

# QAMIG

## Self-Assessment Questionnaire on Your Group Interaction Modes

---

Pierre Mongeau & Jacques Tremblay

Interprétation Guide

[qamig.com](http://qamig.com)





# Table of contents

The QAMIG	3
Origins of the QAMIG	4
This guide	5
Interpretation	6
The six interactions modes	9
<i>Expression</i>	11
<i>Promotion</i>	17
<i>Explanation</i>	23
<i>Structuring</i>	29
<i>Vigilance</i>	35
<i>Support</i>	41
In conclusion	47
Appendix:	
Basis	48
<i>The “practitioners”</i>	49
<i>The “academics”</i>	50
<i>Two parallel worlds</i>	51
<i>Research process</i>	52
Results	
<i>List of statements</i>	53
<i>Groups’ coefficients of internal consistencies</i>	54
<i>Inter-groups correlations</i>	55
<i>Gathering together of group statements</i>	55

© 2014

ISBN : 978-2-9807587-4-4

All reproduction, translation and adaptation rights reserved.



## Section 1

# The QAMIG<sup>1</sup>

The QAMIG is a questionnaire that allows for the determination of one's group interaction style, based on one's tendency to favor specific interaction modes. It is designed to enable the person to better identify the potential and limits of his/her ways of interacting in a group. The questionnaire can be completed online at the following address: <http://qamig.com>

Results are calculated using an extensive data base comprising answers from close to 9 000 completed questionnaires<sup>2</sup>, and presented in the form of a graphic, traced automatically. The current questionnaire is derived from its initial versions elaborated in the early 1990s, and first tested on a sample of 500 adults in total, both men and women (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995, 2005).

The qualitative elements of interpretation are drawn from a comparative analysis of direct observations and interviews administered to prototype individuals having obtained a very high score in one specific mode, and lower scores in the other modes.

<sup>1</sup>QAMIG – Questionnaire d'auto-évaluation de ses modes d'interactions en groupe – Self-Assessment Questionnaire on Your Group Interaction Modes.

<sup>2</sup>Exactly 8 999 questionnaires were completed. Included in the appendix is a presentation of the questionnaire's psychometric properties.

To maximize the validity of your group intervention style profile, we suggest that you complete the questionnaire before you acquaint yourself with the descriptions of the group interactions modes.

Furthermore, it is preferable to always refer to the same group work experience for each and every question. This way, the profile obtained is more reliable. It is understandable that a person can be quite active in a group when he/she feels committed to the task, and be more in a listening mode in another group for which attendance is mandatory. Therefore, answering a question while referring to one specific group then, answering another question with another group in mind could significantly affect the validity of the results.



## Section 2

---

# Origins of the QAMIG

## Self-Assessment Questionnaire on Your Group Interaction Modes

Publications about group work are numerous. Methods for ensuring good member participation and proper team functioning are often featured. Similarly, training sessions on team-building, learning to communicate more effectively, and better managing group work, etc., are widespread.

In fact, it is widely agreed upon that group work is difficult even though most of the time, everyone is doing their best and acting in good faith. Yet, difficulties still pile up. How can this be? What makes things go wrong?

To answer these questions, we listened to members and gathered their comments on ways that they themselves participate, and ways that other members in their work group participate. These comments could either be made during or outside meetings. A few hundred statements were thus listed. We developed a short questionnaire in which respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement for each statement. Statistical

analysis of the answers allowed us to identify six different ways of interacting in a group (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995). These six different ways, which we refer to as the 6 interaction modes (Expression, Promotion, Explanation, Structuring, Vigilance and Support) constitute the many facets of being and interacting, each with their own beliefs, pleasures, relevancies, retention strategies and weakness compensation means; it is a matter of six worlds that clash now and then.



# This guide

This guide provides reference points to help you interpret your results of the Self-Assessment Questionnaire on your Group Interaction Modes. Formally, the interaction modes correspond to a structure of conduct that can be observed on a recurrent basis in different work groups. From the person's point of view, these modes of interaction can be equated to general ways of acting in group situations.

Six modes of interaction have been identified, these modes are: Expression, promotion, explanation, structuring, vigilance and support. Each person's specific combinations of these modes enable him/her to better identify a personal group interaction style.

All mode descriptions feature six sections. The first section gives a general overview of the interaction mode's main characteristics. The second section is devoted to the mode's underlying beliefs and seeks to highlight the group's work representation as well as the convictions at the base of the interaction

mode. The third section illustrates the pleasures associated with each mode. It shows the specific contributions and the systemic usefulness of pleasure, and the different ways it helps with group dynamics. The fourth section provides pointers to allow you to evaluate, as the action is taking place, the extent to which the interaction mode being used is suitable or not for the situation. The fifth section shows how every interaction mode tends to self-perpetuate, and finally, the last section explains how group members or how the person himself/herself can play a part in averting the self-perpetuating mechanism, thus countering the potentially negative effects of the interaction mode.



# Interpretation

The result page issued by the QAMIG includes, at first, a table with percentiles corresponding to your results. The percentiles allow you to compare your results with all test respondents<sup>1</sup>.

Following this table is a profile indicator consisting of two graphics. The first graphic gives information on your overall tendency to be reactive or proactive in a group. A tendency to be proactive indicates a willingness to take the lead in a group, to act first and then see how others react; whereas, a tendency to be reactive corresponds to a propensity to wait for something to happen and act afterwards. Being reactive does not mean being passive. In fact, many reactive individuals can be more active than many proactive individuals, it's just that their actions tend to be consequential to what is occurring in a group.

The second graphic displays results for each of the six interaction modes: expression, promotion, explanation, structuring, vigilance and support. It provides information on your tendency to act according to some interaction modes and not others. More

specifically, it presents the combination of different dominant interaction modes (usually two or three), and weaker modes that define your group intervention style, as a reference. Keep in mind that these modes can vary depending on the group, or the situation.

The interpretation of these results consists of two parts: Comparison of your results with those of others, and comparison of modes between modes. The results in percentiles allow you to directly position yourself in relation to all those who have answered the questionnaire. Hence, a result at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile means that 75% of the people obtain an inferior result. Furthermore, if this result is combined with lower results, it indicates that the mode with the highest score occupies a predominant place in your group intervention style. For example, a result at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for the tendency to act in a proactive manner, and at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile for the tendency to act in a reactive manner indicates, firstly, an inclination to interact more proactively than 90% of the people and as reactively as 50% of the people. Secondly, these results also point out a tendency to react in a manner that is more proactive than reactive. Figuratively speaking, these results suggest that this individual is in general more likely to take the lead, however, there are many instances in which he/she will wait to see what happens before reacting. Likewise, a result at the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile for the expression mode and at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile for the promotion mode

<sup>1</sup> 8 999 respondents.



---

shows that the tendency to react in the expression mode is stronger than 65% of the people, and the propensity to act in the promotion mode is weaker than 80% of the people. The comparison of overall results obtained in the different intervention modes brings out the one or few dominant modes in one's personal group intervention style.

To interpret the portrait traced according to the different modes of interaction, and to identify one's personal intervention style, we suggest that you consider the one (or few) specific interaction modes with a percentile that truly stands out from the others. For instance, if you stand at the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile for support and vigilance, at the 90<sup>th</sup> for structuring, at the 75<sup>th</sup> for explanation, at the 10<sup>th</sup> for promotion and at the 50<sup>th</sup> for expression, you should specifically pay attention to the structuring, explanation and expression modes. These results depict an intervention style that corresponds mainly to a mixture of the strengths and pitfalls of each of these three modes. The weaker results yield information on what you are inclined to neglect, if not devalue in group life; in this example we find promotion, support and vigilance (respectively at the 10<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> percentile). It is an indication that certain ways of behaving seem less present in your intervention's repertoire.

If all results are similar, that is all weak or all strong, or even all average, this could reflect an actual equivalent use of the different group intervention modes. However, it can also show ba-

sically how one responds to the questionnaire. Thus, an individual may tend to respond to this type of questionnaire in a very uniform or very extreme manner. Consequentially, interpretation of results should be nuanced.

On another note, if upon answering the questionnaire, one refers to a different group for each question, results may possibly be meaningless. By contrast, if all questions were answered while referring to one same group situation and results are nevertheless all very weak, this most likely reflects a certain unease and a difficulty with participation in the referenced group situation. At the opposite, if results are all very strong, this potentially shows an ability to utilize a variety of group interaction strategies. Finally, a situation in which all results are average is one of the most difficult to interpret. In this case, it is likely that the use of the various interaction modes is never excessive or simply, that the questionnaire was answered in a scarcely differentiated manner.

When all group members complete the test, it is possible to highlight the group's dominances and deficiencies. The percentage of individuals contributing in a more proactive or reactive manner can differ from one group to another. Similarly, the importance attributed to the different interaction modes can vary considerably. It can be eye-opening for members of a work group to share their results and get a better grasp of the group's strengths and flaws.

---

Nevertheless, results do not provide conclusions regarding possible complicities or incompatibilities with other group members. At present, we do not have sufficient data to anticipate collaborations or potential rivalries. We cannot attest as to whether “opposites attract” or “birds of a feather flock together”. If a colleague is strongly inclined to interact in a mode that is barely present in one’s interaction style, would he/she make a precious ally or a fierce competitor? This remains an avenue for future research.



# The six interactions mode

## ***Expression***

of oneself, one's ideas and reactions

## ***Promotion***

of projects and proposals

## ***Explanation***

of situations and events

## ***Structuring***

of work and of group organization

## ***Vigilance***

regarding the unspoken and the hidden issues

## ***Support***

of group work and group members

The description of each interaction mode unfolds into six sections: 1) - A general view of the interaction mode's main characteristics; 2) - A presentation of the underlying beliefs; 3) - An exploration of the pleasures associated with the mode; 4) - An identification of signs of inadequacy specific to the mode's interactions; 5) - A review of behaviors leading to the mode's self-perpetuation and, 6) - An establishment of regulation strategies to counteract the mode's potentially negative effects.

The first section provides a descriptive view of the behaviors associated with the mode, and situates the latter in regards to the propensity to behave in a proactive or reactive manner. The second section attempts to show through analysis and understanding the scope of interpretations of group phenomena, when one interacts in this mode. The third section explores the specific pleasures derived from the mode's various actions and contributions to work and group dynamics. The fourth section pinpoints situations in which the mode's actions may become inadequate or counter-productive, as well as a source of discomfort. The fifth section illustrates how the interaction mode can self-perpetuate and how the mode's underlying beliefs are self-confirmed. And, lastly, the sixth section identifies strategies that the individual, or group members could implement to counteract the mode's negative impacts.

Each description should be used as a tool to interpret the profile obtained. These descriptions are derived from a qualitative analysis of participants' comments regarding their perceptions of group work, and of their ways of interacting in meetings. In addition, transposing these descrip-



---

tions unto your own intervention style requires a personal reflection to identify what makes sense to you.

In closing, take note that none of the six interaction modes presented is better than the other, nor preferable. They are all equally «good» and «bad», «relevant» and «irrelevant» or «adequate» and «inadequate».



# Expression<sup>1</sup>

Between mayhem and creation

### **Globally**

*Stimulate and increase involvement*

### **A belief**

*All groups require everyone's involvement*

### **Pleasures**

*Express oneself, stimulate and take action*

### **Signs of inadequacy**

*Provocation and intimidation*

### **Self-perpetuating behaviors**

*Reacting and exaggerating*

### **Regulation strategies**

*Collaboration and trust*

## **Globally**

### **Stimulate and increase involvement**

The mode of interaction that targets group members' self-expression is a proactive mode in the sense that, the person who resorts to this method tends to initiate exchanges. This person takes the lead and engages teammates with questions, responses, propositions and comments. The person interacting in this way is characterized as being more impulsive and spontaneous. Above all, his/her actions aim at eliciting a reaction and encouraging participation by all. The person seeks to stimulate the desires of risk-taking and self-expression, and enjoys that everyone is involved and contributing to goal achievement.

It can be assumed that one is dealing with a person who is interacting by means of the *expression* mode when several group members feel stimulated by the exchanges and wish to assert themselves and take risks. The feeling of freedom of action increases under this person's influence. His/her interactions help establish the belief that members can contribute to reaching the goals of the group. On the other hand, it can also be assumed that one is dealing with a person interacting according to the *expression* mode when several members feel hurt and at times overwhelmed, submerged by a flow of comments that unfurl upon them without notice or, they may feel personally attacked by the person's momentary excess of words and actions.

<sup>1</sup>The term *impulsive* was used in the earlier versions of the test, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995). It was abandoned in favor of *expression* to place emphasis on the modes' specific aspects of interaction and contribution, instead of the person's character trait.



---

To better define the *expression* mode, let us add that the way the person interacts, according to the moment or the context, can be qualified as: Audacious, dynamic, energetic, committed, enterprising, fiery, bold, impulsive, insolent, passionate, daring, provocative, rash, etc.

On a more formal note, the *expression* mode denotes a structure of conduct in which the person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interaction with group members aim at encouraging everyone to express themselves and increase their contribution to work and group dynamics.

## **A belief**

### **All groups require everyone's involvement**

The core belief underlying the interaction mode *expression* is that for a group to exist and survive, all members must be involved. As in a sporting match, team work constitutes an opportunity to excel. It is a time to do more and to do better. A group is not a place of rest, it is a challenge issued to all. And, the idea behind this mode of interaction is that if all members play their part and become fully involved, group success and goal achievement are most likely assured. On the other hand, if group members do not put in the effort and do not become involved, the group is doomed to fail. Hence, group difficulties do not appear to be linked to the fact that certain people take up too much space, but rather to the fact that certain people take up too little. With that in mind, the emergence of stress, or certain tensions, is an indication that the group is in good condition and functioning well. In contrast, silence and restraint can be signs of disharmony.

To put this another way, beyond these tensions, complicity can be achieved through actions.



---

## Pleasures

### Express oneself, stimulate and take action

An individual who interacts in accordance to the *expression* mode, obviously enjoys exchanging and debating with others. His/her opinions are made known and, reactions and responses are generated. This person occupies a prominent position within groups and/or organizations. His/her interventions fuel thoughts and discussions within the group. The sometimes startling and provocative actions convey energy to the other members. The person attempts to get members to express themselves, and encourages the group to make decisions and take action. Nevertheless, this individual is not constantly in the spotlight but instead, interacts by means of successive outbursts, first remaining in the background, then taking the floor. This creates surprise as the person becomes the center of attention and remains in this position long enough to have his/her point of view heard and discussed. Furthermore, the person's enjoyment is fueled by the exchanges that are instigated. These lively discussions are in themselves a source of pleasure. The more there are discussions and the more vivid and profound they are, the greater the satisfaction. Throughout these open discussions and confrontations, the person dives in then readjusts as the action unfolds. He/she enjoys the confrontation of ideas and the immediate response. When faced with inertia, the person will attempt to shock if necessary by resor-

ting to humor or provocation. The pleasure associated with the expression mode brings the person, as team leader, to make meetings more dynamic. He/she wants to see action and wants goals to be achieved. If required, the person explains and verbalizes on matters or elements pertaining to the life of the group that other members wouldn't dare openly address. Also, the spontaneous aspect of the mode allows the person to quickly support and stimulate group members.

In short, the individual who interacts according to the *expression* mode is guided by the pleasures in self-expression, stimulating others, and taking action.



---

## Signs of inadequacy Provocation and intimidation

Often acting on impulse, a person that interacts in the *expression* mode is at times, led to minimize his/her impact on others. Caught in the heat of the action, the individual has little time available to evaluate how his/her behaviors are interpreted, and is thus inclined to disregard other members' non-verbal messages of resistance. The person is aware of these messages of resistance, long silences, refusal to respond, looking away, stern position, etc., but believes that if the other members are not in agreement, they will say so, therefore overestimating the ability of others to assert themselves.

Behaviors associated with the *expression* mode can be considered inadequate when others perceive them as being overwhelming, aggressive or intimidating. When several members have the impression that too much is being said, or it is said in a rough manner, there is a risk that some may get upset or feel hurt. Even though the individual feels that he/she is participating fully and is demonstrating *expression* and commitment towards the group, the relevancy of the interactions pursuant to the expression mode can be put into question when the person notices that others are beginning to regard him/her as someone who is stubborn and trying to obtain acceptance at all cost. Actions can be viewed as inadequate when they serve to create a climate of restraint in which members are always on their guard

to avoid being hurt. This individual is then seen as a rebel, more inclined to provoke than to lead. Consequently, his/her credibility is threatened. The resulting climate is in complete opposition to the one sought by the person. At the same time, the pleasure obtained from intervening gives way to a certain tension. Enemies are more easily identified, whereas allies are less apparent. More and more, the person feels like an outcast.

Furthermore, the pleasures derived from *expressing* oneself, stimulating, and taking action push the person to continue to engage teammates. Efforts are made to elicit members' participation and involvement. In doing so, the person may upset potential allies, thus cutting off group support. The person then feels all alone against the world.

In summary, when the person begins to fear the emergence of a climate of restraint, politeness and apprehension, it may be time for him/her to question the relevance of maintaining behaviors associated with this interaction mode. Upon perceiving these cues, the person should evaluate whether more pleasure could be derived from other means of interacting.



---

## Self-perpetuating behaviors

### Reacting and exaggerating

The pleasures in expressing oneself, stimulating others and taking action associated with the expression mode lead the person to continuously react on the spot. The greater the impact, the more he/she is inclined to believe that the strategy is effective. Keeping this in mind, as members appear to become less involved, the person raises the intensity of the provocations and exaggerations until a response is obtained. In doing so, interactions may become upsetting and signs of irritability begin to appear. This in turn encourages the person to carry on and add on more, as these reactions are proof that his/her actions are increasing group members' expression and implication.

When other members react in a hostile manner and reject the person's actions, when they seek to isolate him/her or simply speak less and look away to avoid a debate, the person is driven to react even more strongly, eliciting the same type of responses that originally brought upon this isolation. The more the person is being avoided or confronted, the more he/she feels they are trying to stop him /her from saying what must be said; As a result, the person's startling interventions are accentuated and tensions rise. In the end, all of this leads to one or several interpersonal conflicts.

## Regulation strategies<sup>1</sup>

### Collaboration and trust

To counter the self-perpetuating behaviors specific to the *expression* mode, one must strive to not react to the shocking or intimidating aspects of the person's intonations or gestures, but rather, respond solely to the contents of the person's interactions. Hostile reactions will thus be avoided. Attempts can be made to maintain communications that focus on content, in a context of alliances. In time, one can even pursue a specific relation of collaboration and trust with the person. Once this is established, attempts can be made to convey to the person how his/her actions negatively affect members' *expression* and implication, as well as goal achievement as pursued by the group. The person is thus able to reduce the negative impacts of the behaviors associated with this mode.

Also, the member who interacts in this mode can reduce the counterproductive effects of his/her actions by reacting solely to the content of the other members' interactions, and not the non-verbal aspects. He/she could try to objectify statements, that is, try to draw out the contents from the container and separate the words that are being said from the emotions perceived in the non-verbal messages. The idea is to find pleasure in separating the content from the container. To ensure this, the person will have to slow down and, as an example, take a moment to

<sup>1</sup>To break the cycle of a self-perpetuating mode of behaviors and counter its negative impacts, the underlying general rule is to lead the person towards new behaviors of relational pleasures that are outside of his/her usual comfort zone, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 2002, 2011)



---

rephrase and validate the content and meaning of the messages. In addition, time should be taken to develop a stronger rapport with a few members through informal meetings.



# Promotion<sup>1</sup>

Between selling and adhering

### **Globally**

*Convince and rally*

### **A belief**

*All groups require that their members adhere*

### **Pleasures**

*Listen, bring together and mobilize*

### **Signs of inadequacy**

*Polarization and division*

### **Self-perpetuating behaviors**

*Pleasing and succeeding*

### **Regulation strategies**

*Differentiation and critique*

## **Globally**

### **Convince and rally**

The mode of interaction that aims at promoting projects or proposals to group members is a proactive mode in the sense that, the person who resorts to this method tends to initiate exchanges. Through questions, responses, propositions, comments, and other forms of interactions, the person mainly focusses on stimulating members to adhere to a common project or common element of agreement. The person who interacts in this manner enjoys trying to convince and rally. Actions are undertaken with tact as he/she seeks to reformulate the members' various contributions, so that a greater number of people will find them more acceptable.

It can be assumed that one is dealing with an individual who is interacting by means of the *promotion* mode when several group members feel that their proposals of projects and potential solutions are taken into consideration by this individual. Under his/her influence, members are led to believe that the group can carry out their projects; their feelings of trust and their sense of belonging to a group increase. In parallel, some accuse this individual of being able to promote any given project regardless of its nature, and change his/her mind depending on other people's proposals and reactions. Although they feel listened to, they have the impression that the individual's proposals

<sup>1</sup>The term *convincing* was used in the earlier versions of the test, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995). It was abandoned in favor of *promotion* to place emphasis on the mode's specific aspects of interaction and contribution, instead of the person's character trait.



---

are constantly subjected to reactions from others. As well, they may have the impression that he/she contributes to the group's avoidance of contentious issues and, they may feel left out if they don't concur.

To better define the *promotion* mode, let us add that the way the person interacts, according to the moment or the context, can be qualified as: Charming, convincing, mobilizing, persuasive, rallying, seductive, etc. His/her actions are likened to canvassing or lobbying efforts, searching for compromise, etc.

On a more formal note, the *promotion* mode denotes a structure of conduct in which the person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interaction with group members aim at stimulating their adhesion to a common project, or a common element of agreement.

## **A belief**

### **All groups require that their members adhere**

The core belief underlying the interaction mode *promotion* is that, for a group to exist and keep going, all members must adhere to a project or idea. Also, for the group's survival, it is essential that each member feel personally connected to the group's project. The very existence of the group appears directly related to the members' adhesion to the group's project and goals, and this adhesion is neither spontaneous nor natural; on the contrary, in this mode, the person views group cohesion as a phenomenon to construct by *promoting* propositions and projects to group members. He/she regards certain members' resistance to commit as a plea to intervene in a way that everyone better understands how their participation can profit them. Likewise, rising tensions linked to the pursuit of a project are perceived as uncompleted discussions and unfinished negotiations. In this respect, the search for member adhesion to projects and propositions takes priority over the projects' and propositions' intrinsic qualities..



---

## Pleasures

### Listen, bring together and mobilize

A person who interacts in accordance to the *promotion* mode enjoys acting in indirect ways, tactfully, through small gestures – placing a word here, placing a word there, lending an ear to one member while glancing at another. He/she takes pleasure in rephrasing others' sentences thus reaching a greater number of members. The person tries to find the project, idea or proposition that will satisfy everyone and put a stop to discussions. He/she listens and seeks to bring together and mobilize members around rallying propositions and projects. In a diplomatic way, the person is delighted to say things and reformulate offensive ideas so that they become more acceptable. Attempts are made to present to each member the benefits that can be obtained in rallying around a certain project or idea. The person places himself/herself between parties in order to occupy a central position; a position, which in turn favors the formulation of proposals that unite different viewpoints. In this context, the person's pleasure is fueled by the members' approval and, when faced with difficulty, pleasure is also derived in promoting a solution. Attempts are made to secure acceptance of the proposition most likely to win people over. In his/her efforts to rally the people, the person keeps tabs on everyone's movements and gestures in accordance to what he/she perceives as being of interest to the group. As team leader, the person works on deve-

loping relations between members, and group cohesion. He /she enjoys seizing informal occasions to discuss the various proposals. Attempts are then made to create and obtain group solidarity around decisions to be made. The person finds pleasure in relying on his/her abilities to influence, and to rally.

In short, the person who interacts according to the *promotion* mode is guided by the pleasures in listening, bringing together and mobilizing people around a project.



---

## Signs of inadequacy

### Polarization and division

In trying to promote projects and propositions that, in all likelihood, will obtain adhesion by most group members, the person who interacts according to the *promotion* mode is at times led to support incompatible projects and propositions. This brings the person to overshadow true oppositions and avoid certain choices that need to be made.

The pleasure that the person obtains in listening, bringing together, and mobilizing group members, makes him/her more inclined to persevere in his/her search for possible arrangements despite certain members' resistance. The person can interpret their opposition as a personal opposition, thus turning into an interpersonal conflict. As a result, personal negative comments regarding an opposing group member, or subgroup, are made by the person or by other members. Caught up in the pleasure from the sequence of replies, the person may go as far as discrediting opposing members, causing them to lose face.

Behaviors associated with the *promotion* mode can be considered inadequate when they start to be perceived as being a source of division, that is, when the person's behavior draws attention to the differences in viewpoints, rather than the similarities. Maintaining this mode of interaction with group members

can, over time, lead to the creation of subgroups: The group that follows the person and rallies with him/her and, the others.

In summary, when the person begins to fear the emergence of opponents or clans, or feels that his/her allies are abandoning ship, it may be time for the person to question the relevance of maintaining behaviors associated with this interaction mode. Upon perceiving these cues, he/she should evaluate whether more pleasure could be derived from other means of interacting.



---

## Self-perpetuating behaviors

### Pleasing and succeeding

The pleasures in listening, bringing together and mobilizing people associated with the *promotion* mode lead the individual to believe that the more the people support his/her propositions, the more he/she is appreciated. Thus, the more the individual feels appreciated and popular, the more he/she seeks to promote his/her projects and propositions to be even more popular, and so on. Hence the more one searches for approval by all, the more one formulates propositions and projects to rally a greater number of people. This association between success and popularity perpetuates the individual's constant search for approval as well as his/her efforts to *promote* ideas or projects within the group.

If members react by asking questions or by being in opposition, the individual may take this as a personal attack or an attempt to make him/her lose face. In turn, the individual will tend to react to these members and depending on the strength of the opposition, will either show them signs of rejection or will deploy more energy to satisfy those that are recalcitrant. There is then a risk that the individual will be perceived as creating injustices or tensions.

## Regulations strategies<sup>1</sup>

### Differentiation and critique

To counter the self-perpetuating behaviors specific to the mode that aims at promoting propositions and projects to its group members, one must encourage the individual to take a position in the debate, to differentiate him/herself and not try to rally the group. Instead of asking what is best for the group, one should ask the individual to share what he/she really thinks and desires. In doing so, one can convey the proposal's inconveniences to the individual and the group, not openly and directly oppose the individual. The idea is to express acceptance of the individual while voicing critique of the projects presented. For example, one can tell the individual that the project presented will not be supported because of its inconveniences or negative impacts on the group.

Also, the member who interacts in this mode can reduce the counterproductive effects of his/her *promotion* efforts, by slowing down and by making the effort to identify the inconveniences of the presented projects. He/she can then share these findings with colleagues even though it may be risky. Also, this member could have informal meetings with those who are more influential, as well as with those who are not. These activities will enable the member to distance him/herself from the discussed projects.

<sup>1</sup>To break the cycle of a self-perpetuating mode of behaviors and counter its negative impacts, the underlying general rule is to lead the person towards new behaviors of relational pleasures that are outside of his/her usual comfort zone, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 2002, 2011).







# Explanation<sup>1</sup>

Between confusion and meaning

### **Globally**

*Explain and understand*

### **A belief**

*All groups require a common understanding*

### **Pleasures**

*Analyze, enlighten and guide*

### **Signs of inadequacy**

*Impatience and withdrawal*

### **Self-perpetuating behaviors**

*Clarifying and confusing*

### **Regulation strategies**

*Involvement and risk taking*

## **Globally**

### **Explain and understand**

The mode of intervention that aims at explaining different group phenomena and life events is a proactive mode in the sense that, the person who resorts to this method tends to initiate exchanges. Through questions, responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interactions, the person basically tries to bring others to see and comprehend the phenomena and events that are misperceived or poorly understood. He/she enjoys putting things into perspective. The person makes connections and seeks to provide a frame of interpretation to help group members better understand what is going on in relation to the group's objectives.

It can be assumed that one is dealing with an individual who is interacting by means of the *explanation* mode when several group members have the impression that this individual's actions are conveying an *explanation*, which gives meaning to the work of the group and the people. Each person's contributions and decisions are interpreted in a manner as to direct group action. The impression that a clearer understanding leads to being more effective heightens under this individual's influence. In contrast, group members can feel somewhat confused and become less attentive when the individual persists in his/her expla-

<sup>1</sup>The term analyst was used in the earlier versions of the test, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995). It was abandoned in favor of explanation to place emphasis on the modes' specific aspects of interaction and contribution, instead of the person's character trait.



---

nations and presents his/her arguments in an abstract manner that is far from the members' perceptions and realities.

To better define the *explanation* mode, let us add that the way the person interacts, according to the moment or the context, can be qualified as: Analytical, confounding, enlightening, insensitive, intellectual, un-spontaneous, "blowing a lot of hot air", wise, visionary, etc. In short, the mode refers to a set of behaviors that roughly correspond to those associated with a stereotyped image of the group's intellect.

On a more formal note, the mode *explanation* denotes a structure of conduct in which the person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interaction with group members aim at bringing members to see and comprehend the misperceived or misunderstood phenomena within the group.

## **A belief**

### **All groups require a common understanding**

The core belief underlying the interaction mode *explanation* is that, what gets people to work together and what holds them together is a common understanding of the objectives and a shared comprehension of the phenomena and events that punctuate group work. The group is herein a venue in which everyone can share their ideas and perceptions and exchange views on group objectives. The elaboration of a common *explanation* of what is basically happening and actions to be taken, establish the group's reason for being. Without this search for a common vision of things, the group no longer has meaning and slips into confusion. If, from the start, things are going badly, it's that members don't know where they are headed and don't understand what is happening. Group members have a need to clarify and discuss their understanding of the orientations in order to uphold a common guideline. A group is doing well when it understands what is going on, and where it is going. In contrast, when things are going badly, for instance, when it is noticeable that members are withdrawing, that some members are becoming very hasty while others are remaining silent, (or other signs of tension), the person attributes these phenomena to one and others' incorrect common explanation.



---

## Pleasures

### Analyze, enlighten and guide

A person who interacts in accordance to the *explanation* mode enjoys analyzing and communicating his/her assessment of the various situations that confront the group. The person takes pleasure in sharing his/her medium and long term vision of the group's objectives. The person tends to place him/herself in a strategist or *Éminence Grise* position. He/she intervenes at the levels of both the organization's mission and the relationship between the group's objectives and this mission, and proposes guidelines to follow. Furthermore, through his/her actions, the person aims to explain and clarify, to make members see and comprehend the elements that they misunderstand or fail to see, and finds pleasure in shedding light on actions. The person behaves in a manner to guide and outline group action, connecting current decisions to the group's long term projects. All group actions must be subjected to clear guidelines. By the same spirit, the person also enjoys answering questions and situating them in a broader framework. He/she likes to clarify behaviors, both his/her own as well as that of others. Delivering an explanation, summary or commenting on group function is what fuels this person. When faced with difficulty he/she stands back to better perceive all the relevant elements; he/she can then explain its causes and understand its effects. The person views the consequences in a broader context. As team leader,

he/she tends to encourage discussion and relational analysis as well as clarify the work ahead. Discussions are kept focused on the group's guidelines and projects. The person exerts his/her role thoughtfully. He/she enjoys giving meaning to the tasks at hand and putting them into perspective with the organization's mission and general policies.

In short, the person who interacts according to the *explanation* mode is guided by the pleasures in analyzing, clarifying and guiding the action.



---

## Signs of inadequacy

### Impatience and withdrawal

In wanting to share his/her comprehension of things with group members, the individual who interacts in the *explanation* mode is sometimes led to speak frequently and at length. In doing so, the more he/she offers explanations, the more the others ask questions and note unclear or incoherent issues. In turn, the more the individual responds, the more his/her explanations become complicated and the less the others understand. The less the others understand, the more the need arises for a clearer explanation... We thus witness a decline in attention, and even the withdrawal of certain members.

Behaviors associated with the *explanation* mode can be considered inadequate when they begin to be the cause of a certain confusion, and reactions of impatience and withdrawal arise. These behaviors become harmful when they persist even though members have gained sufficient understanding of the perceived problems or, they had already considered these problems to be resolved. Many people are in wait for the individual to stop speaking and no longer feel concerned with his/her statements. They may judge the individual's behavior as disconnected. The individual then loses credibility and even evokes hostile reactions upon him/herself. Furthermore, the pleasure that the individual feels in analyzing, clarifying and guiding

group work pushes him/her to continue arguing and persisting with explanations. This results in members retaining only that the individual solely wishes to have his/her explanation validated and expertise recognized; His/ her contributions to group efforts in understanding phenomena is pushed into the background.

In summary, when the person begins to perceive signs of confusion, impatience and member withdrawal, it may be time for him/her to question the relevance of maintaining behaviors associated with this interaction mode. Upon perceiving these cues, the person should evaluate whether more pleasure could be derived from other means of interacting.



---

## Self-perpetuating behaviors

### Clarifying and confusing

The pleasures in analyzing, clarifying and guiding associated with the *explanation* mode, push the individual to share his/her understanding and offer more explanations, with even more refinement and precision adding information on the context, causes, etc. These addendums and precisions usually lead to more questions. And, the more others ask questions and raise unclear or incoherent aspects, the more the individual appears to be drawing away from their reality with explanations that are becoming more abstract. This can bring about even more questioning, resulting in confusion and, as the situation becomes even more confusing, the person tends to provide more explanations.

On the other hand, the more the members have difficulty understanding, the more they will ask questions. The individual, in trying to respond correctly, adds more detail and accuracy to his/her explanations. As members comment more, offer further explanations or ask questions, the individual rejoices in answering and in sharing his/her comprehension... Thus, the more the interactions between the members and the individual linger around his/her explanations, the more the individual feels that his/her explanations are appreciated.

## Regulations strategies<sup>1</sup>

### Involvement and risk taking

To counter the self-perpetuating behaviors specific to the mode that aims at sharing explanations of phenomena affecting the group, one must try to break the cycle of: “they don’t understand / I explain / they question / I explain with more precision / they don’t understand”. To do so, one must try to elicit a personal implication from the individual and draw him/her closer to the action. It is a matter of asking the individual the opposite of his/her natural strategy: doing, rather than saying. At least three options are available to whoever wants to pursue this idea: Action, emotion and silences. For example, one can ask the individual to convert his/her idea into action; to give a concrete illustration of how he/she views the idea or better, to take the first steps. Another venue involves asking the individual to establish him/herself according to what he/she is feeling. This way, the individual is obliged to call upon new resources. Lastly, one can draw attention to the individual’s silences; being attentive during these moments compels the person to once again resort to new resources.

Also, the member who interacts in this mode can try to reduce the counterproductive effects of his/her actions by taking the risk of letting others fend for themselves and by reducing the number, or the length of actions that aim at explaining the situa-

<sup>1</sup>To break the cycle of a self-perpetuating mode of behaviors and counter its negative impacts, the underlying general rule is to lead the person towards new behaviors of relational pleasures that are outside of his/her usual comfort zone, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 2002, 2011).



---

tion. The member could also share his/her problems with, or misunderstanding of, the phenomenon. Then again, the member could suggest a course of action without conferring its rational or its context.



# Structuring<sup>1</sup>

Between rigidity and effectiveness

### **Globally**

*Manage and regulate*

### **A belief**

*All groups require rules and procedures*

### **Pleasures**

*Organize, regulate and distribute*

### **Signs of inadequacy**

*Irritation and delinquency*

### **Self-perpetuating behaviors**

*Explaining and conforming*

### **Regulation strategies**

*Exploration and pragmatism*

## **Globally**

### **Manage and regulate**

The mode of interaction that aims at structuring is a reactive mode in the sense that the person who resorts to this method does not initiate exchange, but rather reacts to it. In this mode, the primary concern of the group member's questions, responses, propositions, comments, and other forms of interactions, is to structure the group and organize it in terms of time and space (deadlines, rules, methods, procedures, etc.). The person interacting in this mode likes to behave methodically and fairly. When he/she interacts, it is often to propose ways of proceeding, or to remind members of group rules and policies. The person looks for a method, a rule, or a procedure that will solve the group's problems.

It can be assumed that one is dealing with an individual who is interacting by means of the *structuring* mode when, several group members have the impression that this individual's behavior contributes to the work organization and overall functioning of the group. The perceptions of justice and fairness are heightened under this individual's influence. The suggested rules and procedures appear to enhance achievement of group goals. In contrast, it can also be assumed that one is dealing with an individual interacting in the structuring mode when several group members feel that too many rules are being applied too rigidly,

<sup>1</sup>The term strict was used in the earlier versions of the test, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995). It was abandoned in favor of structuring to place emphasis on the modes' specific aspects of interaction and contribution, instead of the person's character trait.



---

without consideration for the context; or again, when members perceive that their interactions are adding to the problems and, instead of solving them, they are burdening their work.

To better define the *structuring* mode, let us add that the way the person interacts, according to the moment or the context can be qualified as: Conforming, conservative, legalistic, methodical, rigid, rigorous, strict, structured, systematic, etc.

On a more formal note, the *structuring* mode denotes a structure of conduct in which the person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interaction with group members aim at organizing tasks, and their relations in terms of time and space (deadlines, rules, methods, procedures, etc.).

## **A belief**

### **All groups require rules and procedures**

The core belief underlying the interaction mode *structuring* is that, for a group to exist and keep going, it must have rules and procedures that are respected by all members. According to this mode, for a group to survive and develop it must be structured. Otherwise, as several people get together, the effervescence and the meeting's life itself lead to the breaking-down of the group into multiple separate projects; everybody makes do, each to their own liking. Injustices and de-motivation then set in. In the absence of a regulatory framework, the group slides into anarchy and disorder. Before the onset of actual chaos, rising tensions and irritations in the group are interpreted as indirect results of a lack of order and structure. In addition, the smooth running of a group, if not its survival, is based on a mutual acceptance of clear and explicit operating rules. The publicized and uniform application of these rules guaranty equity and prevent manifestations of conflict and tensions.



---

## Pleasures

### Organize, regulate and distribute

A person who interacts in accordance to the *structuring* mode enjoys explaining and applying the rules and procedures adopted by the group, in a rigorous and fair manner. This person likes order whether it be regarding tasks or regarding relationships between members. He/she enjoys watching group members work methodically and fairly. Also, this person acts more to the “how” than to the “what”. Among other things, he/she makes sure that the timetable is respected, people get their turn to speak, tasks are allocated, and roles and responsibilities are clarified. The person influences the meeting’s functioning in a determining way. In this sense, his/her pleasure in interacting is obviously fueled and encouraged by the fact that things are unfolding as expected. When faced with difficulties or when encountering tensions, the person’s efforts aim at putting things in order and preventing anarchy from settling in. He/she seeks to explain the norms that remain vague, proposes procedures, and upholds those that are in place. As team leader, the person likes to invest him/herself in the organization of meetings, and ensures that they are conducted smoothly. He/she monitors time, mandates, delays, agendas, etc., and provides a secure and structured work environment in which everyone’s tasks and roles are clear and precise.

In short, the person who interacts according to the *structuring* mode is guided by the pleasures in organizing, regulating and distributing work in a fair way.



---

## Signs of inadequacy irritation and delinquency

In his/her desire to organize group work, the individual who interacts in the *structuring* mode is sometimes driven to wanting to control the group's way of working and wanting to evaluate what is correct and acceptable regarding regular procedures. In doing so, certain members become irritated by this individual who is rigid and lacks nuance in his/her willingness to regulate and standardize procedures. The individual thus appears controlling and lacking in context-sensitivity.

Behaviors associated with the *structuring* mode can be viewed as inadequate when a surplus of norms and procedures renders work more laborious and provokes widespread discontent. By dint of introducing and implementing explicit and already existing procedures, one can lose sight of the forest for the trees. Excess may do you harm!

Furthermore, the pleasures derived in organizing, regulating and distributing group work compel the individual to persevere in his/her efforts. In doing so, ironically, the individual leads the other group members towards certain forms of unintended delinquency. Other members who are more concerned with the spirit than the letter, may for example, not follow rules. Faced with these behaviors that could lead to chaos, the individual will show more firmness in his/her attempt to have existing rules res-

pected, which in turn results in even more noticeable delinquent behaviors.

In summary, it may be time for the person to question the relevance of maintaining behaviors associated with this interaction mode, when in doing so, more problems are arising instead of being solved, such as the resulting discontent and disobedience. Upon perceiving these cues, the person should evaluate whether more pleasure could be derived from other means of interacting.



---

## Self-perpetuating behaviors

### Explaining and conforming

The pleasures in organizing, regulating, and distributing work, associated with the *structuring* mode, bring the person to follow and the rules and clearly explain them. The fact that the group can exchange and be productive confirms, in the eyes of the person, that rules and procedures need to be followed for the group to function and get things done. Also, the more the structuring of work and the exchanges within the group appear deficient, the more the person will propose new rules. The more the rules are adopted by the group, the harder the person will try to organize the ways of doing things. In being rigorous, he/she risks becoming rigid.

Furthermore, members who are more concerned with the spirit rather than the letter may not want to abide by the rules. Thus, faced with the threat of chaos depicted by their refusal to comply to set rules, the person will show more determination in his/her attempts to ensure that rules are followed. This in turn will cause further problems in terms of work organization, member performance, and increased behaviors of delinquency, resulting in a multiplication and strong enforcement of rules that are sometimes difficult to conjugate.

## Regulation strategies<sup>1</sup>

### Exploration and pragmatism

To counter the self-perpetuating behaviors specific to the mode that aims at structuring both work and exchanges, one can favor pragmatism. Efforts can be made to explore with the person, the practical repercussions of the suggested working methods on him/herself and group members. On a common accord, one can attempt to identify the actual usefulness of the person's propositions and working methods in relation to the group's genuine needs in terms of procedures and policies. One can ask these questions: To what problem do these proposed methods apply? Are they truly necessary? What changes will they bring about? What will be gained, what will be lost? It is not about confronting the person, but rather working with him/her to identify the most desirable ways of proceeding for the whole group, while pointing-out the inconveniences of the proposed rules in a simple and concrete manner.

Also, the member who interacts in this mode can reduce the counterproductive effects of his/her actions by presenting the gains and losses associated with his/her structuring propositions. In this case, remaining practical in the analysis of the gains and losses allows the member to stay in touch with the group's needs. Furthermore, the member could ask other members whether they believe that applying the rules will solve the

<sup>1</sup>To break the self-perpetuating cycle of a behavior mode, and to counter its negative impacts, the general underlying principle is to lead the person towards new behaviors of pleasurable relations, outside of his/her usual comfort zone (Mongeau & Tremblay, 2002, 2011).



---

problem. Can they identify exceptions as well as procedures to deal with these exceptions?



# Vigilance<sup>1</sup>

*Between suspicion and disclosure*

### **Globally**

*Watch over and enlighten*

### **A belief**

*Every group requires that personal interests be met*

### **Pleasures**

*Oversee, perceive and reveal*

### **Signs of inadequacy**

*Distrust and isolation*

### **Self-perpetuating behaviors**

*Suspecting and gathering*

### **Regulation strategies**

*Trust and constancy*

## **Globally**

**Watch over and enlighten**

The mode of interaction that targets *vigilance* of interests at stake regarding group actions and decisions, is a reactive mode in the sense that the person who resorts to this method does not initiate exchange, but rather reacts to it. A person who interacts according to this mode can be quite active during a debate however, he/she will generally not be the one launching it. The person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interaction aim at highlighting and examining the issues and impacts of the proposals put forward, and the decisions to be made. He/she contributes to everyone having their interests considered. The person enjoys uncovering incoherencies and implied or unspoken contradictions that can affect group work and group dynamics. He/she seeks to ensure that everyone is aware of what is currently at stake.

It can be assumed that one is dealing with an individual who is interacting by means of the *vigilance* mode when several group members have the impression that the person's interactions lead to unveiling the unspoken and explaining innuendos. The perceptions of transparency and open-mindedness increase under his/her influence. During debate, personal interests are revealed and taken into consideration. In contrast, it can also be assumed that one is dealing with a participant interacting accor-

<sup>1</sup>The term skeptical was used in the earlier versions of the test, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995). It was abandoned in favor of vigilance to place emphasis on the modes' specific aspects of interaction and contribution, instead of the person's character trait.



---

ding to the vigilance mode when group members become defensive, feel they must justify themselves, and a climate of suspicion sets in.

To better define the *vigilance* mode, let us add that the way the person interacts, according to the moment or the context, can be qualified as: Skeptical, incredulous, lucid, cautious, pessimist, indicative, suspicious, clairvoyant, revealing, etc.

On a more formal note, the *vigilance* mode denotes a structure of conduct in which the person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interaction with other members aim at highlighting and examining the issues and their impacts

## **A belief**

### **Every group requires that personal needs be met**

The core belief underlying the interaction mode *vigilance* is that, the existence and survival of a group are the fruit of members' personal interests being met and ensuing struggles being addressed. The group is an arena in which each and everyone's objectives are clashing and competing, sometimes explicitly, but more often in an obscure way. The person only sees individuals who have gathered together and, as long as all their personal needs are met, everything is fine. Thus, a group that has problems is a group that doesn't respond to the members' aspirations and is unsuccessful in giving them what they came looking for. Tensions, irritations and conflicts are viewed as expressions of members' unmet needs or, as manifestations of the group being in the presence of hidden or mismanaged issues. The person doubts early consensus and what is taken for granted, and mistrusts good intentions. He/she believes that the parties' official discourse cannot, in itself, enable one to grasp the issues at stake. Also, with this mode of interaction, the person seeks to correctly identify members' personal interests so as to provide a response compatible with group interests. The important thing in achieving objectives is to "get down to business" and make explicit the real issues that are often left unspoken. Keeping this in mind, the person becomes sensitive to the non-verbal and hidden interests that fuel conversation.



---

## Pleasures

### Oversee, perceive and reveal

A person who interacts in accordance to the *vigilance* mode enjoys identifying the interests involved and the various issues of power between parties. He/she likes to step back, observe the action, and maintain a distance in dealing with other members' hasty assessments. The person takes pleasure in perceiving the flip side of the coin, the bottom of things, the hidden motivations and the elements forgotten by others. He/she seeks to contextualize events, establish links between them and, allows for a little time to pass before supporting and confirming a consensus. The person's pleasure is fueled by his/her plausible assumptions, interpretations and inevitable "findings". When faced with proposals of potential solutions to respond to difficulties encountered by the group, the person tries to assess the extent to which these solutions truly provide an answer to the conflicting interests in question. As team leader, the person is particularly concerned about the strategic aspects of group decisions regarding the needs and interests of the members and the enemies of the group. He/she enjoys ensuring transparency and coherence between the group's propositions and their actions.

In short, the person who interacts according to the *vigilance* mode is guided by the pleasures in overseeing, perceiving and revealing issues underlying members' interactions.

## Signs of inadequacy

### Distrust and isolation

In trying to identify the real issues and hidden interests, the individual who interacts according to the *vigilance* mode is sometimes called upon to interpret the unspoken. He/she is led to criticize the obvious choices more severely than others and denounce collusions and bogus agreements. The skepticism and questioning that characterize this mode end up creating a climate of distrust in the work groups in which the person plays a part.

Behaviors associated with the *vigilance* mode can be viewed as inadequate when they give rise to a climate of suspicion among group members. They become harmful when several members end up feeling personally targeted by the individual's statements and fear they will lend themselves to malicious interpretations in which they don't recognize themselves. In response to the individual's excessive vigilant behavior, members become more cautious, if not on the defensive. There is a risk that a Manichean perception of the world (them/us, good/bad) will slowly settle into the group.

Furthermore, the pleasure that the individual derives from overseeing, perceiving and revealing the unspoken brings him/her to persevere in the search for hidden issues and possible dishonesties. In doing so, the individual is at risk of isolation and rejection because, by dint of lacking confidence in partners and



---

by dint of surveillance of all, his/her interactions annoy members as they become exasperated by the continuous recriminations. The individual is blamed for generating what he/she is denouncing. From being widely surveilled, members end up wanting to avoid this vigilance; this in turn arouses even more distrust within the individual, subsequently reducing one's desire to interact with him/her.

In summary, when the person begins to feel that distrust is settling into the group and he/she is beginning to feel isolated from others, it may be time for him/her to question the relevance of maintaining behaviors associated with this interaction mode. Upon perceiving these cues, the person should evaluate whether more pleasure could be derived from other means of interacting.

## **Self-perpetuating behaviors**

### **Suspect and gather**

The pleasures in overseeing, perceiving and revealing associated with the *vigilance* mode bring the person to distrust appearances and doubt the presumed obvious. By being overly attentive and by surveilling the non-verbal and the various hidden issues, the person gathers evidence that confirms his/her suspicions. The person raises contradictions, asks for proof, and refers to facts and actions from the past regarding members' discourses and behaviors. Members attempt to justify and defend themselves as they try to explain these contradictions. The more they justify themselves and the more they manifest defensive behaviors, the more the person will become suspicious and try to "let the cat out of the bag", which in turn causes the members to become entangled in their stories and feel that "something fishy is going on".

Nevertheless, if the saying "where there's smoke there's fire" applies well to the person's contribution, the member's point of view is that "the house doesn't burn down every time someone strikes a match". In addition, from feeling overly surveilled and criticized, members may become fearful and distrust the person's interpretations. Fearing accusations, some members will want to control the information that they are providing the person with, while others will heighten their tone of exasperation or



---

prepare themselves for the person's interactions prior to the meeting. All these reactions reinforce the individual's distrust. How can he/she not exercise caution when people distrust him/her so?

## **Regulations strategies<sup>1</sup>** **confiance et constance**

To counter the self-perpetuating behaviors specific to the mode that aims at being vigilant when it comes to hidden issues, one must adopt a position of confidence in the person's capabilities to properly assess situations and their possible repercussions. One must attempt to convey to the person that not only is he/she accepted but his/her contributions are appreciated. Such a position destabilizes the person's usual reactions. Being used to signs of distrust and irritation, the person is driven towards new behaviors. At first, he/she will exercise caution. According to this mode, one cannot rely on others without the risk of being manipulated. Hence, to break the cycle of self-confirmation, one must add constancy and honesty to the confidence because with this mode comes a particularly acute sensitivity to lying. The person is certainly not a fool. Also, honesty and transparency not only become valuable assets, but also necessary conditions in establishing a constructive relationship with the person. With that in mind, one can communicate to the group what was discussed during informal meetings with certain members. In addition, one must avoid repeating these informal meetings as they may make the person more suspicious. On another note, when the time comes to submit proposals, one can straightaway present the weaknesses and contradictions of the proposals in advance to prevent "denunciation".

<sup>1</sup>To break the self-perpetuating cycle of a behavior mode, and to counter its negative impacts, the general underlying principle is to lead the person towards new behaviors of pleasurable relations, outside of his/her usual comfort zone (Mongeau & Tremblay, 2002, 2011).



---

Also, the member who interacts in this mode can reduce the counterproductive effects of his/her actions by avoiding interpretations and by limiting his/her interactions to the content, irrespective of the non-verbal and tone of voice. Also, the member should not insist that the person respond and provide justification; rather, he/she should ask the group if they could shed more light on the information. Finally, the member can try to communicate how such contradictions or perceptions impact the group and discuss actions to take to reduce the negative effects.



# Support<sup>1</sup>

Between assistance and withdrawal

### **Globally**

*Assist and unite*

### **A belief**

*All groups require that differences be accepted*

### **Pleasures**

*Support, reassure and be accepted*

### **Signs of inadequacy**

*Fear and judgement*

### **Self-perpetuating behaviors**

*Staying in the background and fading away*

### **Regulation strategies**

*Valorization and audacity*

## **Globally**

### **Assist and unite**

The mode of interaction that aims at supporting group activities, as well as the people making up the group is a reactive mode in the sense that, instead of initiating exchanges, the person who resorts to this method tends to react to them. The person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of behavior aim primarily at supporting proposals and ensuring everyone's well-being, including his/her own. The person's interactions value harmonious exchanges, free of conflict or tension. Their accommodating aspect favor attentive listening and respect of personal differences.

It can be assumed that one is dealing with a person who is interacting in the *support* mode when several group members have the impression that he/she shows solidarity with each person in the group, and helps ensure that everyone's personal characteristics are taken into consideration. Concurrently, some members will find the person somewhat timid, sensitive and discreet. They will no longer speak directly to him/her and even forget that he/she is present. Some will be afraid of unconsciously hurting the person or, fear that the person will be judged and graded negatively.

<sup>1</sup>The term discreet was used in the earlier versions of the test, (Mongeau & Tremblay, 1993, 1995). It was abandoned in favor of support to place emphasis on the modes' specific aspects of interaction and contribution, instead of the person's character trait.



---

To better define the *support* mode, let us add that the way the person interacts, according to the moment or the context can be qualified as: Discreet, timid, weak, humble, moderate, soft, reserved, respectful, tempered, shy, etc.

On a more formal note, the *support* mode denotes a structure of conduct in which the person's questions and responses, propositions and comments, and other forms of interaction with other group members aim at supporting group work, and not fueling dissention.

## **A belief**

### **All groups require that differences be accepted**

The core belief underlying the interaction mode *support* is that the existence and survival of a group rest upon everyone being heard and given attention. The acceptance of differences exhibited by members is the driving force behind group work. It is not because people are feeling good that work is going well, but rather work is going well because people are feeling good. It is members' well-being that brings about proper group functioning and objective attainment, not the other way around. Also, in the eyes of the person, the quality of the exchanges takes precedence over the tasks or procedures. A group in which members have difficulty accepting each other's differences is doomed to failure. In contrast, a group that is functioning well is a group in which members feel well accepted and are polite and understanding with one another. The malfunctions observed in a group, according to the person, arise from the lack of respect between members. They are signs of insufficient mutual aid and of members not accepting the presence of other members. Based on this knowledge, the person seeks to ensure his/her own well-being, as well as that of others, by offering to listen and providing support.



---

## Pleasures

### Support, reassure and be accepted

A person who interacts in accordance to the *support* mode finds pleasure in remaining in the background, listening and offering support in as much on tasks as on a personal level as well.

He/she enjoys being accepted as a member amongst others and being able to help to the best of his/her capacities. The person does not want to become the center of attention. The person's interactions are long-awaited for, and when he/she speaks up, it is more to endorse than to propose. The person does not want to hurt or rush anyone, and tries not to take an overly strong position. He/she likes to reassure, and be reassured. The positive signs of acceptance and appreciation that the person gives and receives feed into his/her pleasures of being a group member. The person enjoys attempting to compensate for the aggressiveness or the negative vibes felt in the group. Concerned for everyone's well-being, he/she wishes for the acceptance of differences. As team leader, the person manages members with sensitivity and finds pleasure in interacting in a way that will ease relations between them. He/she likes to express appreciation of every one's contribution in a positive manner. The person encourages respect for one another and fosters a work environment devoid of conflict.

In short, the person who interacts according to the *support* mode is guided by the pleasures in supporting, reassuring and being accepted.



---

## Signs of inadequacy

### Fear and judgment

In trying to help group members and in contributing to the work to be done without creating any waves, the individual who interacts according to the *support* mode, is sometimes led to cling to the obvious consensus. He/she tends to tolerate discrepancies and cut corners short, not wanting to run the risk that the existing agreement might dissipate. With this mode of interaction, the individual can quickly occupy a neutral position, perhaps even be utterly forgotten by others during debates.

Behaviors associated with the *support* mode can be considered inadequate when the fear of not being accepted is such that the individual no longer expresses any diverging opinions and interactions become redundant as he/she repeats what has been said. These behaviors can become damaging when several members begin to no longer express their disagreement for fear of being hurtful or, be deemed as aggressive. Everything becomes polite and restrained.

In summary, it may be time for this person to question the relevance of maintaining behaviors associated with this interaction mode, when he/she begins to feel discomfort and notes that others are fearful of hurting him/her or, starts to see that they act as if he/she was not even present. Upon perceiving these

cues, the person should evaluate whether more pleasure could be derived from other means of interacting.



---

## Self-perpetuating behaviors

### Staying in the background and fading away

The pleasures in supporting, reassuring and being accepted associated with the *support* mode, bring the person to adopt a relatively discreet and reserved attitude. He/she tends to remain in the background. Often the person's interactions on debates are somewhat belated and are a repetition of elements already discussed. Over time, he/she is left behind, especially when the discussion escalates or becomes more erratic. In fact, by dint of moving aside, politeness and discretion, the person is eventually disregarded by others. The members call upon the person less and less, and reactions to his/her communications are fewer. The person, who is taken for granted, will follow but will be overlooked. This confirms to the person that he/she is not as deserving of attention and, his/her opinion is not that important.

Faced with the person's repeated assents and refusal to take position, others are increasingly compelled to not seek his/her opinion and even cut him/her off. The person then interprets others' reactions as a confirmation that his/her comments are insignificant. Furthermore, sometimes certain members take up his/her ideas without naming him/her. The person views this as a sign of weakness on his/her part. The person's reactions further justify the low opinion he/her has of him/herself. The per-

son is quite right to withdraw from the group and stick to more private meetings with two or three members only.



---

## Regulations strategies<sup>1</sup>

### Valorization and audacity

To counter the self-perpetuating behaviors specific to the mode that aims at supporting people and activities, one must strive to be welcoming towards the person, and value who he/she is and what he/she does. One must clearly demonstrate support of the person, and actively send the message that he/she is accepted as is, without any expectations. One must attempt to encourage the person to express his/her view of things. Ultimately, one can engage the person to express him/herself by means of the person's ability to play the role of one who can summarize the situation after having listened carefully. One can support the person's in his/her capacity to identify possible compromises between submitted proposals.

As the person is reassured and feeling more confident, he/she can begin to show some "audacity", for example, by running the risk of speaking first or putting forward his/her own ideas or projects without really being sure of how others will react. Furthermore, one must remember that the person prefers standing in the background, and is not one to jump into troubled waters or into the heat of the action. In addition, during debates, it is in one's best interest to invite the person to participate as soon as possible.

<sup>1</sup>To break the self-perpetuating cycle of a behavior mode, and to counter its negative impacts, the general underlying principle is to lead the person towards new behaviors of pleasurable relations, outside of his/her usual comfort zone (Mongeau & Tremblay, 2002, 2011).

Also, the member who interacts in this mode can reduce the counterproductive effects of his/her actions by showing some "audacity". For example, the member can take a seat where he/she sees everyone, and everyone sees him/her. And, the member can do the talking from the very start of the meeting to summarize previous discussions or, try to express his/her agreement. When the member endorses certain opinions, he/she can question the people giving them, or try to rephrase in his/her own words certain points of view that are expressed by those he/she supports. Then again, the member could meet informally with another influential member to express his/her opinion and perception of the situation, and ask the latter to make them known to the group.



# In conclusion

All interaction modes used for profile interpretation provide a frame of reference that enables one to better understand why it can be so difficult to get along in a group, despite the good intentions that motivate us all. Most of all, it allows one to guide actions towards new pleasures.

Everyone spontaneously, or naturally as one would say, tries to understand the other members of the group in which he/she is participating, based on his/her convictions and propensities. In fact, it is so easy to judge and say that Mrs. or Mr. X shouldn't have behaved in such a way, yet it is difficult to admit that everyone is simply doing their best, is well intentioned, and acting in good faith.

Nevertheless, as with all aspects of life, group work becomes more bearable, if not more pleasant, when we acknowledge our own biases and learn to live with the shortcomings of others. To do so, it is not a question of changing others or changing ourselves, but simply being conscious of the modes of interaction

---

that we resort to, and the modes of interactions that others resort to. Nor is it about being the victim of who we are; it is about recognizing and better defining the impact we have on other group members in a specific context, and trying to understand the link between our personal dynamic with that of the group.



# Appendix

*As much as we are suspicious of a researcher who affirms something for the first time, we are also suspicious of the stereotyped practitioner who repeats the same interventions with each of his/her clients. To succeed in the academic world, one must become integrated; to succeed in the professional world, one must innovate. When dialogue is established between the researcher and the practitioner, the former is on the lookout for what one can recognize, the latter values what he/she has created<sup>1</sup>.*

Autant on est suspect face à un chercheur qui affirme quelque chose pour la première fois, autant on est suspect face au praticien stéréotypé qui répète les mêmes interventions avec tous ses clients. Pour réussir dans l'univers académique il faut s'intégrer; pour réussir dans l'univers professionnel, il faut innover. Lorsque le dialogue s'établit entre chercheurs et praticiens, les premiers sont à l'affût de ce qu'on peut reconnaître, les seconds valorisent ce qu'ils ont créé. (St-Arnaud, 1992)

### **Basis**

*The “practitioners”*

*The “academics”*

*Two parallel worlds*

*Research process*

### **Results**

- *Grouping of statements according to six factors*
- *List of statements*
- *Groupings’ internal consistency coefficients*
- *Inter-groups correlations*
- *Gathering together of group statements*

<sup>1</sup> Free translation

## **Basis**

Apart from the six interaction modes presented, we all at some point recognize certain types of participants or specific ways of being and behaving from one meeting to the next. Over the years, everyone develops his/her personal typology of these patterns of behavior. For some, there are the rebellious, the gentle or the critical, etc., and for others there are the chatty, the quiet or the “just right”, etc. Ordinarily, these observations are subject to the hazards of individual perception and are obviously lacking in rigor.

Several authors have attempted to systemize group interaction typologies. Essentially, they can be grouped into two categories. The appellation “practitioner” refers to the authors who have tried, based on their professional experience, to identify a few major types of participants. Most of them, being specialists in group work, proceeded in a fashion that any person who often participates in group reunions would. They devised rather impressionist clinical portraits that were highly comparable to the categories that any individual who regularly participates in group reunions would produce. These authors based themselves on their observations and personal analysis which, it must be emphasized, take root in their experience usually alongside very large groups. Also, as an outside consultant to the group,



---

they hold a privileged observation position. Nevertheless, as rich as their typologies may be, they are unfortunately not rigorous enough to be recognized scientifically.

On the other hand, the appellation “academics” designates researchers who have made use of scientific research methods to further examine groups. Paradoxically, even though group work is first and foremost based on interactions between people, and despite the significant number of publications on this domain, scientific studies on interactions between mere participants has been neglected at the expense of studies on interactions between members who exert a certain leadership or authority. Academics are more interested in the fundamental aspects of group development and maintenance, such as : Dimensions, phases of development, leadership, etc. They have not allowed for the emergence of a true scientific typology of group interactions. Instead, they have given rise to analysis grids which are certainly refined and precise but not always obvious when it comes to practical usefulness.

## Practitioners

Most of the accumulated knowledge, clinical data and know-how on the functioning of small groups are basically the result of numerous practitioners’ reflection process. This knowledge and know-how constitute the legacy of hundreds if not, thousands of people mainly concerned with interactions and behaviors within groups. One can just think about the numerous instructors who have worked at the Bethel Institute in the state of Maine, or at Esalen in California, or any of the many other centers that have flourished across the world. Several people have participated, and are still taking part in this booming domain. Even Lewin<sup>1</sup>, theorist and founder of group dynamics, was deeply preoccupied with the practical outcomes of his research.

Nowadays, the vast amounts of information accumulated is impressive. Group facilitator manuals with their multiple recommendations are countless. Most publications aim to help group coordinators, leaders or those in charge of organizing and managing all types of meetings. Authors generally present a typology of participants in a way that indicates to the reader how to best react to these individuals. Featured are the reality freak, the verbally active, the silent, the critic, the evasive, etc., sometimes grouped into two categories: Those that exert a positive influence (the expert, the optimist, the secretary, etc.), and those that exert a negative influence (the systematic challenger, the

<sup>1</sup> Lewin. K. (1953). Studies in Group Decision. In Group dynamics: Research and theory, D. Cartwright Et A. Zander. Evanston, Il.: Row, Peterson  
Lewin. K. (1959). Psychologie dynamique – Les relations humaines. Paris: PUF.  
Lewin K. et Lippitt. R.(1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy. A49 preliminary note. Sociometry (1), 292-300.



---

domineering aggressive, the indifferent, etc.). Most of these qualities refer to personal character traits that are either favorable or unfavorable to group work. Hence, it comes down to two classes of participants: The good and the bad. This Manichian view underlines the various categorizations, yet one is not always certain as to the reasons for belonging to one clan, and not another.

Furthermore, the convergences and constancies observed in the numerous clinical descriptions enable one to assume that the various group interaction styles are a direct result of the group situation. According to this hypothesis, interaction styles are an emerging phenomenon intrinsically related to communications occurring within the context of small-group work which seem to promote the surfacing of certain roles. And, depending on participant's personal affinity with these roles, they may possibly adopt them. To illustrate this point, let's just say that if several generally silent individuals in their respective group are reunited in one same group, the most timid participant would become the silent one, while the most daring would become the chatty one.

With this approach, rather than being an attribute of the person, the diagnostic label stamped on the member's behavior (silent participant, chatty participant, etc.), is an attribute of his/her role

or function in the group. The diagnostic label thus pertains to the context and to the person's contribution to group dynamics.

## **Academics**

Formal studies of small work group functioning started to expand into universities with Lewin's work. His work on autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles have particularly influenced subsequent research direction and development in this domain. His work has given rise to a heap of studies that nowadays impose themselves as much in their numbers as in their diffusion. These studies either focused on the identification of the different impacts of these styles of leadership, or authority, on all group member participation or, the identification of the pertinence of these styles in such and such a situation. For example, nowadays, it is generally recognized that amongst the three styles, the democrat is the one that fosters the most participation or again, the authoritarian is more efficient in a situation of emergency.

Even though all three styles, autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire are sometimes used to categorize interactions of certain participants, they have not been defined in a way that accounts for phenomena explicitly linked to interactions between mere participants. These styles refer directly to ways of influencing, rather than ways of participating in general. They, first and fore-



---

most, apply to the diagnosis of styles in the exercise of leadership or authority. And, even if they enable the identification of certain participants' tendencies, the information gathered remains unclear in regard to the actual interaction style. One may be judged as being more autocratic and bossy in his/her interaction style, while another may be classified as laissez-faire because he/she appears unconcerned by the discussions. These researches have not brought about actual tools for assessing group interactions.

Moreover, a research tradition focused on the group rather than the leader has also been developed. Exercising leadership is presented as a role amongst others, specific to the group. These roles emerge straight from the group situation. According to this school of thought, it is the group that creates the function. A person will exercise leadership because he/she is in a group situation, not because he/she personally has leadership. Beyond the situation, he/she does not necessarily have leadership. In addition, each person has qualities that may be useful at some point in the group's evolution; he/she can then exert an influence over the whole group. If behaviors are based on the group situation, it becomes possible to conceive that leadership is divided amongst many members according to the various dimensions of group life. A very methodical person will influence work structure whereas another more sensitive person will affect group climate.

## Two parallel worlds

Following this brief overview of the practitioners' and academics' work on group participation, one must note that both worlds remain parallel. The practitioner's work has not been directly taken and developed by the scientists. Only Bales' categories<sup>1</sup> come close to the practitioners' clinical portraits. They can be found in most reliable psych sociology manuals, but few practitioners make use of them. Thus, a rigorous elaboration of a genuine typology of ways of interacting, "usable" by practitioners remained to be done. Also, it is primarily this need that we have thoroughly sought to meet without however, denying the clinical wealth so dear to practitioners.

We have thereby tried to elaborate a typology of ways of interacting, or modes of interaction in a group, in touch with concerns of participants who seek to better understand their own way of participating in a group or, who want to know who they are dealing with. We wanted to study the modes of interacting in a group, by considering empirical data utilized by practitioners while introducing a more satisfying scientific rigor. .

<sup>1</sup> Bales, R. F. (1950). Interaction process analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups. Cambridge : Addison-Wesley.

Bales, R. F. (1970). Personality and Interpersonal Behavior. New-York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston.



---

## Research process

It appeared to us that the best way to begin elaborating a typology of the modes of interaction in a group, while seeking to reconcile practitioners' and academics' points of view, was through an empirical approach, based on the analysis of statistical relations between answers given by actual group participants. This approach offers the advantage of bringing out certain underlying traits regarding questions asked. To do this, we compiled over a few years, various comments, observations, and remarks made by practitioners on participants. These comments and remarks mostly related to participants' actions, emotions and beliefs. We have thus gathered and identified over three hundred assertions. Once the duplications and improperly worded assertions were eliminated, we elaborated a questionnaire comprising 75 statements. Respondents had to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement for each of the statements, on a four-point scale: Agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, disagree.

This first questionnaire was pre-tested with approximately 80 people. Following this pre-test, statements that gave rise to misinterpretations or, that couldn't be linked to any factor were eliminated; 30 were retained. The order of appearance of these 30 statements in the questionnaire's final version was randomly determined. Subsequently, close to 15 000 on line questionnaires were filled in by a population of students and workers, equal-

ly formed of both sexes, in the following undergraduate university programs in the regions of Montreal and Quebec: Communication, engineering, psychology, and social studies. All were adults, aged between 20 to 40 years old. All subjects responded voluntarily, and anonymously.



## Results

Results are in general agreement with both the works of practitioners and the works of scientists. In fact, analysis revealed the possibility of grouping statements together according to six factors, see table I.

Table I: Grouping of statements according to six factors<sup>1</sup>

#	Explanation	Structuring	Support	Promotion	Expression	Vigilance
q7	0,717	0,127	0,064	-0,06	-0,032	0,093
q3	0,656	0,147	-0,124	0,061	0,086	-0,106
q13	0,649	-0,016	-0,121	0,19	0,125	0,035
q18	0,645	0,08	-0,099	0,04	0,122	0,023
q27	0,622	0,098	-0,167	0,221	0,215	-0,069
q26	0,167	0,756	0,031	0,02	0,015	0,015
q16	0,114	0,709	0,014	-0,04	0,013	0,001
q30	0,173	0,701	0,026	0,067	0,03	-0,024
q11	-0,052	0,7	0,046	0,121	-0,009	0,151
q6	-0,014	0,664	0,08	0,098	0,025	0,161
q20	-0,057	-0,001	0,684	-0,195	-0,213	0,184
q9	-0,118	-0,038	0,657	-0,174	-0,163	0,25
q15	-0,076	0,084	0,653	-0,192	-0,023	0,06
q25	-0,086	0,044	0,645	0,047	-0,082	0,074
q23	-0,074	0,074	0,628	0,154	-0,058	-0,057
q21	0,217	-0,011	-0,191	0,688	0,189	0,077
q31	0,06	-0,017	-0,192	0,678	0,242	0,128
q8	0,167	0,044	-0,064	0,644	0,145	0,176
q17	0,039	0,173	-0,023	0,617	0,058	0,146
q24	-0,023	0,119	0,36	0,554	0,091	-0,008
q29	0,07	0,084	-0,122	0,198	0,689	0,034
q19	-0,148	-0,055	0,102	0,19	0,682	0,142
q14	0,205	0,013	-0,173	0,25	0,641	-0,017
q32	0,147	0,045	-0,099	-0,034	0,63	0,027
q4	0,224	-0,02	-0,216	0,125	0,62	-0,07
q12	-0,065	0,131	0,098	0,092	0,041	0,721
q22	-0,205	-0,009	0,147	0,125	0,094	0,688
q28	0,038	0,047	0,042	0,203	0,037	0,657
q10	0,434	-0,037	-0,026	0,143	-0,041	0,529
q5	0,086	0,109	0,083	-0,017	-0,017	0,504

<sup>1</sup> Statement contributions following Varimax rotation, convergence in 6 iterations. Analyses were made using data gathered from the French version. We are, at this time, in the process of collecting data to check the factorial structure of the English version

These six factors gather the statements into six groups of five statements that define the core of the six interaction modes presented in this publication, see table II.

Table II: List of statements

### Statements from the Structuring group

The *structuring* group gathers the statements corresponding to behaviors that target the respect of rules and procedures.

- 6- *I am irritated when rules are not followed.*
- 11- *I am annoyed by disorganized people.*
- 16- *Respecting the schedule is important to me.*
- 26- *I always make sure that the rules and procedures are respected.*
- 30- *I believe it is essential to be structured; if not, chaos will ensue.*

### Statements from the Support group

The *support* group gathers the statements corresponding to behaviors that aim at contributing in relatively discreet ways.

- 9- *I remain in the background.*
- 15- *I concur more than I propose.*
- 20- *I am rather unobtrusive, I would rather listen than speak.*
- 23- *I flee conflicts.*
- 25- *I always remain quiet during confrontations between group members.*

### Statements from the Explanation group

The *explanation* group gathers the statements corresponding to behaviors that aim at analyzing and sharing one's comprehension of things.

- 3- *I explain.*
- 7- *I seek to understand causes.*
- 13- *I seek to raise new points of view.*
- 18- *In a situation of conflict, I communicate my understanding of the issues.*
- 27- *I often share my analysis.*



### Statements from the Expression group

The *expression* group gathers the statements corresponding to behaviors that aim at speaking out as a group.

- 4- *I speak freely, without reserve.*
- 14- *I tend to express my opinion promptly.*
- 19- *I often express myself impulsively.*
- 29- *I cannot help but express my thoughts or my feelings.*
- 32- *Others generally know what I think of them.*

### Statements from the Promotion group

The *promotion* group gathers the statements corresponding to behaviors that aim at bringing members to adhere to proposals and projects.

- 8- *I use all available opportunities to get people to rally to my proposals.*
- 17- *I strive to be seen amongst the winners.*
- 21- *I often speak to try to persuade or, to sell an idea or project.*
- 24- *I need my participation to be openly approved.*
- 31- *I have a salesman's attitude, I try to convince everyone*

### Statements from the Vigilance group

The *vigilance* group gathers the statements corresponding to behaviors that target the unspoken.

- 5- *I am sensitive to the risk of being manipulated.*
- 10- *I look for hidden issues.*
- 12- *I am wary.*
- 22- *I doubt the good intentions of others.*
- 28- *I believe that one must always be on one's guard and know who will profit from a decision.*

From a statistical point of view, each group's statements are sufficiently homogenous between themselves and distinct from the other groups to consider that they measure different aspects of group participation. Indeed, the coefficients of internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha) of the groups of statements are high

enough to assume that they measure one same aspect of group participation. See table III.

**Table III: Groups' coefficients of internal consistencies**

Group	Coefficients of internal consistencies (Cronbach Alpha)
Expression	0,72
Promotion	0,72
Explanation	0,74
Structuring	0,77
Vigilance	0,65
Support	0,73

In addition, for each of the groups, intra-group correlations are all sufficiently inferior to the coefficients of internal correlation; we can thus consider that they effectively measure distinct dimensions, see table IV.

**Table IV: Inter-group correlations**

	Explanation	Structuring	Support	Promotion	Expression	Vigilance
Explanation	1	,218**	-,277**	,282**	,310**	,096**
Structuring	,218**	1	,095**	,182**	,065**	,180**
Support	-,277**	,095**	1	-,156**	-,318**	,201**
Promotion	,282**	,182**	-,156**	1	,431**	,305**
Expression	,310**	,065**	-,318**	,431**	1	,097**
Vigilance	,096**	,180**	,201**	,305**	,097**	1

\*\* Pearson correlation sig. (bilateral) 0.01

n = 16907



Thus, in the way that numerous practitioners have proposed clinical portraits, these six gatherings of statements enable one to identify six group-interaction modes. However, these modes are far from the description of the Manichean tendency observed by clinical authors, that identifies either “good” or “bad” participants. Here, each mode has its advantages and inconveniences. Neither is better nor worse than the other. All contribute in their own way to the group’s approach. Each one has its pitfalls and resources.

A second more general level of analysis, rounds up the six groups of statements into two categories that correspond to propensities. The first is entitled: “Tendency to be proactive” and the second: “Tendency to be reactive”. One category gathers the interaction modes: *expression*, *explanation* and *promotion*, while the second category gathers the modes: *structuring*, *vigilance* and *support*. In the first case, it is a question of more active modes. The individual startles, promotes or shares analysis. Whereas in the second case, it is more about reactive modes of interaction. The individual reacts to what is happening. He/she regulates, examines and listens. This roundup of groups of statements into two categories defines two specific propensities entitled respectively: The propensity to act in a proactive way and, The propensity to act in a reactive way. Group contributions to both factors are shown in table V.

**Table V: Gathering together of group statements**

Group	Proactive	Reactive
<b>Expression</b>	<b>0,74</b>	-0,23
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>0,75</b>	0,18
<b>Explanation</b>	<b>0,68</b>	-0,11
<b>Vigilance</b>	0,34	<b>0,70</b>
<b>Structuring</b>	0,35	<b>0,51</b>
<b>Support</b>	-0,43	<b>0,72</b>

The identification of these two general tendencies to interact to events in a proactive or reactive way is a new contribution to the literature on groups. Nevertheless, these tendencies are widely known in factorial studies. Since the turn of the century, they appear under different names most often in terms resembling the notions of introversion and extroversion borrowed from Jung. In this case, the terms proactive and reactive appeared to us as being more appropriate in describing general modes of group interaction, whereas the terms introversion and extroversion seem too close to notions and concepts pertaining to personality theories. One must remember that the goal of this actual research was to better define specific ways of interacting in a group situation. On the other hand, this convergence between our results and those traditionally observed help validate our research process.



---

The list of modes submitted here does not, however, claim to be exhaustive. One cannot be sure to have covered all possible behaviors. The list of modes presented depend directly on the statements collected and treated. In fact, the modes identified stem from an analysis of answers to a questionnaire. Such a method can only “find” what has formerly been “placed” in the questionnaire. This method does not allow one to identify factors other than those pertaining to the questions that make up the questionnaire. And, other modes of interaction, other nuances, or even better definitions are surely possible. Despite this limitation, the six modes identified provide a rigorous basis to better define one’s preferred group interaction style, one’s specific combination of interaction modes. These six modes make-up an analysis grid that is both statistically valid and in touch with the reality of the people. It provides a rigorous and credible basis to begin reflecting upon ways, as a participant, of contributing to group work..