more cooperative in a group setting, it would follow that they would be more satisfied with the group when comparing them to individualists. Thus:

Hypothesis 2: Collectivists will have a higher satisfaction level with their group in comparison to individualists.

The third purpose of this study is to investigate whether group satisfaction is moderated by the socio-political orientation of the group members. As Linder's (1977) findings indicate, conservatives and liberals may follow different value systems. Consistent with this research, it is suggested that:

Hypothesis 3: Group members will be more satisfied with the group if the outcome of the group activity is congruent with their political orientation than if the outcome is not congruent with their political orientation.
METHOD

Participants

A sample of 286 undergraduate and graduate students from two southern California state universities participated in this study. The total sample consisted of 208 females and 78 males ranging in ages from 16 to 52, with a mean age of 25.47 and a median of 23. The students' median GPA was 3.00, ranging from 1.39 to 4.00. The ethnicity of the subjects reflected 46.2% Caucasian, 22.4% Hispanic, 10.5% African American, 10.1% Asian, 7.3% mixed, 2.7% other, and .7% did not respond to this item. The majority of subjects were collected from various psychology courses; however, some subjects were from a social science expository writing course as well. Students voluntarily participated either during class time or they participated during a time when class was not in session. Extra credit was given to those who participated.

Materials

Measurement of Group Satisfaction. Group satisfaction was measured with a 12-item scale developed by the researcher (Appendix A). The 12 items tap individual members' satisfaction with the group as a whole, their own participation in the group, their interactions with group members, and the outcome of the group. Each item has a five-point Likert response scale with 1 representing "Very Dissatisfied"; 3 representing "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"; and 5 representing "Very Satisfied". A pilot test was conducted to ensure reliability of scale items. The sample included 102 male and
female undergraduate and graduate students from a state university. The participants signed informed consent forms prior to completing the survey and afterward were given debriefing forms. The participants completed the survey during class time and were instructed to draw upon a past group activity in which they had engaged. The results of the pilot study revealed an alpha reliability coefficient of .91, with all items included (Table 1). See Table 2 for the demographic information for the Group Satisfaction Survey.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SMID</th>
<th>CITC</th>
<th>SMC</th>
<th>AID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM1</td>
<td>44.9608</td>
<td>.5386</td>
<td>.7314</td>
<td>.9086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM2</td>
<td>45.0490</td>
<td>.7178</td>
<td>.6840</td>
<td>.9001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM3</td>
<td>44.8824</td>
<td>.6775</td>
<td>.7314</td>
<td>.9018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM4</td>
<td>44.8137</td>
<td>.6454</td>
<td>.5025</td>
<td>.9033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM5</td>
<td>44.5882</td>
<td>.6470</td>
<td>.6025</td>
<td>.9034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM6</td>
<td>45.0196</td>
<td>.6401</td>
<td>.7644</td>
<td>.9035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM7</td>
<td>45.0098</td>
<td>.6169</td>
<td>.7051</td>
<td>.9046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM8</td>
<td>44.9608</td>
<td>.6410</td>
<td>.6199</td>
<td>.9035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM9</td>
<td>44.9118</td>
<td>.5923</td>
<td>.5379</td>
<td>.9056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM10</td>
<td>44.8824</td>
<td>.6128</td>
<td>.6887</td>
<td>.9049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM11</td>
<td>44.8627</td>
<td>.7209</td>
<td>.6138</td>
<td>.8997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM12</td>
<td>44.7353</td>
<td>.6977</td>
<td>.5949</td>
<td>.9008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .9107 and Standardized Item Alpha = .9112

Note. SMID = Scale Mean if Item Deleted; CITC = Corrected Item-Total Correlation; SMC = Squared Multiple Correlation; AID = Alpha if Item Deleted.

Measurement of Socio-Political Orientation and Individualism/Collectivism. The Political-Economic Conservatism scale (PEC) and a scale measuring individualism/collectivism were combined into one survey consisting of 25 items (Appendix B). The PEC was adapted from the Newcomb et al. (1967) scale by
McBroom and Reed (1990) and it measures an individual's level of conservatism. The scale consists of five items, with a five-point Likert response scale (1 representing "Strongly Disagree" and 5 representing "Strongly Agree"). After calculations of the alpha reliability for the PEC, the item "Most employers think only of profits and care little about employees' welfare" was deleted from further analysis because the alpha coefficient increased from .31 to .44.

Twenty items measuring individualism/collectivism were adapted from Wagner (1995) from a seven-point response Likert scale to the same five-point response Likert scale as used for the PEC. This scale measures an individual's level of individualism/collectivism. In assessing both the eigenvalues and scree plot, Principal Axis Factoring revealed that 18 of the 20 items loaded heavily on five factors. The five factors could be described as (1) Self Reliance, with an alpha coefficient of .72; (2) Working Alone, with an alpha coefficient of .80; (3) Winning is Everything, with an alpha coefficient of .74; (4) Group First, with an alpha coefficient of .71; and (5) Individual First, with an alpha coefficient of .74. The item "Success is the most important thing in life" loaded onto both Factor 1 (Self Reliance) and Factor 3 (Winning is Everything) at a weight of .41901 and .40485, respectively. Because of its weight on the two factors, this item was included in the analyses of both scales. Two items, "What happens to me is my own doing" and "It annoys me when other people perform better than I do," were deleted from further analyses because they did not load on any of the five factors at a level of .35 or above. The resulting alpha reliability coefficient was .66. Refer to Appendix G for the factor loadings for each item. Responses to one item from the PEC and 14 items from the
individualism/collectivism scale were reversed so that higher numbers indicated stronger liberalism and collectivism, respectively. Refer to Table 2 for the demographic information for both of these surveys.

Table 2

Measures of Central Tendency for Surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Overall Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Satisfaction</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.9350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.4381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism/Collectivism</td>
<td>61.19</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.6609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A higher score on the Group Satisfaction, PEC, and Individualism/Collectivism Surveys indicates greater satisfaction, conservatism, and individualism, respectively.

Group Activity. The group problem-solving exercise (Appendix C) was developed in order to stimulate participants into a discussion that would draw out their individual political beliefs. Subjects were presented with the scenario in which they had to decide between donating money to a pro-welfare organization or an anti-welfare organization. The subjects were allowed 15 minutes to discuss and then decide to which organization the money would be donated.

Welfare was used in this exercise because it is believed to be an issue that divides conservatives and liberals. Support for this belief can be seen in a current issue of Fortune magazine in which Paul Krugman (1995) writes that "the main difference between economic liberals and economic conservatives is over what they propose to do
with the welfare state" (41). Krugman goes on to add that conservatives would like to all but remove the "welfare state's safety net" and liberals would prefer to have the net preserved if not raised (41).

Procedure

The researcher first presented the subjects with an informed consent form (Appendix D) in which they were instructed to read, and then sign and date, upon their agreement to participate. Next, the subjects were given the composite survey that measured their level of conservatism/liberalism and individualism/collectivism. Upon completion of the survey the subjects were placed into groups of four, ideally consisting of four females, four males, or two females and two males. Each group was assigned a number and were instructed to write the number on every material received thereafter.

The subjects were then given the Group Problem-Solving Exercise (Appendix C) and were instructed to read, discuss, and within 15 minutes come to a group decision. At this point, the researcher left the room to reduce any experimenter bias or pressure to select a specific option. Once the 15 minutes had elapsed, the researcher returned to the subjects ensuring that all groups had come to a consensus.

The subjects were then given the Group Satisfaction Survey (Appendix A) and a demographic information form (Appendix E) and were instructed to complete these independent of their groups. After the subjects had completed this last portion of the study, they were given a debriefing form (Appendix F) and thanked for their participation. The researcher stapled each subject's response materials together and assigned each survey a group number.
RESULTS

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis predicted that both men and women would experience greater group satisfaction when placed in a uniform group than when placed in a group that is gender-balanced. Due to group composition, the number of groups usable for analysis of this hypothesis dropped from 74 to 61, with 35 groups consisting of four females, nine groups of males, and 17 groups of two females and two males. Of these groups, 36 chose the pro-welfare decision and 25 chose the anti-welfare decision. In order to evaluate the significance of this hypothesis, a factorial analysis of variance was conducted. A 2 X 2 between-groups analysis of variance was performed on group satisfaction (SATTOT). Independent variables consisted of gender composition (uniform and mixed groups) (GENSAME) and gender (male and female) (GENDER). Analyses were performed by SPSS for Windows.

Results of evaluation of the assumptions of normality revealed that the dependent variable, SATTOT, was negatively skewed at -1.087. In addition, there were unequal cell sizes due to the greater number of females than males and the greater number of uniform groups than gender-balanced groups. Although there were unequal cell sizes, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated. Further, there were no outliers found.
Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Group Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>537.317</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.659</td>
<td>5.294**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>412.309</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.309</td>
<td>8.124**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Composition</td>
<td>236.424</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.424</td>
<td>4.658*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5.944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.944</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

Group satisfaction varied significantly with gender and gender composition of the groups, as summarized in Table 3, with $F(1, 240) = 8.124, p < .01$, and $F(1, 240) = 4.658, p < .05$, respectively. There was no statistically significant interaction found between gender and gender composition, however. Refer to Table 4 for the independent variables' cell means.

Table 4

Table of Means for Hypothesis 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group Composition</th>
<th>Uniform</th>
<th>Gender-Balanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.36</td>
<td>50.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.84</td>
<td>52.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although significant main effects were found with the two independent variables on
group satisfaction, it was found through examination of the mean effects that the
difference between the two types of group composition and group satisfaction was not
significant for either males nor females, $F(1, 68) = 2.49$, $p = .12$ and $F(1, 172) = 2.14$,
$p = .15$, respectively. Thus, the first hypothesis was not supported by the data gathered.

**Hypothesis 2**

The second hypothesis predicted that collectivists would have a higher level of
group satisfaction in comparison to individualists. The Pearson product-moment
correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the relationship between level of group
satisfaction (SATTOT) and the five factors that make up the individualism/collectivism
scale (Appendix G).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Group Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance</td>
<td>-.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Alone</td>
<td>.0697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning is Everything</td>
<td>-.0542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group First</td>
<td>.2272*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual First</td>
<td>-.1300**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
**p < .01.

The results of the Pearson correlation revealed that group satisfaction significantly
correlated with two of the individualism/collectivism survey's factors, Individual First, $r$
(285) = -1.30, $p < .05$, and Group First, $r(283) = .227$, $p < .01$ (Table 5). These results
show support for the second hypothesis. However, although the correlations were significant the results should be considered with caution due to their small size.

**Hypothesis 3**

The last hypothesis predicted that group members would be more satisfied with the group if the outcome of the group activity was congruent with their political orientation than if the outcome was not congruent with their political orientation. A standard multiple regression was performed between group satisfaction (SATTOT) as the dependent variable and welfare decision (WELDEC), political orientation of the individual (POLORIEN), and the interaction term of WELDEC and POLORIEN (POLDEC) as the independent variables.

Results of the evaluation of assumptions led to throwing out three multivariate outliers stemming from the dependent variable, SATTOT. Based on an assessment of partial residual plots of the dependent variable and each of the independent variables as well as by assessing the standardized residual plot, the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals were met. With 283 usable cases and three independent variables, the cases-to-IV ratio was 94.3:1, well above the 20:1 minimum requirement for regression suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (1989). In examination of the squared multiple correlations (SMC) of the independent variables, it was found that the SMCs among the POLDEC variable with the variables POLORIEN, \( r^2 (283) = .299, p < .01 \), and WELDEC, \( r^2 (283) = .767, p < .01 \), were nearing a violation of the multicollinearity and singularity assumption. Multicollinearity should be expected to some degree because POLDEC is an interaction term composed of POLORIEN and
Table 6

Standard Multiple Regression of Welfare Decision, Political Orientation of Group Members, and Political Decision on Group Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>SATTOT (DV)</th>
<th>WELDEC</th>
<th>POLORIEN</th>
<th>POLDEC</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>sr² (unique)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WELDEC</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-13.464</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLORIEN</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.1599</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLDEC</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>70.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means: 50.633, 1.428, 12.117, 17.401
Std. deviations: 6.529, .496, 2.405, 7.316
R² = .04
Adjusted R² = .03
R = .20**

Table 6 displays the correlations between the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients (b) and intercept, the semi-partial correlations (sr²) and R, R², and adjusted R². R for regression was significantly different from zero, F (3, 278) = 3.81, p ≤ .01. All three regression coefficients, WELDEC, POLORIEN, and POLDEC, differed significantly from zero with 95% confidence limits of -21.5076 to -5.4204, -2.5539 to - .6439, and .4559 to 1.7499, respectively.

All three independent variables contributed significantly to prediction of group satisfaction; welfare decision (sr² = .04), political orientation (sr² = .04), and POLDEC (sr² = .04). These three independent variables in combination only contributed to 4% (3% adjusted) of the variability in group satisfaction.

Additional Multiple Regressions were ran to better evaluate the effects of political
orientation and welfare decision on group satisfaction. The first Multiple Regression analyzed pro-welfare decision and political orientation on group satisfaction resulting with an $R$ significantly different from zero, $F(1, 161) = 3.89, \ p \leq .05$. The second Multiple Regression analyzed anti-welfare decision and political orientation on group satisfaction, resulting with an $R$ also significantly different from zero, $F(1, 120) = 11.61, \ p < .01$. This indicates a stronger relationship between group satisfaction and those that score high on the PEC and chose the anti-welfare decision, than those that score lower on the PEC and chose the pro-welfare decision. Refer to Table 7 for a summary of the results.

Table 7

Results of Additional Multiple Regressions for Hypothesis 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-WELDEC</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.4286</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-1.972**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-WELDEC</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>3.408*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01.
DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis was not supported by the current research. It was found that gender composition did not significantly affect group satisfaction for either males nor females. These results do not reflect the findings of previous research that was cited in the literature review. The majority of cited research supported the idea that uniform groups were advantageous over gender-balanced groups due to improved level of performance and increased number of rewards by women (LaNoue & Curtis, 1985), as well as both genders receiving more achievement oriented social support when in uniform groups than when in a gender-balanced group (South et al., 1987). However, it should be recalled that Martin's (1985) beliefs were in direct contrast to this research in which he felt both men and women would profit more by engaging in a gender-balanced group than a uniform group because each gender brings different strengths to the group experience. Although these two studies are in contrast to each other, both support the notion that a significant difference would be detected between the two types of groups. There are possible statistical reasons for these findings.

First, the mean cell sizes were unequal. This reduces the probability of finding a significant result. This is to say that if the mean cell sizes would have been equal, the probability of finding support for the first hypothesis would increase. Second, the dependent variable, group satisfaction, was negatively skewed. Although a significant difference was not detected, it should be noted that the cell means indicated that males
and females were somewhat more satisfied in gender-balanced groups than uniform
groups. This opposes the first hypothesis but does not support Wagner's (1989) beliefs.

**Hypothesis 2**

Previous research found that cooperation significantly differed among
individualists and collectivists (Wagner, 1995). It is not surprising then that the second
hypothesis was supported by significant correlations between group satisfaction and two
of the Individualism/Collectivism scale's five factors, Group First and Individual First. It
is logical that these two factors correlated with group satisfaction because each concerns
the degree of interest in participating in a group. The factor Group First had a positive
correlation with group satisfaction and the factor Individual First had a negative
correlation revealing that collectivists were more satisfied with the group than
individualists. However, these results need to be considered with caution because the
effect sizes, albeit significant, were quite small.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis was also significantly supported by the current research, in
which the variance in group satisfaction accounted for by the three independent variables,
welfare decision, political orientation, and political decision, was four percent.
Additionally, it was found that group satisfaction was significantly related to a high score
on the PEC, indicating conservatism, and the anti-welfare decision. Although the
relationship was not as strong, group satisfaction was also significantly related to lower
scores on the PEC, which indicates liberalism, and pro-welfare decisions. This
relationship between conservatives and an anti-welfare decision may have been found to
be stronger than the relationship between liberals and a pro-welfare decision because conservatives may feel more negatively about welfare than liberals feel positively.

Possible reasons why more variance was not accounted for may be partly due to a certain violation of one of the Multiple Regression assumptions. The chance of multicollinearity and singularity is apparent because two of the independent variables, welfare decision and political orientation, were combined to create the POLDEC interaction term. This threatens the statistical analysis due to the "instability of regression coefficients" (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989, 130). Additionally, many other factors may have played a role in the variance of group satisfaction. First, the participants may have considered the activity as not significant in general or in relation to their class. This may have led the participants to discard their own personal opinions in which they would have accepted either choice. Second, the time limit of 15 minutes for the group activity may also have affected the group's choice. Participants may have either felt forced to make a decision, or they may have wanted to make a decision quickly in order to complete the activity and get on with other matters. Third, because the study was at times conducted in the classroom, participants may have been familiar with each other and may have ignored their own opinions and instead supported the choice of a friend. One last factor that may have impacted the variance in group satisfaction is the content or process of the group discussion. Although the researcher left the room during the group activity, certain fragments from various group discussions were overheard that indicated that some groups were very passionate about the issue, some to the point that they continued debating the issue even after the researcher had collected the materials. Other groups, conversely,
talked about other issues, spending little time debating the activity at hand.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The limitations and results of the current study lead to many recommendations for future research concerned with group dynamics. First, due to the nature of the population in which the sample was derived, there were many more females than males who participated in this study. It would be advantageous for future studies to have more of a balance between the genders. Second, the results were based on a sample of college students. Welfare may be an issue too "distant" from college students' own experiences so it may have been difficult for them to relate. For future research, it is recommended that the number of individuals participating in the activity that have or have not been on welfare be considered and included in the analyses. Third, generalizability is questionable due to the nature of the sample. For this reason, similar research in an organizational setting is recommended.

Many variables may play a part in enhancing or detracting from the members' satisfaction with the group. Establishing these variables will be of great value to organizations as they continue to strive for an increase in production and an improvement in their final products. As the current study found, group members' level of individualism/collectivism and their socio-political orientation can affect group satisfaction. In order to enhance employees' satisfaction, organizations will be aided by the knowledge of their employees level of individualism/collectivism when making decisions about those who will participate in a group. In which, it would be advantageous to place collectivists in group settings and to allow individualists the opportunity to work
alone. Additionally, being somewhat sensitive to employees' opinions, such as their socio-political orientation, the organization may want to carefully choose which employee they want working in certain group settings.
APPENDIX A

Group Satisfaction Survey

The following questions concern your attitudes and opinions about the group in which you just participated. Please read each statement carefully and circle the number that corresponds to your level of satisfaction.

KEY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>How satisfied are you with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VD = Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>D = Dissatisfied</td>
<td>N = Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>VS = Very Satisfied</td>
<td>S = Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Your own participation in the group.
2. The roles of the other members in the group.
3. The outcome/conclusion of the activity.
4. The group members' openness to new ideas/suggestions.
5. The overall friendliness of the group members.
6. Your role in the group.
7. The other members' participation in the group.
8. Your interactions with the group members.
9. Competence of the group members.
10. The final decision of the group activity.
11. Your comfort level with the group members.
12. Your opportunity to participate in the group activity.
Please rate your perception of the group's socio-political orientation: (circle choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Liberal</th>
<th>Neither Liberal nor Conservative</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Very Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What was the gender composition of your group? (circle correct response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Females &amp; One Male</th>
<th>Three Females &amp; Two Males</th>
<th>Two Females &amp; Two Males</th>
<th>Three Males &amp; One Female</th>
<th>Four Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**APPENDIX B**

**Socio-Political Orientation and Individualism/Collectivism Survey**

The following questions concern you and your attitudes and opinions about American society. Please read each statement carefully and circle the number that corresponds to your beliefs.

**KEY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Any able-bodied person could get a job right now if he/she tried hard enough.
2. Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life.
3. Winning is everything.
4. I prefer to work with others in a group rather than working alone.
5. People should be made aware that if they are going to be part of a group then they are sometimes going to have to do things they don't want to do.
6. A group is more productive when its members do what they want to do rather than what the group wants them to do.
7. Most employers think only of profits and care little about employees' welfare.
8. To be superior a person must stand alone.
9. I feel that winning is important in both work and games.
10. Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone rather than doing a job where I have to work with others in a group.

11. People who belong to a group should realize that they're not always going to get what they personally want.

12. A group is most efficient when its members do what they think is best rather than doing what the group wants them to do.

13. You can't expect democracy to work very well as long as so many uneducated and unintelligent people have the vote.

14. If you want something done right, you've got to do it yourself.

15. Success is the most important thing in life.

16. Working with a group is better than working alone.

17. People in a group should realize that they sometimes are going to have to make sacrifices for the sake of the group as a whole.

18. A group is more productive when its members follow their own interests and concerns.

19. The vast majority of those in lower classes are there because they are stupid, shiftless, or both.

20. What happens to me is my own doing.

21. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. People in a group should be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the group's well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. In the long run the only person you can count on is yourself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Doing your best isn't enough, it is important to win.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Those who have the ability and the foresight to accumulate wealth ought to be permitted to enjoy it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Group Problem Solving Exercise

You are close friends with two siblings. A very distant elderly cousin recently put a large sum of money in a trust fund for them. However, there was one stipulation for them to have access to the money. They needed to give 15% of the money to an organization of their choosing by a certain date otherwise the cousin would take the money back. The siblings could not decide which organization to donate the money to because they each wanted it to go to two distinctly different organizations. One wanted to give the money to a pro-welfare organization and the other wanted to donate it to an anti-welfare organization. Unexpectedly, the siblings had to leave to a location where they could not be reached. They thought, however, that they would return in time to make their decision. As they boarded the plane, they both asked you to decide to which organization the money should go to in the event they were unable to make it back in time. Because you are such close friends, you agree. Well, the siblings were unable to return in time to make their decision and today is the last day before their cousin will take all of the money back.

You and your group members must now responsibly decide if the money should be donated to a pro-welfare organization or an anti-welfare organization (e.g., do not just place both organizations in a hat and use the one that is chosen as your decision). You must donate 15% of the money (and only 15%) to one of these two causes and no others, and you cannot divide the 15% between the two different causes. You must give 15%, and only 15%, of the money to one and only one cause. You will have 15 minutes to decide to which group the money should be donated. After your group has come to a decision, please write which organization your group chose in the space provided.

We decided to give the money to _____________________________.
APPENDIX D

Informed Consent

This study you are about to participate in is designed to investigate group satisfaction. The study is being conducted by Stacy Haase, a graduate student in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino. The researcher is under the supervision of Dr. Janet Kottke of the Psychology Department at CSUSB.

In this study you will first be asked to read and answer questions inquiring about your social and political attitudes. Then, in groups of four, you will participate in a problem-solving exercise, after which you will read and answer questions inquiring about your attitudes and opinions about the group in which you just participated. The entire process will take approximately 30 to 40 minutes. Please give each step of the study careful consideration.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to end your participation at any time, either during the course of taking either survey, when participating in the group activity, or any time thereafter. If you have any questions about your participation, please contact Dr. Janet Kottke at (909)880-5585.

Any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. Your name will never be reported along with your responses. In addition, all information will be reported in group form only. If you wish to receive results from the study, you may contact Dr. Janet Kottke at the above number.

Your signature below indicates that you acknowledge that you have been informed of, and understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and freely consent to participate. Please sign and date:

Participant's Signature  Date

Researcher's Signature  Date
APPENDIX E

Demographic Questionnaire

The following 11 questions are for demographic purposes only. Please circle the appropriate answer or fill in the appropriate space as carefully and accurately as you can.

1. What is your gender? (1) male (2) female

2. How old are you? ____________

3. What is your class status? (1) freshman (2) sophomore (3) junior (4) senior (5) graduate

4. What is your overall grade point average? ____________

5. What is your ethnicity? (1) Asian, Asian-American, Asian-Pacific, or Pacific Islander (2) Black or African American (3) Hispanic or Latino/Latina (4) White, Caucasian, European, not Hispanic (5) American Indian (6) Middle Eastern (7) Mixed; parents are from two different groups. If so, please specify: __________________________

   (8) Other (please specify): __________________________

6. Of the groups you selected above, which cultural group do you most closely identify? __________________________

7. With what religion do you identify? __________________________
8. How religious do you consider yourself to be? (please circle the number that corresponds to your level of religiousness).

1 NOT VERY RELIGIOUS 2 3 4 5 VERY RELIGIOUS

9. Have you ever received governmental assistance? (1) yes (2) no
(e.g., food stamps, disability, AFDC)
(This does not include student financial aid.)

10. Are you currently receiving governmental assistance? (1) yes (2) no

11. If you have ever received this type of funding, would you please identify the type? ________________________________
APPENDIX F

Debriefing Statement

Your participation in the current study are greatly appreciated and will remain anonymous. Anonymity of your participation and confidentiality of results are guaranteed in accordance with ethical and professional codes set by the CSUSB Institutional Review Board and the American Psychological Association. This study has been undertaken to fulfill the thesis requirement for the Master's of Science Industrial/Organizational Psychology program. The information collected will be used to investigate differences in satisfaction among group members. It is unlikely that participation in this study will result in psychological harm. However, if you have concerns regarding distress or anxiety caused by your participation in this study, please contact the CSUSB Counseling Center for assistance or Dr. Janet Kottke.

Psychological Counseling Center          Dr. Janet Kottke
HC-112                                     (909)880-5585
(909)880-5040

If you have any further questions about your participation or wish to receive survey findings, you may contact Dr. Janet Kottke.
APPENDIX G

Factor Analysis of Individualism/Collectivism Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life</td>
<td>.51227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be superior a person must stand alone</td>
<td>.49759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you want something done right, you've got to do it yourself</td>
<td>.61609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success is the most important thing in life</td>
<td>.41901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the long run the only person you can count on is yourself</td>
<td>.70296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to work with others in a group rather than working alone</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone rather than doing a job where I have to work with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with a group is better than working alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning is everything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that winning is important in both work and games</td>
<td>.47629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success is the most important thing in life</td>
<td>.40485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing your best isn't enough, it is important to win</td>
<td>.72416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should be made aware that if they are going to be a part of a group than they are sometimes going to have to do things they don't want to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who belong to a group should realize that they're not always going to get what they personally want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in a group should realize that they sometimes are going to have to make sacrifices for the sake of the group as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in a group should be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the group's well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group is more productive when its members do what they want to do rather than what the group wants them to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group is more efficient when its members do what they think is best rather than what the group wants them to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group is more productive when its members follow their own interests and concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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