Developing a Japanese Version of the Reaction to Group Situation Test (RGST)*

Mohamed HAFSI

Nara University, Japan

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was first to translate the Reaction To Group Situation Test (RGST) into Japanese, and test it for internal consistency. However, the first attempts to work with the original manual for scoring the protocols, met with two main difficulties, namely, lack of clear and precise definition of the scoring dimensions, and a complex scoring procedure that was maybe at the roots of the neglect of the RGST. Consequently, a new, simple and less time-consuming scoring procedure was developed. To test the reliability of the Japanese version of the RGST and the new scoring procedure, a study involving 241 undergraduate students was conducted. Three trained raters were asked to score the protocols. The results revealed 1) a highly significant correlation between the raters, demonstrating, consequently, the validity of the scoring procedure, and 2) a high reliability for the Japanese translation of the RGST, suggesting its usefulness and validity for the study of group emotionality.

The present study is based on two fundamental works: Bion's clinical work on and experiences with therapy groups, and the large number of empirical studies conducted by Thelen et al. (1954), and Stock and Thelen (1958).

Like his predecessors Freud and Lewin, Bion (1968) developed a unique group theory as a result of experiences with small groups of neurotic patients at the Tavistock Clinic. The method used by Bion within these groups was to let the group behave as spontaneously and as freely as possible, providing it with no direction or structure. This lack of structure obviously enhanced the patients' frustration and, led them to display anger and aggressivity toward the therapist or passivity. It is the patients' anger and passivity that constituted the initial material for therapeutic interventions. Two important characteristics distinguishes Bion's therapeutic interventions. The first characteristic that interpretations were made to the whole group and not to individuals, because any behavior observed in the group was considered as a group phenomenon rather than as an individual phenomenon. The second characteristic is that interpretations of the group situation were

immediately made to the group. As pointed out by Stock and Thelen (1958), this therapeutic approach may have made some group behaviors more visible than others. This in turn has influenced Bion in developing his group theory. Based on his experiences with groups, Bion developed one of the most unique group theory which had significant influence on the study of group behavior and individual behavior within the group.

Central to this theory is the concept of *basic assumption*. According to Bion (1968), whenever a group is born it has only two alternatives: to function as a *work group* or as a *basic assumption group*. In the former case, the group members appear to be united around a real or "basic task". In this case the group is cahracterized by a high sense of reality, cooperation among its members, and, therefore, growth and high achievements.

On the other hand, a group functioning as a basic assumption group appears to be dominated or determined by an underlying common assumption. It behaves "as if" its members shared a common unconscious (unspoken) assumption by which the group behavior and culture are influenced and directed. Although very often a fantasy, the group behaves "as if" this assumption is real, rational, and agreed upon by every member, Bion referred to this fantasy as "basic assumption", and described three different basic assumptions, namely, the basic assumptions of *dependency* (baD), *fight/flight* (baF), and *pairing* (baP). Other researchers have added new basic assumptions (see, Anzieu, 1984, Turquet, 1985; Lion & Gruenfeld, 1993), but they will not be discussed in the present study.

Describing in detail the behavioral content of each basic assumption is far beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, only the general aspects characterizing each assumption will be discussed here.

Dependency: This assumption is expressed in the form of a tendency to 1) rely or depend on other persons (group members, authority, especially the leader), for help and protection, and on rules, directions, instructions, structure, and traditions, 2) to behave "as if" one is immature, weak, helpless, incapable of making decisions alone, and fearful of taking initiatives and trying things out.

Fight: For the sake of simplicity, the author will, unlike Bion, describe separately the Fight and Flight, however this does not mean that they are conceived of as two independent basic assumptions. On the contrary, they are defined as two distinct behaviors triggered by the same stimulus: fear of a fantastic (in-group and out-group) enemy. The behavioral manifestations of this assumption include all sorts of verbal and non-verbal aggression: fighting with others, drawing other members (especially the leader) into fights, direct and indirect hostility towards others, criticism and devaluation of others, and boredom are a few examples.

Flight: The most frequent expressions of the flight assumption are: avoidance of the task or the problem at hand, or withdrawal from the group activity, intellectualization, laughter aimed at reducing the group tension, contextually inappropriate and inadequate statements and acting outs, and dealing with trivial matters.

Pairing: This assumption corresponds to a tendency of inviting and appealing, and at the same time conveying and encouraging intimate and friendly interactions between two persons, regardless of their sex. The context of these interactions is bright and cheerful. The content of these interactions is also usually characterized by an "idyllic flavor" and a strong hope for the future.

Work: Unlike basic assumptions, a work group is characterized by a high interest in the group task, cooperation between the members, recognition of one's own and others' individuality, and responsibility in accomplishing the task, and therefore, growth. All these positive features are the result of the fact that, unlike in the basic assumption group (where members manage unconsciously to avoid any contact with reality), a group functioning as a work group is in permanent and real touch with reality.

Another core concept in Bion's group dynamics is the concept of *valency*. According to Bion (1968), valency corresponds to *individual readiness to enter into combination with the group in making and acting on the basic assumptions* (p. 116). Moreover, valency *is spontaneous and instinctive, requiring no effort and appears to be an inherent part* (De Board, 1978: p.42) of the individual behavior. There are as many valencies as there are basic assumptions.

Combining the concepts of basic assumption, work group, and valency, Bion developed a unique and comprehensive group theory which provided a basis for the study of "the group as an organism" (Stock & Thelen, 1958), and influenced the group research trend to a point that the early 1950s was the heyday of small group research in the United States (Hare, 1976).

Description of The RGST and Its Initial Scoring Methd

Based on Bion's group theory, Thelen et al. (1954) conducted a series of studies at the National Training Laboratory in Group Development (NTL Institute) in Bethel. These studies resulted in the development of a battery of research methods, and a great amount of publications in the period from 1951 to 1958 (Stock & Thelen, 1958). To my knowledge, however, few studies only (Fransson, 1980; Armelius & Armelius, 1982; Karterud & Foss, 1989; Lion & Gruenfeld, 1993), have applied these methods since then.

One of these methods is the Reaction to Group Situation Test (RGST). This test is a sentence completion test composed of 44 items or group situations on which the subject is expected to project his/her valency. Drawing from Bion, Thelen and his team conceived of group activity in terms of two axes: emotionality and work. Therefore, they constructed the RGST so that 28 of its 44 items present the subject with a particular emotional (fight, flight, dependency, and pairing) or work stimulus–situation.

As indicated in Table 1, the stimuli–situations expressing the fight situation are items 9, 12, 19, 26, 34, and 41. Those describing the dependency situation are

Table 1. Description of The Stimuli-Situations Expressing Emotionality and Work

Fight:
Q 9. When he realized he was angry at Phil, Charles.............................
　　　太郎に対して腹が立っていることに次郎が気づいたとき、次郎は.........
Q12. When the group disparaged his idea, Frank............................
　　　グループによって自分の考えがけなされたとき、太郎は..................
Q19. When Jim realized quite a few people were taking digs at each other, he.........
　　　多くの人が互いのあら探しをしていると気づいたとき、太郎は.........
Q26. During the argument, Henry's vehemence caused Earl............................
　　　議論の最中に、太郎の情熱が、次郎の...............の原因となった。
Q34. When Hal felt hostile to the group, he...................................
　　　グループに対して敵意を感じたとき、太郎は...............................
Q41. When George attacked the group, Bob.................................
　　　太郎がグループを非難したとき、次郎は.....................................

Dependency:
Q 3. Bert felt the leader was...
　　　太郎は、リーダーが...だと感じた。
Q13. When the leader offered to help him, Pete...................................
　　　リーダーが太郎を助けようとしたとき、太郎は...............................
Q20. When the group just couldn't see to get ahead, I............................
　　　グループがうまくいっていないように思ったとき、私は..................
Q27. When the leader changed the subject, Al...................................
　　　リーダーが話題を変えたとき、太郎は....................................
Q35. When Harry said that we needed help, Martin............................
　　　太郎が「グループに助けが必要だ」と言ったとき、次郎は..................
Q42. When the leader offered to help Carl, Joe...................................
　　　リーダーが太郎を助けようとしたとき、次郎は...............................

Flight:
Q 4. When Jerry was joking, the group...
　　　次郎が冗談を言っているとき、グループは...............................
Q14. When several members dropped out of the discussion, Hank..................
　　　いく人かのメンバーがディスカッションに参加しなくなったとき、太郎は.....................
Q21. When Ed seemed to be daydreaming, Bill...................................
　　　太郎がボーッとしているように見えたとき、次郎は...............................
Q28. When my attention wandered from the discussion, Jim.......................
　　　ディスカッションから私の注意がそれたとき、太郎は...................
Q36. When Jim left the meeting early, we...................................
　　　太郎がミーティングから早く退出したとき、グループは..................
Q44. When the group seemed to be breaking up, Nick...................................
　　　グループがバラバラになりそうだったとき、太郎は..................

Pairing:
Q 8. Since Jack liked some members more than others, he........................
　　　グループの中の特定のメンバーと親しくなったから太郎は..................
Q11. When Tom and Marry arrived twenty minutes late, the group......................
　　　太郎と花子が20分遅れてきたとき、グループは..................
Q18. Together John and Fred...
　　　太郎と次郎はいっしょに..
Q25. When Len turned to me, I...
　　　太郎が私の方に振り向いたとき、私は...
Q33. When the group was particularly friendly toward one of its members, Ken.........
　　　グループにおいて一人のメンバーだけが、ちやほやされているとき、太郎は............

Work:
Q 7. When Sam said "Let's get to the problem", I.....................
　　　太郎が「問題に取りかかろう」と言ったとき、私は......................
Q15. When Marvin suggested that the group assess it own resources, we..............
　　　太郎がグループの能力を測るように皆に提案した時、私たちは..................
Q22. Since the group wanted to test the suggested procedure, Milt..................
　　　グループは提案されたやり方を試したかったので、太郎は..................
Q29. When Morris said we needed more information about how we felt, I..............
　　　次郎は「皆の感じたことについてもっと知る必要がある」と言ったとき、太郎は...............
Q37. When Ray recommended that the group consider the theoretical aspects of the problem, I......
　　　太郎がグループに問題の理論的な側面を考えるようにすすめたとき、私は...............

Note: The "general items" are not described here. For a complete description of the RGST,
　　　refer to Stock and Thelen (1958).

items 3, 13, 20, 27, 35, and 42. The flight situation is described in items 4, 14, 21, 28, 36, and 44. Items 8, 11, 18, 25, and 33 represent the pairing situation, and items 7, 15, 22, 29, and 37 the work situation. The remaining items were "general" items, which were meant to describe mixed, ambiguous, and indefined situations.

In the RGST, the subject is asked to write down what the actor (the group, a member, or two members) would do in the stimulus-situation. Then, with the exception of the general items, the content of all other items is scored on three dimensions: 1) acceptance of the situation conveyed by the stimulus-situation, 2) clarity of response, and 3) manner of response. The general items were scored only on the two latter dimensions.

Acceptance: When the subject's response shows that he/she identifies with or accepts the content of the stimulus-situation, it is rated "accept". If the response indicates that the subject rejects the content of the stimulus-situation, it is rated "non-accept".

Clarity: The response is rated on this dimension when the subject introduces in his/her response a modality different than the one presented in the stimulus-situation. For instance, when the subjects responds with a fight modality to a dependency stimulus-situation. In this case where the subject reacts directly, the response is thus scored "overt", but if his/her response is indirectly expressed, it is scored "covert".

Manner: This dimension is pertinent to the way the subject responds to the stimulus-situation. That is, if the subject reacts with emotion, the response is scored for "feeling". If he/she responds with action, the response is scored for "action plus", and if the action is inhibited, the response is scored in "action minus". The subject may also respond with ideation, and, therefore, be scored for "ideation". When the subject's response does not provide enough data to be scored on this dimension, it is scored "question mark"(?).

The subject's scores are recorded on a scoring form, and a score summary is made for each subject. An example of the scoring procedure and score summary is represented in Figure 1. As can be sen this figure, the score summary shows 1) the number of times each category of stimulus-situations, or modality (Pairing, Fight, Flight, Dependency, and Work) was accepted, 2) the number of times a new modality was introduced in the subject's response (clarity dimension), and 3) the manner of his/her response. The modality with the highest total corresponds to the subject's general tendency concerning the reaction to group situation, in other words, his/her valency.

Before learning of the RGST, the present author, working with Bion's concepts, had made several attempts to develop a scale that could be used to measure basic assumptions (Hafsi, 1995; 1996a). Therefore, after becoming familiar with the RGST and translating it into Japanese, a few pilot-studies were conducted. The results of these studies revealed that Thelen et al.'s original rating manual was in need of some modifications.

Figure 1. An Example of the Score Summary Used By Stock and Thelen

Modality	Accept	Covert	Overt	Total	Fight	Action plus	Action minus	Ideation	?
P	3	0	1	4		3		2	
F	2	3	5*	14		4	2		
D	1	3	2	6	1	3		1	
Fl	1	1	6**	8	1	1	1	3	
W	4	–	16	20		1	.	2	2
CD	–	2	5	7					
E	–	1	1	2					
Mixed Items					1	4	2	5	
Total					3	16	5	13	2

*Occurs with work 3 times.

**Occures with work 3 times.

Note : The source of this figure is Stock & Thelen, 1958.

Reforming and Testing the RGST for Reliability

Translation: The author's first task was to translate the RGST in Japanese. The translation was done collectively by eight students as a credit for a psychology seminar. Each item was read, analyzed word by word, and then translated. The translation team made it a rule that for a translation to be considered as "final" all the members should agree on it.

One of the most difficult problems was how to deal with the original non–Japanese names of the personages appearing in the RGST items. The non–Japanese names were not used, fearing that this may inhibit the subject's projection or mobilize negative projection. Thus, they were replaced by fictitious names, such as *Jiro*, *Hanako*, and *Taro*. When the translation was finished, the items were back–translated, and then compared with the original ones to avoid any kind of discrepancy and cultural bias.

Manual and Scoring procedure: Most of those who have used Thelen et al.'s research methods (including the RGST) have pointed out the difficulty in working with the original manuals (Karterud & Foss, 1989). That is also why the RGST also was not used extensively (Hare, 1973; McGrath, 1984, Lion & Gruenfeld, 1993). In a series of trials using the original manual, two raters were asked to rate a number of 120 RGST protocols. However, the results did not lead to a significant inter–rater reliability. The results thus supported other studies' findings (Karterud & Foss, ibid.), demonstrating thus the need for a more adequate and precise manual that would enable even the untrained rater to distinguish between 1) acceptance and non–acceptance of a stimulus–situation, 2) an overt and overt modality, and 3) the different manners of reacting to a stimulus (action plus, action minus, feeling, and ideation).

To remedy this lack, the author clearly redefined the three dimensions (accceptance,

clarity, and manner) described above, developing thereby a manual that can help to rate any reaction to the stimulus-situation (Hafsi, 1996b).

Besides the vagueness of the original manual, the RGST presented another drawback, namely the complexity of its scoring procedure. Using this procedure to rate even one protocol is a time -consuming task. Thus, it is not appropriate for scoring a large amount of data. This disadvantage is mainly due to the fact that the three dimensions on which this scoring procedure is based are conceived independently.

Therefore, the author has attempted to simplify this procedure by, first, omitting the "clarity" dimension which did not seem indispensable. As mentioned above, a subject is scored on this dimension only if he/she reacts to a given situation using a modality other than the one the stimulus-situation is supposed to trigger. The rationale for eliminating this dimension, then, is that using another modality can be interpreted as a form of non-acceptance of the initial modality. Hence, by combining two dimensions (acceptance and manner) the author developed a scoring procedure (Hafsi, 1996b) based on an 8-point scale ranging from the highest level of acceptance, namely "acceptance with positive action" (point-1), to the lowest level of non-acceptance, that is, "non-acceptance with positive action" (point-8). The intermediate levels of the scale are∶ acceptance with nagative action (point-2), acceptance with emotion (point-3), acceptance with ideation (point-4), non-acceptance with ideation (point-5), non-acceptance with emotion (point-6), and non-acceptance with negative action (point-7).

Before adopting this scoring procedure, the author had first to ensure that acceptance with action (points -1 & -2) was really, as suggested by the scale, stronger than acceptance with emotion (point-3). (The superiority of acceptance with action over acceptance with ideation, point-4, seems obvious). To test the superiority of acceptance with action over acceptance with emotion, a pilot-study was conducted.

From the results of this pilot study, two reactions (one scored as "acceptance with action", and one as "acceptance with emotion") were randomly selected for each of the four modalities (fight, flight, dependency, and pairing). The subjects (N=124), all undergraduate students, were asked to indicate which of the two reactions was the strongest, or has the most impact in each modality.

The results of Chi-Square Test revealed that in each modality, the "acceptance with action" reaction was evaluated as significantly stronger that the "acceptance with emotion" reaction ($\chi^2[3]=75.00614$, $p < .00001$). That is, 78 percent evaluated the first reaction type as the strongest in terms of its impact, while only 22 percent perceived the second kind of reaction as the strongest one. Based on this finding, accepting the stimulus-situation "with action" was considered as the highest expression (point-1) of acceptance of a given modality, followed by acceptance "with emotion" (point-2). This is how the RGST scoring procedure used in the present study was developed. After determining in this way the scoring procedure, the study described below was conducted.

METHOD

The aim of this study was to test the internal consistency and reliability of the RGST. The test includes an analysis of the inter-raters reliability, the internal reliability of each item or stimulus-situation.

Subjects: The 241 subjects who participated in this study were male Japanese students enrolled in an introductory course on social psychology. During one session, the subjects were collectively administered the RGST. They were asked to complete the stimulus-sentence (stumulus-situation) soon after the experimenter has finished reading it. Moreover they were also told to write down their ideas in a free-association style without thinking deeply, because there were no "right" or "wrong" answers. The experimenter read the stimulus-sentences one-by one, allowing an interval of 20 seconds between each two stimuli. The aims of administering the RGST collectively were 1) to make sure that the subjects concentrated on the task, 2) to temporary inhibit their defense processes, 3) and, at the same time, to lighten the experimenter's burden. Because the students all finished in the same time; the experimenter did not need to wait for each subject, as is always the case when the test is administered individually. The test lasted 25 minutes.

Reliability Tests: To test the above discussed RGST scoring procedure (Nara University version) for inter-rater reliability, three raters were trained to score the test. After attending two training sessions of one and half hour each, the raters were provided with a scoring manual, and asked to practice with the data of 10 randomly selected subjects. Following this exercise, the three raters were asked to score separately all the protocols (N=241) using the scoring manual developed by the author. Then, the scores attributed to each subject by the three raters were compared. The working hypothesis here was that there would be no significant difference between the raters. To put it differently, the raters were expected to come close to each other in scoring the protocols, or display similar scoring patterns.

Besides the inter-rater reliability test, an item-analysis was also made to test the RGST for internal consistency. The results of the two reliability tests are discussed below.

RESULTS

To test the scoring procedure developed in the present study for inter-rater reliability, a one-way ANOVA was performed, comparing the three raters.

The results of ANOVA revealed no significant difference between the three raters. That is, as indicated in Table 2, the comparison between the raters was made in each of the five modalities, namely, dependency, fight, pairing, flight, and work.

Table 2. The results of a Comparison Between Three Raters

Stimulus-situation Modality	1st Rater	2nd Rater	3rd Rater	Sig.
Pairing	3.3*	3.5	3.4	n.s.
	(.88)	(.74)	(.87)	
Fight	3.4	3.4	3.5	n.s.
	(.82)	(.63)	(.75)	
Dependency	3.3	3.5	3.4	n.s.
	(.88)	(.74)	(.87)	
Flight	3.6	3.8	3.7	n.s.
	(1.01)	(.80)	(.87)	
Work	2.9	3.1	3.1	n.s.
	(1.16)	(.97)	(.97)	

Note: The values in the Table are Means and SDs in parentheses.

The dependency, fight, and flight modalities comprise six stimuli-situations each; and the pairing and work modalities five each. As shown in Table 2, with respect to the scoring of the dependency modality, the three raters were very close to each other, showing thus no significant inter-rater difference (F=1.5398, df=2/317, p=.2160). The Levene Test for Homogeneity of Variances showed also a similar result (L=.5116, p=.600, two-tailed).

Likewise, the raters presented also similar scoring patterns in the fight modality (F=.3006, df=2/317, p=.740, and L=1.9679, p=.141), the pairing modality (F=1.0842, df=2/317, p=.3394, and L=.1925, p=.825), the flight modality (F=1.9799, df=2/317, p=.1398, and L=1.6109, p=.201), and the work modality (F=.6945, df=2/317, p=.5001, and L=.2018, p=.817). Moreover, the results of the Modified LSD (Bonferroni) test revealed also that no two groups were significantly different at the .05 level in any of the modalities. Therefore, the null hypothesis that all the raters would display a similar scoring pattern, could not be rejected.

Moreover, in order to find out how close the three raters have come in rating the total number of the RGST protocols, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used. As indicated in Table 3, a highly significant correlation between raters was found (rs=.944 ~ .969, ps < .01 ~ .001). This finding proves thus the reliability of the scoring procedure developed in the present study, and, at the same time, the validity and efficacity of the scoring manual used by the raters.

After demonstrating the reliability of the scoring procedure, the RGST was also, as mentioned above, tested for internal reliability, using Cronbach's alpha and item analysis. Cronbach's alpha for each of the five scales constituting the RGST was as follows: pairing=.67, fight=.72, dependency=.76, flight=.86, and work=.82.

Table 3. Correlations (Pearson) Between The RGST Scores by The Three Raters

	1st Rater	2nd Rater	3rd Rater
1st Rater	1.000	.944*	.947*
2nd Rater		1.000	.969**
3rd Rater			1.000

Note: $*p<.01$, $**p<.001$, Two-tailed.

Seeking further support of the internal reliability of the RGST, an item analysis was conducted. After computing the grand mean for all the 28 items (stimuli-situations), the subjects were, based on their mean score, divided into two groups, namely, a group with a mean score higher than the grand mean (Accept Group), and group with a mean score lower than the grand mean (Non-accept Group). Then, the two groups' means on each of the 28 stimuli-situations constituting the RGST used here were compared using t-test.

As indicated in Table 4, the results of this item analysis revealed highly significant differences ($p < .0001$, two-tailed, in each item) between the two groups. This implies that, as a scale, the RGST is highly reliable, and is, therefore, a valid and appropriate scale for measuring the above discussed basic assumptions and work modalities, and for discriminating between subjects displaying different (qualitative and quantitative) reactions to the stimuli-situations.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In the present study, the author has revised Thelen et al. (1954)'s Reaction to Group Situation Test (RGST), proposing a new and simpler scoring procedure. The aim of the present study was to demonstrate the reliability and validity of both this procedure and the Japanese version of the RGST.

After working with Thelen et al.'s original manual, and applying their scoring method, it soon became evident that because of 1) the lack of clarity in the definition of the dimensions (on which Thelen et al.'s scoring method was based), and 2) the difficulty a rater with unsufficient clinical experience would have to rate a protocol, there was a need for revision of the initial scoring procedure.

Consequently, after translating the RGST into Japanese, a new scoring procedure was developed. The present study was conducted to test, as mentioned above, the Japanese version of the RGST and this scoring procedure.

The results demonstrated the reliability of the different items and subscales of the RGST in distinguishing between subjects with different valencies. Moreover, the results provided strong support for the reliability of the newly-devised scoring procedure. That is, the results revealed that by using this procedure it was possible

Table 4. Comparison between Accept and Non-Accept Groups in Each Stimulus-Situation of the RGST

Stimulus-situation	Accept Group	Non-accept Group	t-value
Pairing:			
Q. 8	2.3(1.7)	3.7(2.2)	-4.9
Q.11	4.3(2.7)	6.8(1.6)	-8.8
Q.18	1.3(1.2)	2.3(2.3)	-3.9
Q.25	2.7(2.1)	5.7(2.4)	-9.7
Q.33	4.8(1.9)	5.9(1.2)	-6.0
Fight:			
Q. 9	2.9(2.4)	5.1(2.7)	-6.6
Q.12	3.4(2.0)	4.9(2.2)	-5.6
Q.19	4.3(2.5)	5.6(1.9)	-4.1
Q.26	2.8(1.8)	4.3(2.1)	-5.6
Q.34	3.9(2.4)	5.5(2.1)	-5.4
Q.41	2.2(1.9)	4.6(2.7)	-8.1
Dependency:			
Q. 3	4.1(1.1)	4.7(1.0)	-4.3
Q.13	3.5(2.3)	4.9(2.4)	-5.9
Q.20	3.7(2.3)	5.6(2.2)	-5.6
Q.27	3.2(2.7)	5.5(2.4)	-7.4
Q.35	1.8(1.6)	5.0(2.9)	-10.9
Q.42	2.4(2.2)	5.0(2.7)	-8.0
Flight:			
Q. 4	3.1(1.9)	4.3(2.1)	-3.6
Q.14	3.9(2.1)	5.9(2.1)	-6.0
Q.21	4.1(2.6)	6.3(2.4)	-5.1
Q.28	2.8(2.5)	5.7(2.7)	-6.9
Q.36	3.4(2.4)	6.5(2.3)	-5.1
Q.44	3.7(2.2)	6.0(2.4)	-6.2
Work:			
Q. 7	2.3(2.1)	4.5(2.7)	-6.5
Q.15	4.1(2.9)	6.7(1.8)	-8.2
Q.22	1.4(1.3)	3.0(2.8)	-4.9
Q.29	2.4(2.0)	5.3(2.5)	-8.9
Q.37	3.0(1.9)	5.3(2.1)	-7.8

Note: The values in the Table are Means and SDs in parentheses.
The difference between the two groups in each stimulus-situation was highly significant ($ps < .0001$).

to reduce the inter-rater difference. This finding implies also that this scoring procedure can be more widely used than the one used by Thelen and his colleagues, because, unlike the latter, this scoring procedure does not require intensive clinical training. With the help of the manual, attendance of few lectures on RGST, and few scoring trials, the rater became able to score any protocol.

Moreover, compared with the initial procedure, the one proposed here has the advantage of being less time-consuming, making it an ideal tool for scoring large numbers of protocols because it enables quantitative studies to be conducted.

As mentioned above, the RGST was not widely used, perhaps owing to the complexity of its scoring method. Consequently, it is hoped that the procedure developed here will encourage researchers to use it for 1) studying group personality and the effects it has on group development and on many group phenomena (eg., leadership, scapegoating, etc.), and for 2) testing empirically the unexploited theoretical and clinical edifice Bion has bequeathed to us.

In conclusion, studies using clinical methods have advanced our knowledge about group dynamics, however owing to their methodological shortcomings (e.g., problems of control, operationalization, and reliability testing) they have not been highly evaluated by non-clinician psychologists. Hence, I (Hafsi, 1996) share the criticism by many researchers (Silverman, 1975; Masling & Schwartz, 1979; Green & Rosenkrantz, 1986) that to be widely accepted clinical hypotheses and findings in general should be submitted to experimental testing. Without the experimental testing, no real and significant progress would be witnessed in psychoanalytic group psychology. In this sense, the RGST and the empirically-oriented spirit which animates it may serve as example for further attempts to test clinical theories and findings.

NOTE: The present paper is a revised version of the paper *"Basic Assumptions and Their Measurement: Developing a New Rating System for the The Reaction to Group Situation Test (RGST)"*, submitted to the journal *"Psychologia"* for publication.

REFERENCES

Anzieu, D. 1984. *The group and the unconscious* (B. Kilborne, Trans.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Armelius, K., & Armelius, B. A. 1982. *Work and emotionality in small groups working with probalistic inference tasks* (Report No.7). Umea, Sweden: University of Umea.

Bion, W. R. 1968. *Experiences in groups*. New York: Basic Books.

De Board, R. 1978. *The psychoanalysis of organizations*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Fransson, P. 1980. *Measuring the group personality of the individual, according to the theory of Bion*. Umea, Sweden: University of Umea.

Greene, L. R., & Rosenkrantz, J. 1986. Idiosyncratic needs for fusion and differentiation in groups. In Masling (Ed.), *Empirical studies of psychoanalytic theories: Vol. 2* (pp. 197-217). Hillsdale N. J.: The Analytic Press.

Hafsi, M. 1995. *The group basic assumption and the scapegoating phenomenon* (Unpublished). Nara, Japan: Nara University.

Hafsi, M. 1996a. Anxiety as a determinant of leadership emergence in leaderless groups. *Psychologia, 39,* 24-32.

Hafsi, M. 1996b. *Developing a new scoring manual for the RGST* (Unpublished). Nara, Japan: Nara University.

Hare, A. P. 1973. Theories of group development and categories for interaction analysis. *Small*

Group Behavior, 4, 259–304.

Hare, A. P. 1976. *Handbook of small group research*. New York: Free Press.

Karterud, s., & Foss, T. 1989. The group emotionality rating system: A modification fo Thelen's method of assessing emotionality in groups. *Small Group behavior*, 20, 131–150.

Lion, C. L., & Gruenfeld, L. W. 1993. The behavior and personality of work group and basic assumption group members. *Small Group Behavior*, 24, 236–257.

Masling, J., & Schwartz, M. 1979. A critic of research in psychoanalytic theory. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 100*, 257–307.

McGrath, J. E. 1984. *Groups: Interaction and performance*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Silverman, L. 1975. On the role of laboratory experiments in the development of the clinical theory of psychoanalysis: Data on the subliminal activation of aggressive and merging wishes in schizophrenics. *International Review of Psychoanalysis, 2*, 43–64.

Stock, D., & Thelen, H. 1958. *Emotional dynamics and group culture*. Washington DC: National Training Laboratories.

Thelen, H. et al. 1954. *Methods for studying work and emotionality in groups* (planographed). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Turquet, P. M. 1985. Leadership: The individual and the group. In A. D. Colman & M. Geler (Eds.), *Group relations reader 2*. Washington, DC: A. K. Rice Institute.